

"He was a fun-loving person," his mother said yesterday. "He had a lot of friends. They were always coming to the house . . . just loads of them," she said.

DETAILS WITHHELD

Private Wimmer was killed near Pleiku. His mother said yesterday that the Army has asked her not to tell the circumstances of his death.

Private Wimmer is survived by five sisters, Mrs. Mildred Jane Graham, Mrs. Carolyn V. Ashworth, Mrs. Cheryl Burdinski, Mrs. Wanda June Pittman and Bonnie Charlene Wimmer, all of Baltimore; a brother, Roger D. Wimmer, of Baltimore, and his paternal grandmother, Mrs. Viola Wimmer, of Olderson, W. Va.

Specialist Turner, 23, was a college senior who aspired to a career as a writer when he was drafted into the Army.

"WHAT HE HAD TO DO"

Specialist Turner's father, Marshall S. Turner, who works with the Public Buildings Service of the U.S. General Services Administration, said yesterday his son wrote "profusely" from Vietnam.

"He, like many other Vietnam soldiers, didn't want to be there. He just did what he had to do," Mr. Turner said.

Specialist Turner was killed during a mission to secure an enemy-held arms camp. One of his best friends, Spec. 4 Samuel A. Bond, also of Bethesda, is to serve as escort when Specialist Turner's body is flown to the United States.

Specialist Turner was a ground-fighter with Company B, 1st Battalion, 12th Infantry Regiment of the 4th Infantry Division.

ATTENDED UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

He attended the University of Maryland and Bellarmine College in Louisville, where he majored in English.

Specialist Turner had already started to learn the publishing trade at Newsweek, Inc., where he once worked for six months as a copy boy.

As a youth, he lived in Cambridge in Dorchester County, and he graduated in 1963 from Bethesda-Chevy Chase High School.

Besides his father and mother, Mrs. Myra H. Turner, he is survived by two sisters, Mary Ann Turner and Mrs. Marsha Turner Bonner, all of the Bethesda area.

DRAFTED LAST JULY

Specialist Demby was born in Havre de Grace and lived in Harford County all his life, until he was drafted into the Army last July.

In September, after basic training at Fort Bragg, N.C., the infantryman was married to the former Janice Harris, of Abingdon, Md. Mrs. Harris is expecting a baby this spring.

Specialist Demby was killed March 11 in Saigon in a skirmish with the enemy.

The son of Mrs. Evelyn Richardson and the stepson of Harold Richardson, he was the idol of his six stepsisters and many cousins, according to an aunt.

Specialist Demby, who turned 20 last August, was a track and basketball star at Bel Air High School, where he was a member of the Class of 1967.

Besides his wife and parents, he is survived by a brother, Alexander Demby, an apprentice electrician; and his stepsisters, Lenore Richardson, Vasessa Richardson, Teresa Richardson, Victoria Richardson, Doreen Richardson, and Donna Richardson, and a number of aunts, uncles and cousins, all in Harford County.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, April 3, 1969

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

A new commandment I give unto you, that you love one another.—John 13: 34.

Our Father God, as we continue our pilgrim way this holy week, entering an upper room, climbing the hill called Calvary, and realizing anew the glory of the Easter morn, we pause in Thy presence to lift our hearts unto Thee in praise and thanksgiving.

We thank Thee for Thy love revealed in the experiences of these days, for Thy forgiving love made known in the way of the cross, and for Thy strengthening power received in our response to Thy love and Thy forgiving mercy.

Bless us and our Nation in these crucial days that we may continue to be crusaders in the cause of human freedom, workers for an enduring peace, and cultivators of good will in the hearts of all people.

Draw Thou my soul, O God, closer to Thine;

Breathe into every wish Thy will divine. Raise my low self above, won by Thy deathless love;

Ever, O God, through mine let Thy life shine.

In the spirit of Christ, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SWEARING IN OF A MEMBER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. DAVID R. OBEY, be permitted to take the oath of office today. His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with respect to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to

the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. OBEY appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

ELECTION OF MEMBER TO JOINT COMMITTEE OF CONGRESS ON THE LIBRARY

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 358) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 358

Resolved, That the gentleman from Iowa, Mr. Schwengel, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the Joint Committee of Congress on the Library.

The resolution was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

POSTAL REFORM HEARINGS TO BEGIN ON APRIL 22, 1969

(Mr. ALBERT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time at the request of the gentleman from New York (Mr. DULSKI), chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. The gentleman from New York has asked me to announce that public hearings on postal reorganization will begin on Tuesday, April 22, before his full committee.

Several bills are pending before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service relating to the reorganization of the Post Office Department. The committee has decided, as a matter of policy, that this legislation is of such major importance that it will be considered by the full committee, rather than one or more subcommittees.

The gentleman from New York plans to hold hearings on 1 or 2 days each week, at least at the outset, in order that the

subcommittees of his committee may continue with their own schedules.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF APRIL 14, 1969

(Mr. GERALD R. FORD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I have taken this time for the purpose of asking the distinguished majority leader the program for the week beginning April 14.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the distinguished minority leader yield?

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. In response to the inquiry of the distinguished minority leader we, of course, have finished the legislative business for the week and will go over for the Easter holidays upon adjournment today, pursuant to the adjournment resolution previously agreed to.

Monday, April 14, is District day. There will be no District bills.

Monday is also Pan American day.

Tuesday is Private Calendar day. Also for Tuesday and the balance of the week are the following:

H.R. 4148, the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1969, will come up under an open rule with 3 hours of debate, waiving points of order against committee amendment;

H.R. 514, Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1969, subject to a rule being granted; and

H.R. 4153, to authorize appropriations for procurement of vessels and aircraft and construction of shore and offshore establishments for the Coast Guard, subject to a rule being granted.

This announcement is made subject to the usual reservations that conference reports may be brought up at any time and that any further program may be announced later.

COMPARABILITY IN POSTAL PAY

(Mr. OLSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill which demands the serious attention and consideration of every Member of the Congress. It is a bill which, if enacted, will at long last establish wage comparability for the lowest paid employees in the Postal Establishment—those who occupy levels 1 through 7 in the pay structure. It also corrects inequities in supervising pay scales.

This bill will meet an obligation we have owed the postal employees of the Nation for 7 long years. I am convinced that Congress has had every intention of acting in good faith in this area, but that our intentions have been unsuccessful.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that in the Federal Salary Reform Act of 1962, we laid down certain policies to govern the postal and Federal pay schedules. In that declaration of policy we said:

Federal Salary rates shall be comparable with private enterprise salary rates for the same level of work.

We also said:

Salary levels shall be set and henceforth adjusted in accordance with the above principles.

We have never lived up to these policies.

In the Pay Act of 1967, we insisted that true comparability must be achieved by July 1, 1969. But, instead of offering a program which would meet this obligation, the national administration is recommending that low-paid postal employees be granted only a 4.1-percent pay increase—a token increase, an increase that will not only fail to achieve any semblance of comparability for the postal employees but which will not even match the increase in the cost of living over the past year.

The proposed 4.1-percent increase, I might add, is only one-tenth of the percentage increase we accepted for ourselves this year. This increase in pay is far greater than the total salary of a letter carrier or postal clerk with 25 years of service.

It is no secret, Mr. Speaker, that our postal employees over the country are in a restless and dissatisfied mood. For the first time in our history the word "strike" is heard in our post offices. The responsible leaders of the postal unions—who support my bill in its entirety—are opposed to the idea of a postal strike, but there is a limit to what they can do in restraining their restless members in high cost-of-living areas throughout the country.

It is also no secret, Mr. Speaker, that public dissatisfaction with the postal service is growing. The service is deteriorating month by month, year by year.

The quality of the service depends upon the quality of the people who work in it. The wage structure is so inadequate that the Postal Establishment is simply not competitive in today's labor market. Even if this puny 4.1-percent

pay increase which the administration is offering were permitted to stand, the starting wage of a letter carrier or postal clerk would still be \$3,000 less than the starting wage of a sanitation worker in New York City, or in many other large metropolitan areas. Policemen, firemen, busdriver—almost every American who performs a service for the public—gets more money by far than do our postal clerks and letter carriers.

The pay situation is even worse—by comparison—after a man has been in the postal service for a while. Under the present structure, new employees must work for a minimum of 21 years until he reaches the top pay in his level. Some postal employees have worked 25 years, and still have not reached the top pay level.

And once they do reach the top they are getting only \$8,000 a year.

What kind of a career inducement is this? In almost every city in the land policemen, firemen, and busdrivers not only get more money at entrance to their careers, but they reach the top pay level in 3 or 4 years.

Is it any wonder that the Post Office is having great difficulty attracting and retaining topflight talent? There are thousands upon thousands of jobs in this prosperous country of ours which offer an ambitious young man better pay, better working conditions, better fringe benefits, better promotion opportunities, better career inducements. Why should anyone want to become a postal worker under present conditions?

I have talked to hundreds of postal workers—veterans of the career service—and almost to a man they have told me that if they knew the Government was going to drag its feet in the area of comparability, they never would have joined the service in the first place.

And, Mr. Speaker, thousands upon thousands of workers are simply refusing to take the inaction of their Government any longer. The turnover in the major post offices of the country is a national scandal—and it is usually the best and the most talented employees who are leaving to take easier and more lucrative jobs in the private sector. No wonder the postal service is deteriorating. The Post Office cannot recruit enough good employees and it cannot keep the good ones it has.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, a situation like this needs a bold and imaginative solution. I sincerely believe I have offered such a solution in my bill.

The real pinch is found in levels 1 through 7; that is where the money is needed; and that is where the erosion of quality in the personnel is taking place.

Under my bill no employee in the postal service will receive less than \$5,000 a year.

All the lowest six levels of postal employment will be upgraded by one level.

In the heavily populated level 5—where 80 percent of the postal workforce subsists—the starting wage will be raised to \$7,500 a year. There will be annual step increases of \$500, so a man can reach the top salary of \$10,000 after 5 years.

There will also be longevity pay in-

creases after 8 years of service, after 11 years, and after 14 years. This will retain incentives and will make the prospect of remaining in the service more attractive than it is today.

My bill will also correct an inequity which was inadvertently written into the 1962 Pay Reform Act. This section of the bill has long been associated with the name of the chairman of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and is familiarly known as the Dulski amendment.

Because of certain technical provisions of the act of 1962, many postal employees lost time they had earned toward their next step increase. They have been one step behind on the pay ladder ever since. My bill makes provision for the adjustment of this inequity and will place these employees into a pay step commensurate with their service.

My bill will also make appropriate and equivalent provision for our good friends and competent Government servants, the rural letter carriers.

There is another feature of my bill which, I think, should gain the favorable consideration of my colleagues.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, one of the unpleasant features of postal employment is the fact that a large body of men must work at night to prepare the mail for the next day's delivery. Not many men like night work and, even with the 10-percent nightwork differential being granted today, many will quit their jobs rather than accept a night job. My bill would raise that differential to 20 percent to make this irksome duty more palatable.

I sincerely believe my bill will go a long way to making the Post Office a modern employer, comparable with industries of similar size and importance in the private sector.

The Bureau of the Budget suggests that a 4.1-percent increase will bring the postal workers up even with their counterparts in private industry.

This simply is not true. The salary increase the employees received on July 1, 1968, was based on statistics gathered prior to April 1967. It was based, in short, on statistics almost a year and a half old. The statistics on which the disgraceful 4.1 percent suggested increase for this year is based are equally antique. The cost of living has gone up 10 percent in the past 2 years—and, in some areas, even more than that.

The Bureau of the Budget is not even willing to give postal workers comparability with workers in the other branches of Government. They have prepared an impressive chart on which they are basing their pay recommendations. But they have "cooked" their figures by drawing through the chart an arbitrary, curving line. As a result of this line they are offering to letter carriers and postal clerks \$824 a year less than the average which the Bureau of Labor Statistics maintains is industrial comparability.

Mr. Speaker, we have decided consistently upon the policy of comparability in postal pay. The Bureau of the Budget just as consistently has used methods like the wavering line I have just mentioned to thwart the will of the Congress to insure comparability.

A letter carrier and a postal clerk, Mr. Speaker, have families to support. They are the breadwinners of their families. They have people depending upon their earning power—depending on this power for their food, their housing, their clothes, their education.

We can save the postal service from chaos and I believe this legislation is a step in that direction. We must pay these valuable employees a wage commensurate with their importance—a living wage which will permit them to rear their families in self-respect and security—a decent wage that will permit them to live with the same comforts that are enjoyed by their neighbors in comparable non-Government jobs.

I sincerely believe that my bill will right these wrongs which threaten the postal service in this country.

MILLIONAIRES DUCKING TAXES

(Mr. MADDEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress returning to their districts for the Easter recess will no doubt discover that one of the real torrid issues on the minds of their constituents is high taxes. April 15 is the deadline for Federal income taxes and your constituents by great numbers have been startled, not only by the regular high Federal taxes, but also by the added 10-percent surtax. This is now hitting them right "bang" in their pocketbooks. For the first time they are becoming aroused to the fact that it is the average small and middle class salaried and wage citizen who is paying the bulk of Federal taxes. They will ask you "What is the Congress going to do about it in this session?" Some of them will ask how so many large corporations escape with a small tax and some with millions in income pay no tax at all.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I submit with my remarks the following article by Tom Stewart of the Associated Press and which was printed in many newspapers over the country last week:

MILLIONAIRES DUCKING TAXES, 21 SKIPPED
LAST YEAR

(By Tom Stewart)

WASHINGTON.—There are two kinds of millionaires in the United States: those who pay federal income taxes and those who don't. In the latter group there were 21 last year.

How is it possible, you ask as you reach for your checkbook after a losing bout with Form 1040, to have an income of more than \$1 million a year and yet not pay any federal income tax?

The method most favored by untaxed millionaires is to give away things that have grown in value since they were acquired. Stocks, real estate, a share of the donor's business, art objects—all are good for this treatment.

The current value of the gift is deducted from income subject to taxation. So it's quite possible to reduce taxable income to zero.

One return cited in a recent Treasury Department study showed adjusted gross income of \$10.8 million, contributions totaling \$10.5 million and other deductions of \$400,000 plus. No taxable income and hence no tax.

Another taxpayer's adjusted gross income of \$4.3 million was erased by \$4.5 million deductions, including \$4 million in contributions.

Ordinarily, a taxpayer may deduct no more than 30 per cent of his income for charitable gifts. But it's not an ironclad rule.

A special exception allows the claiming of contributions without limit if in 8 of the past 10 years the taxpayer's contributions plus his taxes have added up to 90 per cent or more of income.

One aspect of these gifts that bothers those seeking reform of tax laws is that it is legal for Mr. Rich to make his donations to a foundation run by his family.

And perhaps the contribution to the Rich Foundation is a share of Mr. Rich's business. This kind of giving, a Treasury study says drily, "lacks the finality which characterizes a true parting with property."

Congress is thinking of throwing out the unlimited charitable contributions privilege, largely because it figures so often in stories about untaxed millionaires.

Another proposed change would make the untaxed superwealthy an extinct species by imposing a minimum tax on all-bracket incomes, with no exceptions.

Before he left office in January, Treasury Secretary Joseph W. Barr told Congress many middle-income taxpayers are losing confidence in the fairness of the tax system. His warning of a "taxpayer revolt" is still echoing on Capitol Hill. The new Treasury team is also pledged to a reworking of the tax laws.

If the unlimited charitable contribution rule is the favorite of untaxed millionaires, one of the runners-up would have to be the depreciation rules.

Depreciation is a great vanishing cream for taxable income. You don't have to be a millionaire to use it, but it helps.

Suppose you're a corporation executive poking along at \$250,000 a year. Normally, you might figure on paying about \$110,000 in income tax.

What you might do instead is borrow \$15 million and buy a nice big apartment building. Figure an income from rents of \$1 million, reduced by maybe \$500,000 for upkeep and loan payments.

So far, you're \$500,000 in black as a landlord, but don't worry about having to pay tax on it. Depreciation will bail you out.

While allowable amounts in succeeding years will be smaller, one accelerated method of figuring depreciation would permit you to claim your \$15 million investment depreciated \$750,000 the first year.

You get to deduct depreciation from income, even though no actual cash expenditure occurred. So the \$500,000 you netted from operating the building becomes instead a paper loss of \$250,000 and this cancels out that \$250,000 salary. Result: no taxes instead of \$110,000.

What makes it even more attractive is that the amount of cash that has passed through your hands—money you could put into other short-run projects—is \$750,000. That's more than triple the cash you had to play with back before you became an apartment owner on borrowed capital.

Then there is the oil depletion allowance. Suppose your wells are producing a before-tax income of \$1 million a year. It costs \$450,000 to run the operation—deductible expense—so your net is \$550,000.

But the depletion allowance, one of the most controversial tax breaks in the books, permits you to deduct 27½ per cent of the gross income from the wells. So off comes \$275,000.

You still have another \$275,000 in income. You can make it disappear this way:

You could spend \$375,000 developing some other oil properties. This is deductible expense, so your black ink \$275,000 becomes a red ink \$100,000.

You are now theoretically \$100,000 in the hole. Surprisingly enough, this is a position many of the superrich aim for, because paper losses are just the thing to shelter other income.

In your case, the \$100,000 loss would enable you to have \$100,000 in other income—stocks and bonds, for instance—and keep it all.

The net result of your year as a combination oilman and stock market dabbler is that you have paid no tax, and you come away with at least \$275,000 clear. And though \$1.1 million has passed through your hands, you have had, in the eyes of the law, no taxable income.

IDES OF APRIL

(Mr. VANIK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, with the approach of April 15, which could be termed the "Ides of April," I hope that the beleaguered American taxpayer will not forget the struggle which must go on for tax reform in a substantial and effective manner.

Congress will act if the pressure stays on beyond the taxpaying deadline. Too often everything is forgotten after April 15.

I hope the taxpayer will not be taken in by "tokenism" instead of hard-hitting revenue-producing tax reform.

I am for tax reforms which require everyone to carry their fair share of the load including the tax-free, bondowning superrich, and the ungentlemanly farmer. I oppose the gimmickry of some tax-free foundations.

However, the real culprits which cause the vast Treasury losses include the oil depletion allowance, capital gains at death and the investment credit. Any tax reform proposal which fails to include these basic reforms constitutes a sham.

The American taxpayer must continue to be vigilant.

WE SHOULD HONOR COMMITMENTS MADE TO MICRONESIA

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, Micronesia—the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands—has been largely absent from the news headlines for about two decades. During World War II, millions of Americans read about Saipan and Tinian and Kwajalein. After the war, nuclear weapons tests made Bikini a household word. But since that time, the 90,000 people of the trust territory, and their 2,100 islands, have been pretty much out of sight, and out of mind.

I am very much afraid, Mr. Speaker, that Micronesia may be almost ready to capture some fresh headlines. They will not be attractive headlines for American readers. For if they do appear, they will record charges by the Micronesians of American neglect of their development, of American indifference to their welfare, and of American refusal to honor in full the commitments contained in the trusteeship agreement under which we ad-

minister the territory. These charges have already been set forth in a resolution of the Micronesian Senate which my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on March 25. Unless we respond promptly and meaningfully to their demand for self-determination, those charges will soon be aired before a world audience and our hopes for preserving close and friendly ties to Micronesia will be seriously compromised.

Two questions need to be posed, How have we come to this situation, and have we in fact reached the point where these headlines are inevitable? Let us examine them in order.

Few Americans are even aware that our formal governmental responsibilities extend across 3 million square miles of the Pacific Ocean. Fewer still are aware of the nature of those responsibilities, as defined by the trusteeship agreement we entered into in 1947. Among other things, we pledged to promote the economic, social, and educational advancement of the inhabitants, and to promote their development "toward self-government or independence" according to their own freely expressed wishes.

Only in the last few years have we really begun to deliver on our promises, by substantially increasing appropriations and by encouraging the development of indigenous administrative and political structures, including the Congress of Micronesia itself. The pace envisaged for this development has been a gradual one, and ultimate authority in the trust territory has remained firmly in the hands of American officials. True self-government, as envisaged in the trusteeship agreement, remained something for a more distant future.

In this rapidly evolving world we live in, our efforts seem likely to prove too little, too late. The people of Micronesia were extraordinarily patient, even docile, through two decades of an American policy of relative inaction. Thus, the gradual approach to development would probably have been welcomed in the trust territory 10, or even 5, years ago. But meanwhile, the Micronesians have been touched by the same winds of change that are stirring so many others around the world, and gradualism is no longer enough. When I visited the trust territory in 1961, as U.S. Representative on the U.N. Trusteeship Council, the political objectives of its people were extremely limited. The language of the recent Micronesian Senate resolution to which I referred—language typical of the struggle against colonialism elsewhere in the world—was simply not in the Micronesian political vocabulary at that time. But this has been a decade of profound change, in Micronesia as elsewhere, and the pressures for full self-government and self-determination are near the point of explosion.

In this situation, can we still take action which would demonstrate to the people of the trust territory—as none of our actions to date have done—that we are willing to grant them the self-determination they were promised in 1947?

I believe we can. I believe there may

still be a chance to seek a reasonable solution in full cooperation with the people of Micronesia, thus avoiding a harsh confrontation which would damage beyond repair our relationship with our long-time wards. But this opportunity is a fleeting one, for the trusteeship council will hold its next regular meeting in less than 2 months. At that time, the charges contained in the Micronesian Senate resolution will inevitably be given a full hearing. The Soviet delegate will gleefully seize on the opportunity to support—and to embellish—the Micronesian complaints, giving us a public black eye in the process. More serious may be the effect on the Micronesians, whose flexibility and readiness to compromise may be sharply curbed if they are prompted to take extreme public positions in an attempt to gain press attention in New York. In addition, we can be sure their charges will be aired in the strongly anticolonial committee of 24 and in the general assembly session which convenes in the fall.

As a first step in demonstrating our good faith, I hope the Congress will give prompt and favorable consideration to a resolution which I am introducing today. This resolution, virtually identical with one that I offered 2 years ago, would constitute a Commission of Americans and Micronesians to recommend within 1 year means by which the people of the trust territory could be enabled to express their wishes as to its future status. A similar resolution was also offered in the Senate at the last session, and one has recently been reintroduced in that body by the distinguished junior Senator from North Dakota, Mr. BURDICK, and five cosponsors.

This resolution was offered 2 years ago, Mr. Speaker, in response to a specific request from the Micronesian Congress that just such a Commission be created. Had we responded affirmatively at that time, we would have given the Micronesians a concrete demonstration of our willingness to respond to reasonable requests advanced by their elected representatives. By so doing, we might have precluded the buildup of pressures which produced the recent Micronesian Senate resolution and thus kept the temperature of our entire relationship at a more normal, and healthier, temperature.

There will, inevitably, be opposition in this country to any exercise of self-determination by the Micronesians. Some will argue that the Micronesians are "not ready" to bear the full burdens of self-government. But this argument has become irrelevant in the world today, and indeed passed out of the vocabulary of such former colonial powers as Britain and France some 20 years ago. Others will contend that we must hold on to Micronesia because our troops fought and died for its islands in World War II—but this overlooks the fact that the enemy then was Japan, not the Micronesian people who are the claimants today. Finally, the argument will be made that these islands are strategically vital. There is, of course, some truth in this contention, but the broader issues of self-determination, and of the United

States keeping its promises, should prevail. And there is, in any event, little likelihood that the Micronesians today would choose a status that would open the area wide to other nations.

Nevertheless, we must be prepared for the proposed Commission to put forward alternatives for the future of Micronesia which some in the country might consider unpalatable, including the option of independence. Unless our relations are permitted to worsen drastically, however, complete independence is not likely to be an appealing prospect for the Micronesians. They are far more likely to choose a status which will permit a continued close relationship with the United States. Two possibilities suggest themselves: a "free association" arrangement like that of Puerto Rico, or incorporation in the State of Hawaii. If the latter were to include appropriate protection for local autonomy and some assurance of future Federal funding for Micronesian development, it might well prove the most attractive alternative.

I would also like to call to the attention of my colleagues a bill introduced both at the last session and at the present one by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK), which would endow the trust territory with an organic act. This proposal, first put forward by President Eisenhower's Secretary of Interior in 1953, also merits prompt consideration. But I fear that an organic act would not alone provide convincing evidence of American willingness to face the key question of self-determination for Micronesia—and only if such evidence is swiftly furnished can we hope to induce the people of Micronesia to withhold such demands as are contained in their recent resolution.

In consequence, Mr. Speaker, I believe a commission created specifically to consider self-determination is also essential. My distinguished colleague from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) commented last week that events seemed to have outrun such a commission. I would suggest, however, that we cannot proceed toward meaningful self-determination until we know what options should be offered the Micronesians in a plebiscite—and these options can only be defined in full consultation with the Micronesians themselves. It is for this reason that I have proposed that four of the nine members of the commission be chosen from the elected representatives of the Micronesian people. Only when their views are known can we in Congress legislate effectively in this area and thereby meet our responsibility to the trust territory. I believe the Micronesian leaders would recognize the validity of this argument and would gladly cooperate in the work of such a commission. I therefore urge my colleagues to give their support to the resolution which I am introducing today.

TRIBUTE TO "DOC" KLEIN

(Mr. PEPPER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege of attending a dinner at Piccolo's Restaurant in Miami Beach—in my good district—on Sunday, March 16, put on by American Legion Post No. 85, Miami Beach, commemorating the 50th anniversary of the founding of the American Legion. On this occasion special and affectionate recognition was given to the grand man of the American Legion of Florida, Maurice "Doc" Klein, a member of Post No. 85 of the American Legion of Miami Beach for 35 years, twice commander of the post, in whose term the splendid post home was built, and a leader in the American Legion not only in the Greater Miami area but in Florida and in the country for more than a third of a century.

"Doc" Klein symbolizes everything the American Legion stands for—reverence for God, love of country, and dedication to serving the veterans of our Nation's wars, as well as everything which is good for our country. I was privileged to pay my own heartfelt tribute of admiration and affection to "Doc" Klein on this occasion.

The Honorable Chuck Hall, mayor of Metropolitan Dade County, honored the occasion with his presence and read a proclamation honoring "Doc" Klein on behalf of the Board of County Commissioners of Dade County.

Mr. Speaker, I include this commendation following my remarks in the RECORD.

Also the Honorable Jay Dermer, mayor of Miami Beach, honored the occasion with his presence and read a proclamation bestowing the title of "Honorary Citizen of the City of Miami Beach" upon Maurice "Doc" Klein. I include this proclamation of the city of Miami Beach following my remarks.

Also present at this occasion was Capt. George Maines, the secretary of the founding group of the American Legion in the United States. I put in the RECORD sometime ago a list of those who attended this great convention and some of the resolutions adopted. A special honor was paid to Captain Maines by the awarding of a plaque to him commemorating his service to the American Legion.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to attest my friendship to Maurice "Doc" Klein and to commend him for all that he has done for America and for Americanism in his long and distinguished life. I pray that he shall have many, many more years to continue his great service.

The above-mentioned material follows:

METRO COMMENDATION

Whereas: Maurice Klein, affectionately known as "Doc," has made immeasurable contributions to the advancement of his community of Miami Beach, as well as all Dade County, much of it through his most loyal service to American Legion Post No. 85, now observing the 50th anniversary of the American Legion, and

Whereas: Mr. Klein, a member of the Post for 35 years, has nobly served twice as its Commander and during whose first tenure as Commander in 1940 witnessed the building of the Post home, and

Whereas: He has consistently remained as a mighty bulwark of South Florida, giving so generously of his time and energies on

various committees, and also in such capacity as director of civil defense for Miami Beach during World War II and as director of the Miami Beach Serviceman's Center for 17 years, and as a former Councilman and Mayor of Miami Beach,

Now, therefore: The Board of County Commissioners of Metropolitan Dade County, Florida, takes great pride and pleasure in honoring years of dedicated service to his community, his state and his nation, by presenting this Certificate of Commendation to Maurice "Doc" Klein.

Signed and sealed in the office of the Board of County Commissioners of Metropolitan Dade County, Fla., this 12th day of March 1969.

The City of Miami Beach bestows the title of Honorary Citizen upon Maurice "Doc" Klein with full honors, privileges and courtesies attendant to this official recognition.

In deep appreciation of his friendship and outstanding contributions to our City, and as a token of the esteem and affection in which he is held by our citizenry.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the City of Miami Beach to be affixed this 16th day of March A.D., 1969.

JAY DERMER,
Mayor.

TIME FOR SUGAR ACT REFORM

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, while reading a Washington paper last month, the following article came to my attention:

MEXICANS HOARD SCARCE SUGAR

MEXICO CITY, February 24.—Mexican housewives were reported hoarding sugar today, hit by a shortage caused by pulling white sugar off the domestic market to meet sales obligations of the United States.

The National Union of Sugar Producers issued orders to its distributor member not to sell any more white sugar for home use. Instead, brown sugar will be made available to housewives and white sugar will be rationed to commercial users.

Industry sources said the sugar harvests have been late in some western states, forcing a cutback domestically to meet sales quotas abroad.

I call this article to the attention of my colleagues for the simple reason that I think it points up so clearly one unfair provision of the Sugar Act. The Sugar Act divides our total consumption between certain foreign sugar producing countries, offshore suppliers, and our domestic beet and cane farmers. In 1968, our mainland cane farmers were required to reduce their plantings by 5 percent. For 1969, our mainland cane farmers are having to reduce their plantings an additional 15 percent. At the same time they have had to build additional storage in order to store sugar already produced which cannot be marketed within their quota. To me, and I am sure to our American cane farmers, it is irreconcilable for our good neighbors to the south of us to be deprived of sugar in order for the Mexican Government to fill a quota to the United States which could be supplied by our American sugarcane farmers.

The Sugar Act resulted from a delicate balance between foreign policy considerations, beet-sugar States, cane-sugar States, and refinery States, which probably was not very satisfactory to any of them. Nevertheless, the last few years has proven that the present formula needs immediate revision.

I would like to call this situation to the special attention of my colleagues from wheat-producing States, or cotton States, or for that matter, all the other great producing areas of the Nation. Most of you operate under some form of Government regulation over production. But none, aside from sugar, suffers the added burden of foreign import quotas guaranteed by law. I wonder how the great Wheat Belt would feel if the U.S. Department of Agriculture were to say to you, as it does to our cane sugar producers, you must cut back production 20 percent in 2 years, not to achieve price stabilization, but to protect foreign import quotas which guarantees these foreign competitors a substantial portion of your American market. We are all aware of the particular problems in the cotton States, where cheap imported cotton competes unfairly with our own production. But even cotton does not face the threat of a guaranteed market for a set percentage of your domestic sales from foreign sources.

Congress must take a new look at the sugar situation. American farmers must not be forced to reduce their own production to satisfy foreign governments. As in the case of Mexico, many countries which benefit from this unfair treatment cannot even meet their quotas, but the foreign share is then simply divided among the other foreign sources.

Within the last few weeks the Department of Agriculture increased domestic quotas by 65,000 tons, but at the same time increased foreign quotas by 350,000 tons. The foreign increases were mostly due to shortages in production in Puerto Rico, which for purposes of the Sugar Act is considered a foreign source, and whose quota is then reallocated to other foreign countries when it is unable to fill its own. Thus we find that an allocation which was intended to assist the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, an actual partner of the United States, is divided among foreign countries who have no similar ties with our own country.

It is shocking to realize that even Peru, which has nationalized U.S. investments without compensation, and has seized American fishing boats on the high seas, also shares in this reallocation. In this regard, at the very time the United States enters into negotiations with Peru for the recovery of stolen property, the Department of Agriculture grants them an increased sugar quota.

U.S. producers are willing and able to meet the increasing demands of our own domestic markets. Congress should not deny U.S. citizens the right to participate more fully in our own Nation's food needs. We need not wait until the expiration of the current Sugar Act to grant relief. It should be done now.

CONGRESSIONAL INACTION ON CRIME CRISIS

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, at the close of business today, Congress will begin its second recess of the year, without taking any affirmative action against the ever increasing crime problem.

In the Senate, the Tydings Committee has held hearings and made some recommendations including the call for a Federal grand jury investigation of the supply system which apparently floods the streets of Washington with hard narcotics. But no legislation has yet been cleared by Senate committees.

In the House, there have not even been hearings.

One reason for the delay may be the lack of a legislative program from the White House. The President has taken note of the drug situation by transferring more Federal agents to the Washington area, which may help, but presumably they will simply be pulled out of other areas of the country where the problem is also great.

The new administration undoubtedly needs time to work up its own plans on the problem, but the crime clock continues to run unabated. We know what is needed: increased manpower at the enforcement, prosecution, and judicial levels, new court facilities and added funds.

A look at the committee calendars in the House for the last few weeks shows that the District Committee has concerned itself with internal organization disputes and with Washington's parking problems, while the Judiciary Committee wrestles with electoral college reform. The importance of these matters speak for themselves, but compared to the crime problem the American people may well ask how priorities are set.

If a crime package has not come from the White House by the end of the spring recess, the committees of the House and Senate should proceed with hearings and write their legislation without further delay. Many Members have already introduced legislation, as I have done, to bring solutions to some of the problems. While the chairmen may want to wait on the White House out of courtesy to the new administration, the entire process of government cannot wait indefinitely to remedy a problem as serious as the current crime crisis.

LET'S CONTROL WELFARE PROGRAMS

(Mr. MONAGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today which authorizes the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to establish a Federal national minimum welfare system in all the States. The bill would give the Secretary power to prescribe:

First, the minimum amount of aid or assistance to be paid to eligible recipients in the various public assistance programs;

Second, the manner in which other income and resources should be taken into account in determining need for aid or assistance;

Third, uniform standards of eligibility for recipients of the various public assistance programs; and

Fourth, the financing relationship between the Federal Government and the various State governments.

The power of the Secretary to set minimum standards and uniform acceptance criteria for all the States, as authorized by this bill, would be subject to congressional review.

The principal aim of this legislation would be to abate the movement of needy families from State to State and from rural to urban areas in search of higher welfare payments. More specifically, the intent of this bill is to level out the inequalities in the present welfare structure which operate to penalize those States with the most humanitarian political systems, the most developed economies, the most progressive fiscal programs, and the most pressing urban needs. As for those States where standards of assistance and average payments are low, this legislation would be to their advantage in that it would act as a lever to upgrade the economic level of the whole population.

In more general terms, this bill would become a powerful force working toward a more healthy and stable population balance in the Nation. A comprehensive reform of public assistance programs would serve as a major factor in stemming the depopulation of America's towns and farms, in curtailing the burgeoning influx of the poor and the unskilled into the Nation's big cities, and in braking the alarming exodus of the urban middle-class to suburbia.

My State—Connecticut—embodies the very serious social and fiscal ills which this bill would redress. Connecticut is now in the throes of serious budgetary difficulty, much of it brought on by the State's deepening welfare crisis.

In the fiscal year of 1966-67, gross welfare expenditures in Connecticut amounted to roughly 20 percent of the State's gross general fund expenditures. Two years later in 1968-69, welfare costs were nearing 30 percent of a vastly increased general fund.

[Dollar amounts in millions]

Fiscal year	Gross welfare expenditures	Gross general fund expenditures	Percent welfare of tota.
1966-67	\$99.5	\$465.9	21.4
1967-68	126.1	568.6	22.2
1968-69	163.7	602.4	27.2

Connecticut's welfare problem is compounded—as it is in those other Northeastern States which are economically advanced and politically enlightened—by the steady influx of the very needy in search of increased public assistance. The public assistance program which provides aid for families with dependent children, known commonly as ADC, of-

fers striking evidence of how Connecticut's welfare population is being augmented. Both the number of families and the number of recipients benefiting from the ADC program in Connecticut have increased by 40 percent from 1966 to 1968. The picture for 1969 looks still bleaker.

Year	Number families ADC	Number recipients ADC
1966	12,724	50,000
1967	14,600	57,800
1968	17,900	69,200
1969 estimate	22,342	
1970 estimate	25,665	

The costs of this particular ADC program to the humanitarian State of Connecticut represent the major welfare burden in the welfare budget and—increasingly—a critical factor in the entire Connecticut general fund. From 1965 to 1969 the amount appropriated for ADC in Connecticut rose on an annual average of approximately 20 percent; from 1967 to 1968, the year with the largest hike, the increase in ADC expenditures was a staggering 43 percent.

[In millions of dollars]

Year	ADC expenditures
1965	29.4
1966	32.3
1967	42.7
1968	60.6
1969	71.8
1970 estimate	86.5

The explanation for the steep rise in Connecticut's ADC payments is a combination of two factors: the influx from other States of indigent families with dependent children and the high level of ADC payments in Connecticut in contrast to most other States.

Year	Average ADC payment per family		Average ADC payment per recipient	
	Connecticut	United States	Connecticut	United States
1966	180.37	149.91	45.51	36.29
1967	188.20	157.80	47.45	38.50
1968	232.70	166.25	60.00	41.35

Another way of looking at the ADC burden which is peculiar to Connecticut is to measure the degree of effort which Connecticut makes compared to the degree of effort in most other States. In this regard, Massachusetts, New York, and New Jersey are northeastern exceptions, since the welfare standards of these three States are as humanitarian as those in Connecticut. The table below indicates that Connecticut makes nearly twice the effort in ADC expenditures as do other States. The same approximate ratio holds for the effort which Connecticut makes compared to other States in the old-age assistance program—OAA—and the aid to permanently and totally disabled persons program—APTD.

1968 State funds for:	Percent
ADC in Connecticut	56.3
ADC in United States	31.7
APTD in Connecticut	52.3
APTD in United States	33.8
OAA in Connecticut	51.4
OAA in United States	28.5

Time is running out on the welfare crisis. The States and the cities in the Northeast with humanitarian welfare standards are slowly being brought to their knees by their crushing financial burdens. My bill would bring these areas protection from greater welfare burdens in the future. It is a means to bring order to the balance of our population between urban and suburban, north and south, needy and self-sufficient. It needs to be enacted.

WE NEED FAMILY SAVERS, NOT FAMILY BUSTERS, IN HEW

(Mr. MIKVA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, I note with alarm a story on the front page of today's Washington Post indicating that President Nixon is considering the appointment of James J. Barry to a sensitive post in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It strikes me that now is a peculiarly inappropriate time—when we are groping for new answers to the age-old problems of welfare and public assistance—now is a peculiarly inappropriate time to propose appointment of a man whose greatest claim to fame is that he busted up more families than any other man on the east coast.

One of the things that our pitiful attempts to solve the problems of poverty and public assistance should have taught us is that the punitive approach will not work. It was only after years of "welfare investigations" and "midnight raids," such as Mr. Barry is famous for in New Hampshire, that we finally realized that all we had done was to break up more families than we had kept together. I dare say, Mr. Speaker, that society will continue to pay the price during the coming years for the lack of foresight with which we forced young people to grow up without fathers as a conscious policy of the State.

Mr. Speaker, the so-called hard-line approach to welfare, such as Mr. Barry appears to have followed in New Hampshire, is so thoroughly discredited among sociologists and welfare experts that it is hard to believe that President Nixon is seriously considering a man of Mr. Barry's inclinations for an important policymaking position in HEW. The hardline was discredited in Newburgh, N.Y., it was discredited in New Hampshire, and it has been discredited elsewhere.

One of the most pressing problems facing this Nation in 1969 is a rational restructuring of the entire public assistance and welfare effort. This kind of undertaking is going to require men of vision and men of compassion. It is going to require men who truly understand the ultimate goals of welfare—assist the disadvantaged, the old, the poor, the disabled, not to punish those who are unfortunate enough to require public welfare assistance. Mr. Speaker, the punitive approach to solving welfare problems will never succeed. It would speak well for Secretary Finch if he delayed his announcement of Mr. Barry's ap-

pointment. I hope that my colleagues are as concerned as I am about this unfortunate impending appointment. I hope that some of them will express this concern either on the floor or to the Secretary directly. All of us will be the losers if HEW, so long a progressive force in the welfare field, becomes a bastion of punitive welfarism.

The article referred to follows:

HARD-LINE WELFARE AIDE IS SLATED FOR HEW POST

(By Eve Edstrom)

A high Nixon Administration post in the sensitive area of shaping Federal welfare policy is scheduled to go to a man with a reputation for administering punitive welfare policies.

James J. Barry, former Health and Welfare Commissioner in New Hampshire, is expected to be named today as Deputy Assistant Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare for Community and Field Services.

One of his primary responsibilities will be to develop alternatives to health and welfare policies affecting programs under his jurisdiction.

These include HEW programs related to Model Cities, neighborhood services and consumer affairs. In addition, Barry will study legislative proposals drafted elsewhere in the Department.

Barry was appointed New Hampshire's Welfare Commissioner in 1949 by then Gov. Sherman Adams.

Over objections of medical and socialwork professionals, he was appointed Commissioner of Health and Welfare in the early 1960s before former Gov. John W. King, a Democrat took office.

Barry left the commissionership in 1966 after numerous clashes with King, and with Health and Welfare subordinates, many of whom signed petitions to complain about his policies.

Barry, according to New Hampshire sources had the support of publisher William Loeb of the far-right-wing. Loeb once called President Eisenhower a "stinking hypocrite."

Barry said last night that the "differences of opinion" that existed between him and King began over "adequate appropriations" and that Loeb reported the differences "objectively."

Barry also said he rigidly enforced welfare rules but denied that he had ordered nighttime raids on the homes of welfare mothers.

However, welfare workers under Barry's supervision said that, contrary to officially stated policy, he "forced" workers to make such raids to determine whether there was an unrelated male in the household.

They also said that, contrary to then existing Federal rules, he made registration for employment a condition for giving aid to families with dependent children.

"It was very difficult, if not impossible, to give social-work services to families under Mr. Barry's regime," one worker said last night.

"It is unbelievable that he should be selected for a high HEW post when the Federal people were always after us for violating their rules."

Barry, 50, was defeated for the Republican nomination for New Hampshire Governor in 1966, and became minority counsel to the Senate Commerce Committee in 1967.

Barry's HEW appointment is scheduled to be announced by Secretary Robert H. Finch and Patricia Hitt, Assistant HEW Secretary for Community and Field Services.

There was speculation last night that Barry's selection was made to offset criticism that the Administration is filling too many HEW posts with liberals, such as Assistant Secretary for Education James E. Allen Jr., and Assistant Secretary for Administration James L. Farmer.

PRESIDENT NIXON'S VOLUNTEER ARMY COMMISSION

(Mr. MIKVA asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, when I first saw the announcement that President Nixon had appointed a study commission to review the present draft system and to investigate the possibility of a volunteer army, I was most encouraged. I have sponsored a draft reform bill that provides for such a commission. Then I read the list of appointees—and I was disappointed. Let me hasten to add, Mr. Speaker, that I was not disappointed by the quality of Mr. Nixon's appointees. They are all men of character and achievement in their chosen fields of endeavor. Every one of the members would, I am certain, serve faithfully and would render his judgment on what was best for the Nation. Every one of them—save one—also suffers from the malaise known as "over 30itis."

Mr. Speaker, six members of the Commission are over 60 years old—one of the members is 70. The median age of the men on the President's new Commission is 56, and there is only one man under 40. Now my concern is not that these men are too old to perform the task asked of them—but simply that whatever their conclusion, it will be less credible to the young draft-age people of this Nation because their generation has not been represented. After all, Mr. Speaker, it is the turbulence and unrest among our young people which has focused the Nation's attention on the inequities of the present outmoded draft system. It is the conscientious objection by many of our students and young adults which has led to serious consideration of the volunteer army proposal. Why, then, we may ask, was only one representative of the generation under 30 included on the Commission? Why was there no representative of the 30-to-40 age group? Why, in short, was only one young person included on the Commission when the "generation gap," which already divides us, is recognized to be widening every day?

Are we saying that those under 30 are only good for doing the serving and fighting—because they are not smart enough to do anything else. Does your beard have to be gray to find the equitable way to resolve the draft dilemma—if the President thinks that, he is wasting his time in even appointing the Commission.

I emphasize again, Mr. Speaker, that I do not question the integrity or judgment of the men chosen by President Nixon. But if events over the last few years have proven anything, they have proven that there are real and significant differences in view between the generations. The one subject on which there is probably more difference than any other is the subject of the draft and the nature of the obligation which citizens owe to the Nation for military service. It does, therefore, seem to me a source of legitimate concern that there is not a stronger representation on the Commission from the group which has the most to gain from a volun-

teer army recommendation—and the most to lose from a continuation of the present inequitable draft system.

For the information of my colleagues, I include a list of the appointees to the new Commission with their respective ages—as furnished by the Legislative Reference Service—and a brief biography of each:

Thomas S. Gates Jr.: Age, 63—Secretary of Defense in the Eisenhower administration, who is now chairman of the executive committee of the Morgan Guaranty Trust Co. in New York.

William Meckling: Age, 48—Dean of the College of Business Administration at the University of Rochester, will serve as the Commission's Executive Director.

Thomas B. Curtis: Age, 59—Former Congressman, St. Louis.

Frederick Friedman: Age, 65—Professor of economics, University of Chicago.

Crawford Greenwalt: Age, 66—chairman, finance committee, duPont DeNemours & Co.

Alan Greenspan: Age, 43—Economic consultant, New York.

Alfred Gruenther: Age, 70—Former Supreme Allied Commander, Europe.

Stephen Herbits: Age, 27—Former House researcher.

Theodore M. Hesburgh: Age, 51—president, University of Notre Dame.

Jerome Holland: Age, 53—president, Hampton Institute, Hampton, Va.

John Kemper: Age, 56—headmaster, Phillips Academy, Andover, Mass.

Jeanne L. Noble: Age, 42—professor of education, New York University.

Lauris Norstad: Age, 61—Former Supreme Allied Commander, Europe.

W. Allen Wallis: Age, 56—President, University of Rochester.

Roy Wilkins: Age, 67—executive director, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Average age: 55.

Median age: 56.

RENAME PENTAGON BUILDING "THE EISENHOWER CENTER"

(Mr. JACOBS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary to insult the memory of one great American in order to honor the memory of another or to discuss the relative merits of their greatness.

There are enough public facilities to go around—to be named for each of our outstanding leaders.

Since General Eisenhower was one of our relatively few five-star generals and since the building now known as "Pentagon" not only has five sides but is at once a symbol both of General Eisenhower's noble military service against outside threats to our security, and still more noble service in warning against excessive military influence inside our country, I am introducing legislation to rename the Pentagon Building "The Eisenhower Center."

MEMORIAL TO REV. DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING, JR.

(Mr. RYAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago tomorrow, on April 4, 1968, the entire

Nation was stunned and shocked to learn that the bullet of an assassin had struck down the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. That a man who had dedicated his entire life to securing justice and an equal opportunity for all Americans should have been so brutally murdered seemed inconceivable. And yet, the violence which has characterized America's response to the fight for equality and equal opportunity was all too common.

On the first commemoration of Dr. King's death, I think it is imperative that we not simply mourn his loss again—although the magnitude of that loss is beyond description. Let us view his life in the terms which he attached to it; namely, as part of the ongoing struggle to achieve justice for those millions of Americans—black and white—who continue to suffer from poverty and discrimination. But the challenges and goals which he set for America must be the urgent concern of all of us.

Martin Luther King, Jr., dedicated his life to the struggle for equal justice for all Americans. His inspirational leadership in the civil rights movement in both the South and the North helped make possible the enactment of the landmark Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1968, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965. Beyond that, his eloquent articulation of the plight of millions of Americans still living under abject poverty awakened the conscience of the Nation and laid the groundwork for the subsequent reordering of our national priorities which must follow that legislation.

Dr. King rejected the notion that hate and violence are inevitable and, instead, by appealing to America's conscience, tried to draw out our better instincts for justice and fairplay. In his own lifetime he became a symbol of the ideals of equality and equal opportunity. And it was as that symbol that he was struck down by the very hate and violence he had devoted his life to eradicating.

I was privileged to work with Dr. King on many occasions during the course of his career, and I never failed to be impressed by the magnitude of his commitment and the steadfastness of his courage. In an era of our national history marked by strife and racial intolerance, he was a man of all races; a man for whom color was irrelevant; a critic who never doubted that America could be redeemed.

At the moment of his death, Dr. King was making plans to lead the Poor Peoples' Campaign intended to expose and dramatize the plight of the millions of Americans trapped in the misery and hopelessness of the big city ghettos, as well as the condition of the poor in the rural areas of our country. It was in the midst of this drive—possibly the most important in his life—that he was brutally murdered. We will never know whether his leadership would have again moved the Nation to action. But we do know that his loss was a grievous loss for all of us, for we could ill afford to lose his understanding and compassion.

In all of the talk about the nonviolent methods of Dr. King and his followers, the fact that he used these means to confront radically the hypocrisy and injustice of the Nation has often been

obscured. Dr. King believed that the evils and deprivations of our society must be confronted and uprooted, and he risked constant danger in order to confront those evils. It was typical of the man that his final efforts before his death were in behalf of striking sanitation workers in Memphis, and that the result of those efforts—even after his death—was an improved life for those to whom he had committed himself.

The urgency of the task before all of us was nowhere so eloquently and dramatically summed up than in the famous letter Dr. King wrote from the Birmingham jail. In that letter he said:

I guess it is easy for those who have never felt the stinging darts of segregation to say wait. But when you have seen vicious mobs lynch your mothers and fathers at will and drown your sisters and brothers at whim; when you have seen hate-filled policemen curse, kick, brutalize, and even kill your black brothers and sisters with impunity; when you have seen the vast majority of your 20 million Negro brothers smoldering in an air tight cage of poverty in the midst of an affluent society; when you suddenly find your tongue twisted and your speech stammering as you seek to explain to your 6 year old daughter why she can't go to the public amusement park that has been advertised on television, and see tears welling up in her little eyes when she is told that Funtown is closed to colored children, and see the depressing clouds of inferiority begin to form in her little mental sky, and see her begin to distort her little personality by unconsciously developing a bitterness toward white people; when you have to concoct an answer for a 5 year old son asking in agonized pathos: "Daddy, why do white people treat colored people so mean?"; when you take a cross-country drive and find it necessary to sleep night after night in the uncomfortable corners of your automobile because no motel will accept you; when you are humiliated day in and day out by nagging signs reading "white" men and "colored"; when your first name becomes "nigger" and your middle name becomes "boy" (however old you are) and your last name becomes "John," and when your wife and mother are never given the respected title "Mrs."; when you are harried by day and haunted by night by the fact that you are a Negro, living constantly at tip-toe stance never quite knowing what to expect next, and plagued with inner fears and outer resentments; when you are forever fighting a degenerating sense of nobodiness; then you will understand why we find it difficult to wait.

Martin Luther King, Jr., awakened the Nation to the reality of injustice and discrimination within our own society and ultimately sacrificed even his very life to the struggle which remains before hate and oppression are eradicated in America. It is up to us—particularly those of us here in Congress who have the power to end poverty and oppression—to carry on his work.

Three weeks ago, the National Urban Coalition, under the leadership of former Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare John Gardner, issued a report of the progress the country has made in meeting the challenges defined by the 1968 report of the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders. In area after area—in education, housing, poverty, discrimination, employment, and pollution—the conclusion was: after 1 year, no progress.

If Martin Luther King, Jr.'s dream of redeeming America is ever to become a

reality, this Congress must see to it that next year's report does not show another year lost in inaction.

THE NEED FOR CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

(Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter, including an editorial.)

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's Evening Star, Columnist David Lawrence made an impassioned plea for congressional reorganization before it is too late. He argues that, as a coequal branch of Government, Congress should be assuming some of the leadership and initiative; but, as presently constituted, it is not capable of this. He attributes this incapacity to small staffs, heavy workloads, and lack of information. He concludes by observing that although most Members are aware of congressional shortcomings, few are willing to propose solutions.

I think Mr. Lawrence is to be commended on his perceptive analysis of what is wrong with Congress and what is to be done if we are to reclaim our rightful role in the Federal scheme of things. At the same time, I was a bit disappointed to note that Mr. Lawrence leaves the reader with the impression that "most Members of Congress are reluctant to offer remedies." This assertion completely overlooks efforts currently being made in both Houses and on both sides of the aisle to effect congressional reform during this session. This move has widespread bipartisan support in the true spirit of the Monroney-Madden Joint Committee on Legislative Reorganization that drafted the original reform package back in 1966.

I am proud to be one of over 100 Republican Members of the House cosponsoring the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1969 (H.R. 6278) which calls for far-reaching changes aimed at streamlining congressional operations and strengthening the legislative role vis-a-vis that of the executive.

But time is running out. If ever there was a time and a need for action, this is it. We cannot countenance the further decline of Congress, for it is ultimately linked to the decline of our entire democratic system. I urge all my colleagues in this House to give this matter their immediate and most urgent attention and to join with us in this important task.

Edmund Burke once said, "Reform in order to preserve." It is obvious that if we are to preserve our democratic form of government we must, from time to time, reform its component parts. We have already given the President the authority to do so with the executive branch; the time has come for us to likewise set our own House in order.

At this point in the RECORD I wish to insert a list of those Republicans cosponsoring the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1969; and, secondly, the full text of the Lawrence column to which I have referred:

COSPONSORS OF THE LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1969

Alabama: John Buchanan, Jack Edwards.
Arizona: Sam Steiger.
California: Don H. Clausen, Charles S. Gubser, Craig Hosmer, Paul N. McCloskey, Jr., Robert B. Mathias, Jerry L. Pettis, Charles M. Teague, Bob Wilson.
Colorado: Donald G. Brotzman.
Connecticut: Thomas J. Meskill, Lowell P. Welcker, Jr.
Delaware: William V. Roth.
Florida: J. Herbert Burke, William C. Cramer, Louis Frey, Jr.
Georgia: Benjamin B. Blackburn, Fletcher Thompson.
Idaho: Orval Hansen, James A. McClure.
Illinois: John B. Anderson, Harold R. Collier, John N. Erlenborn, Paul Findley, Robert McClory, Robert H. Michel, Tom Railsback, Donald Rumsfeld.
Indiana: David W. Dennis, Richard L. Roudebush, Roger H. Zion.
Iowa: John Kyl, Fred Schwengel.
Kansas: Chester L. Mize, Keith G. Sebelius, Garner E. Shriver, Larry Winn, Jr.
Maryland: J. Glenn Beall, Jr., Gilbert Gude, Rogers C. B. Morton.
Massachusetts: Silvio O. Conte, Hastings Keith, F. Bradford Morse.
Michigan: Garry Brown, Marvin L. Esch, James Harvey, Edward Hutchinson, Donald W. Riegle, Jr., Philip E. Ruppe, Guy Vander Jagt.
Minnesota: Clark MacGregor, Ancher Nelson, Albert H. Quile, John M. Zwach.
Nebraska: Glenn Cunningham, Robert V. Denney.
New Hampshire: James C. Cleveland, Louis C. Wyman.
New Jersey: William T. Cahill, Florence P. Dwyer, John E. Hunt, Charles W. Sandman, Jr., William B. Widnall.
New Mexico: Manuel Lujan.
New York: Daniel E. Button, Barber B. Conable, Jr., Hamilton Fish, Jr., James R. Grover, Jr., Seymour Halpern, James F. Hastings, Alexander Pirnie, Ogden R. Reid, Howard W. Robison, John W. Wylder.
North Carolina: James T. Broyhill.
North Dakota: Thomas S. Kleppe.
Ohio: Donald E. Lukens, Charles A. Mosher, J. William Stanton, Robert Taft, Jr., Charles W. Whalen, Jr.
Oregon: John R. Dellenback, Wendell Wyatt.
Pennsylvania: Edward G. Blester, Jr., R. Lawrence Coughlin, Edwin D. Eshleman, James G. Fulton, John P. Saylor, Herman T. Schneebell.
Tennessee: W. E. (Bill) Brock, John J. Duncan, Dan Kuykendall.
Texas: George Bush.
Utah: Sherman P. Lloyd.
Virginia: G. William Whitehurst.
Washington: Catherine May, Thomas M. Pelly.
Wisconsin: John W. Byrnes, Alvin E. O'Konski, William A. Steiger.
Wyoming: John Wold.

[From the Washington (D.C.) Evening Star, Apr. 2, 1969]

CONGRESS REQUIRES REORGANIZING (By David Lawrence)

Congress has been in session three months, but most people are hardly conscious of it. For very little of importance has been accomplished, and the general feeling here is that the legislators are waiting for the Chief Executive to map out programs for their consideration.

A variety of explanations for the inaction is being heard on Capitol Hill. Some of the veterans in Congress say it is customary to wait for an administration to lay out its plans and to submit its proposals. The newer members are a bit impatient and think more progress should have been made.

One interesting observation comes from a few Nixon supporters, who say the new President thinks the country wants a little rest from debate over such controversial proposals as were offered during the preceding administration.

But the obvious is being overlooked. What's wrong with Congress today has always been wrong. A legislative body which has been given co-equal responsibility with the executive might be thought to be organized well enough to assume some initiative and leadership on its own. But it really isn't.

Congress is very much in need of reorganization or "modernization." In the April issue of "Reader's Digest," there is an article entitled "Is Congress Destroying Itself?" It says that the attacks on Congress "come from worried citizens—journalists, political scientists, students of government, state and local officials, disillusioned voters."

What seems to be basically unsolved is the problem of how 435 members of the House and 100 Senators from 50 states can answer the mail from their constituents, satisfy their needs, and yet play a constructive role in shaping the laws that are presented for passage.

Staffs, of course, are inadequate. The people back home continue to ask lots of questions, seek assistance on personal and civic matters, and request help on local public and private projects. Many members maintain offices with a large personnel just to take care of the requests of constituents.

Entirely apart from demands on his office of a local nature, the representative or senator finds himself taking a great deal of time trying to understand the complex issues involved in proposed laws or appropriations. With many billions of dollars being spent in programs that run not merely a year but four or more years, it is necessary to study the background of each proposal, whether it is new or a continuation of a previous program.

Most of the legislators—78 percent of those responding to a questionnaire—said "lack of information" was the No. 1 problem which prevents them from executing their duties satisfactorily. Printed testimony of committees amounted to 250,000 pages last year, plus 27,000 pages of committee reports. But when is the representative or senator going to find the hours necessary each week to examine carefully all these documents?

Theoretically, Congress has delegated special subjects like banking, finance, appropriations, foreign relations, agriculture and judicial questions to committees which have small technical staffs of their own. Many members regularly attend the meetings of committees on which they serve and conscientiously endeavor to become familiar with the subjects presented to them, but they naturally are not able to obtain more than a cursory knowledge of the work of the other committees.

Congress has used the committee system effectively to conduct investigations on subjects of paramount interest and, on the whole, the work of the different committees has been constructive. But as the executive tasks of government grow larger and larger each year, the supervisory duties of the legislative branch also will be forced to expand substantially.

Perhaps the most disappointing phase of all is the tendency of members of Congress to avoid ticklish or delicate questions. There is, for instance, at present no more pressing need than to get a clear definition of federal power in relation to the exercise of authority by state and city governments.

Most members of Congress are well aware of the short-comings of the congressional system of today, but they are reluctant to offer remedies. This, it would appear, is regarded as primarily the obligation of the party leaders.

SOUTH AFRICAN AIRWAYS

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I notice that some of my colleagues here in the House yesterday called on the Nixon administration to revoke the award of the Civil Aeronautics Board to South African Airways granting landing rights to that airline to land its regularly scheduled flights at John F. Kennedy Airport in New York.

At a hearing yesterday before a House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee, it was alleged that refusal by the Nixon administration to review this decision "encouraged apartheid."

Regardless of the fact that we have had an air agreement with South Africa since 1947 permitting Pan American landing rights in that country, it seems strange to me that no objections were heard here in the Congress when landing rights in this country were granted last year to the Soviet airline, Aeroflot. Members raising objections to the South African Airways privileges because of that nation's racial separation policies saw fit to remain silent when the Soviet agreement was signed. The Soviet Union, of course, does not subscribe to racial and religious separation of its citizens. Instead it has relied upon exclusion, removal, and extermination.

Americans should be reminded of another fact. The emblem of the South African Airways is the flying cheetah. That is a proud emblem, also used by the South African Air Force. In 1950, when the United States was fighting in Korea, one of the few countries who backed the United Nation's Korean resolution with men, equipment, and lives was South Africa. The South African Government sent a squadron of "flying cheetahs" to Korea, and the South African "2" Squadron fought valiantly with the men of the U.S. Air Force's 18th Fighter Bomber Wing for the entire duration of that war. Any U.S. airman who fought in Korea will remember well that the "2" Squadron was among the proudest and best fighting units to do combat with the Soviet and North Korean Air Forces.

Mr. Speaker, I merely wanted to recite a little forgotten history to a few of my colleagues.

UNIQUE AND DESIRABLE PATRIOTIC PROGRAMS

(Mr. ADAIR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, a number of concerned and patriotic citizens of Fort Wayne, Ind., have recently instituted several unique and desirable patriotic programs. These citizens, primarily Mr. Ted Besser of WKJG radio and Mrs. Paul J. Peterink, initiated a procedure on Mr. Besser's "Talk to Ted" program on WKJG radio whereby each day a different listener calls in to give aloud the "Pledge of Allegiance" This idea has received warm response from the people of Fort Wayne. It has much merit and

should be emulated by other "call in" radio programs around the country.

Another and equally successful effort made by these concerned citizens was the establishment of patriotic programs at various public gatherings. The first such program was held in late January in honor of the approaching birthday of George Washington. The program took place during a hockey game at the Fort Wayne Memorial Coliseum. The local Boy Scout troops distributed over 6,200 small flags, donated by a public spirited citizen, and thus decorated the Coliseum. It was an impressive program. The Concordia High School Color Guard posted colors, followed by the singing of "America the Beautiful" by the Concordia Choir. The "Pledge of Allegiance" was then led by John Larsen, an eagle scout. The program ended with the singing of the "National Anthem."

These efforts deserve special commendation. I hope that other communities will follow such fine examples.

PROPOSAL TO RENAME DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA STADIUM AS THE DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER MEMORIAL STADIUM

(Mr. HOGAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation cosponsored by Messrs. BLACKBURN, CAMP, DON H. CLAUSEN, COUGHLIN, HALL, HALPERN, MICHEL, MONTGOMERY, O'KONSKI, PELLY, PRICE of Texas, SCHADEBERG, SEBELIUS WATSON, WIGGINS, and WINN and Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, which calls for the renaming of the District of Columbia Stadium as the Dwight David Eisenhower Memorial Stadium.

It is particularly appropriate that the District of Columbia Stadium bear the name of our great former President. Because he was a great athlete, because he signed the legislation creating the District of Columbia Stadium, because he loved sports, because in 7 of his 8 years he threw the first pitch to ceremonially launch our baseball seasons, because it would be such a fitting memorial to his name, especially to our sports-minded young people, I have introduced this legislation.

Congress named the stadium the District of Columbia Stadium and legally it will take an amendment to the District of Columbia Stadium Act of 1957 to change the name. After my election, I decided that, upon President Eisenhower's death, I would introduce legislation to rename the District of Columbia Stadium in his honor. I was, therefore, amazed when the former Secretary of Interior, Stewart Udall, 3 days before the inauguration of President Nixon on a Saturday morning called a special meeting of the District of Columbia Armory Board, which operates the stadium, and urged that the stadium be immediately named for the late Senator Robert F. Kennedy. This was done without any consultation whatsoever with the Congress of the United States which has

authority over and responsibility for the stadium.

Since Congress passed and President Eisenhower signed the District of Columbia Stadium Act of 1957, the act has been amended twice. It is my position that the Secretary of Interior had no more authority to rename the District of Columbia Stadium than he would have to rename the Grand Canyon. This is within the legislative purview of Congress, not the Armory Board or the Secretary of Interior. The act creating the stadium requires the Armory Board to file with Congress in January of each year a report concerning its activities and to make recommendations to Congress as to future control and use of the District of Columbia Stadium. Since the act under which the Armory Board and the Department of Interior draw their authority over the stadium refers specifically to the "District of Columbia Stadium," it would appear that this act would have to be amended to reflect a different name.

With all due respect to the memory of the distinguished Senator, the Secretary of Interior's unilateral act was a source of regret to me, since, as I said, I had planned, upon President Eisenhower's passing, to propose legislation naming the stadium in his honor. Since it is my position, and that of several authorities on the subject, that the Secretary of Interior exceeded his authority, I have introduced this legislation anyway. I hope that it will be enacted.

President Eisenhower loved Washington. He loved sports. His signature created the District of Columbia Stadium. I feel that it would be a fitting tribute to his memory to name this stadium the Dwight David Eisenhower Memorial Stadium.

REMEMBERING THOSE WHO SERVE IN VIETNAM

(Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity today to remind my colleagues of something we, in this country, are too often inclined to overlook. I refer, of course, to our U.S. fighting men in Vietnam and the support and encouragement they are entitled to and so richly deserve from us here at home.

Certainly, it is true that each of us longs for a settlement of the war in Vietnam. That longing, however, should not result in overlooking those brave young men serving in that tiny war-torn country.

Much has been said and written about those who refuse or avoid service in Vietnam with our Armed Forces. Regrettably, however, too little is being said about or done for those who daily risk their lives far from home in the service of their country and in the uniform of our Nation.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I received a letter from Mrs. Peggy Douglas of Arcata, Calif., who serves as president of the auxiliary of our Humboldt County

Cattleman's Association known as the Cow Belles. In her letter to me, Mrs. Douglas informs me of what her organization has done and plans to do for our fighting men in Vietnam.

I would like to share parts of Mrs. Douglas' letter with my distinguished colleagues:

MY DEAR MR. CLAUSEN: In today's troubled times of protest marches, riots, and draft card burning; we, the Humboldt County Cow Belles, thought you might be interested in hearing about a project that we are trying to get started in our county.

Last November, we packed, wrapped, and sent 48 gift packages to a unit of Marines in Vietnam. This program was an off-shoot of the annual hunting and fishing trips of amputees fostered by the Humboldt area Veteran Service Clubs.

Due to the gratification of these boys and our own enjoyment from this endeavor, we are now trying to promote a county-wide "Adopt a Fighting Company" Week.

We feel it is high time we started giving our boys some old-fashioned moral support and hope that the rest of our county feels the same. Who knows, perhaps we can start the ball rolling across the United States!

Sincerely Yours,

Mrs. PEGGY DOUGLAS,

President, Humboldt County Cow Belles.

Mr. Speaker, in one of the responses the Cow Belles have since received from a fighting man in Vietnam, this is what he had to say:

All the fellows really enjoyed what you sent. We didn't think anybody worried about us and that we were over here to just end the war, but now we know different.

This testimonial, in my judgment, reminds us once again that our brave men in Vietnam need our support, our encouragement, our thoughts, and our prayers.

I sincerely hope this fine example of concern and commitment will be encouraged in each of your respective districts in every section of America.

GENERAL EISENHOWER LIKENESS ON 1969 FEDERAL RESERVE NOTES

(Mr. McCLODY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, many suggestions have been made for appropriate recognition of the contributions made by the late Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower to our Nation and to the world.

The Lake County Coin Club, which is an active numismatic organization in my 12th Congressional District, has come forward with a resolution urging that the likeness of General Eisenhower be portrayed on the 1969 \$1 Federal Reserve bank note. This proposal does not imply that the familiar portrait of our first President Gen. George Washington be replaced—but that, as a mark of respect and affection for our late, beloved General Eisenhower, the current 1969 series bear his likeness.

The Bureau of Engraving and Printing will soon produce a new series of \$1 Federal Reserve notes to bear the facsimile signatures of the new Secretary of the Treasury and Treasurer of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it would seem appropriate that the Eisenhower likeness be por-

trayed on this 1969 series. The likeness of General Washington will continue to appear on outstanding \$1 notes and will be resumed, of course, following the final printing of the 1969 series.

Mr. Speaker, I propose to offer legislation to implement this suggestion and hope that the House of Representatives, after hearings by the appropriate House committees, will give speedy and affirmative approval to this proposal.

THE AGRICULTURAL MARKETING AND BARGAINING ACT OF 1969

(Mrs. MAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Agricultural Marketing and Bargaining Act of 1969.

On April 16, 1969, Public Law 90-288 became law. Known as S. 109, this law establishes "standards of fair practices required of handlers in their dealings in agricultural products."

S. 109 prohibits handlers from using such tactics as coercion, "refusing to deal," discrimination, intimidation, and bribery against a producer in order to influence his decision with respect to joining an agricultural marketing-bargaining association.

The enforcement provisions of the law permit a producer or his association to go directly to Federal court and obtain injunctive relief when such prohibited practices occur. The law can also be enforced by the Secretary of Agriculture through the Federal courts when he has reasonable cause to believe that the prohibited practices have occurred. In addition, any person aggrieved can sue for damages caused by such prohibited practices.

The Agricultural Marketing and Bargaining Act of 1969, which I have introduced today, takes an additional step in protecting the rights of agricultural producers to bargain through their associations. It is an amendment to S. 109 with the purpose of encouraging "cooperative marketing and bargaining with respect to farm products by established standards of fair practices with respect to the relationship of handlers and agricultural bargaining associations."

S. 109 defined an "association of producers" as any association of producers of agricultural products engaged in marketing, bargaining, shipping, or processing as defined in the Agricultural Marketing Act of 1929, and the act "to authorize association of producers of agricultural products," approved February 18, 1922—the Capper-Volstead Act.

Section 3(a) of the proposed bill recognizes the importance of encouraging bargaining association activities by defining it as an association of producers "which has as its principal function, as agent of producers, the negotiation with handlers of prices and other terms of contracts with respect to the production, sale, or marketing of agricultural products." The protection provided by this proposed bill would cover all such bargaining associations and would not be limited to one which had been "certified" by a Government agency.

Section 3(b) adds an additional prohibited practice to S. 109 that would make it unlawful for any handler knowingly to engage or permit any employee or agent to engage in an action which constituted a refusal to negotiate prices and other terms of contracts with agricultural bargaining associations. The request to negotiate would have to be at reasonable times and places and the bargaining association would be required to show written proof that it represented producers of agricultural products from whom the handler usually obtained agricultural products or who may reasonably and efficiently supply agricultural products to the handler.

Section 3(c) rewrites section 5 of S. 109 to make it clear that handlers are required to negotiate with bargaining associations. However, the new section 5 also makes it clear that the act does not—

Prevent handlers and producers from selecting their suppliers and customers for any reason other than a producer's membership in an association of producers;

Compel producers to join or belong to an association of producers;

Compel handlers and associations of producers to conclude an agreement with respect to any negotiations; or

Forbid the affiliation of an association of producers with other associations having similar objectives or with bona fide agricultural or horticultural organizations whose primary objectives are to promote, protect, and represent the business and economic interests of farmers and ranchers.

In summary, the Agricultural Marketing and Bargaining Act of 1969 states that, in addition to not interfering with a producer's right to join a bargaining association, the handler must also agree to honor the producer's decision and negotiate with his selected representative. In discharging this responsibility, the handler must treat individual bargaining associations with equal dignity.

MEMORIAL TO THE LATE HONORABLE DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

(Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it is distressing to me as I am sure it is to most Americans, that petty argument and conflict is already being heard over how this Nation should go about properly honoring the memory of our most authentic and revered hero, Ike Eisenhower.

General Eisenhower was too great a man, Mr. Speaker, his service to his country in war and peace too meaningful, for this Congress or our people to become involved in petty disputes over how to do justice to his leadership. His efforts and devotion to building and strengthening the character of the people he loved and the Nation he served so devotedly will be slandered if these arguments continue.

Within a few days, Mr. Speaker, I shall introduce legislation designed to

quickly and adequately begin the erection of a suitable monument to Ike Eisenhower—a living tribute to him and the people of America who loved him. It will be called the Eisenhower National Memorial Arena, to be constructed near the reflecting pool in a prominent place among the cluster of great memorials on the Mall of the Nation's Capital, there to serve in his honor and in his memory as one of the great sports participants and enthusiasts of our time.

I envision, and I believe the Congress and the American people will endorse, an all-inclusive centrally located, crime-safe sports arena as a living memorial to Dwight David Eisenhower, who in his lifetime not only lived the credo of physical fitness but exemplified the best in character building which goes hand in hand with the love of sports.

It would be a full-time, year-around, indoor sports arena, designed to house the President's Physical Fitness Commission, with underground parking, to be operated by the Park Service and located in the Mall area where it would be accessible to all sports enthusiasts in the Metropolitan Washington area as well as to adequate police and enforcement officials so that our citizens who would flock to events there could be secure in their moments of relaxation. Many parents in the Washington area today are afraid to take their kids out in the yard to play, let alone to public events in the city.

The need is great for an adequate sports arena in the District, Mr. Speaker. The cause is just for the erection of a suitable memorial to a great American, and the desire in the hearts of our people is overwhelmingly present. Present sports facilities in the city are inadequate, especially at the high school and college level, and none can be described as a safe place to take our families at the present time, despite an overwhelming interest in Washington and the surrounding communities in athletic events at all levels.

I estimate the cost at \$25 million. The arena would be multipurpose, seat from 18,000 to 20,000, both for summer and winter sports events. The legislation will call for the services of experts, both amateur and professional, in building, planning, and equipping the arena, as was done in the building of the new Madison Square Garden where the best brains in the sports world combined to construct a facility meeting the needs of every sporting group in that city. The arena would be adequate for national events, such as basketball tournaments, professional hockey, track, field events, athletic contests featuring the service academies, and even for national conventions.

Best of all, the Eisenhower memorial would not only keep alive the memory and love of sports of Dwight David Eisenhower, but would serve as a center for planning, activity, progress, and participation in local and national sporting events for every youth and sports-minded adult in America.

Mr. Speaker, I will seek the endorsement of the President of the United States for this legislation, and I urge all

former athletes now serving in the Congress to join me in sponsoring the bill and back it to the hilt so that we can adequately and speedily build a decent and fitting monument to the memory of the most cherished citizen of our times, and let the rest of the world know that the people of America will not forget his services to mankind and the youth of our land who concerned him so much.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. HOWARD. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I could not agree with him more. It is very poor action on the part of anyone to be squabbling over one building or one structure and say whether we should honor former Senator Kennedy or former President Eisenhower with it. I wish to commend the gentleman for taking some affirmative action for former President Eisenhower without at the same time taking any action against anyone else.

DWIGHT DAVID EISENHOWER

(Mr. SCHWENGEL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the death of President Dwight Eisenhower leaves all Americans with a deep sense of grief and sorrow. He was a great leader, both in war and in peace. We shall miss him very much. General Eisenhower's basic philosophy and outlook on life was dramatically revealed to me one day when I had the privilege of attending a luncheon at the White House. During the luncheon, the general mentioned the fact that he had just purchased a farm near Gettysburg, Pa. My immediate comment was that for good farmland he should have gone to Iowa. The general responded by saying that it was his belief that every person should acquire something during his lifetime and leave that something in just a little better condition than he found it. He went on to explain that he could do this more easily on a farm at Gettysburg than he could on the rich farmlands of Iowa. This was a wonderful tribute to Iowa, but even more important it pointed up a basic attribute which made this man one of our greatest leaders. And, indeed, he has not only left the farm at Gettysburg in better condition than he found it but also this Nation of ours and the world. In the 1940's he came to leadership in a world torn by war. He led us through wars to victory, and peace.

Again in the fifties he was successful in restoring peace, this time in Korea. His quiet and effective leadership provided the tranquillity which we so badly needed in the 1950's to complete the transition from war to peace. In the 1960's he continued his service to the Nation in the role of elder statesman. Here, too, it could be said that by his counsel to Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon, he left our Nation in a better condition than that in which he found it. If all mankind were to subscribe to and follow this phi-

losophy of General Eisenhower, what a far better world we would know and enjoy. About another great American, Edwin Markham once wrote, "Here is a man to hold against the world, to match the mountains and the sea"—this was a fitting tribute to Lincoln and it is also a fitting tribute for General Eisenhower.

Mr. Speaker, as might be expected several of the newspapers in eastern Iowa editorialized on the greatness of President Eisenhower. They expressed the high regard held for him by Iowans.

In addition, several of the newsmen recalled their own experiences with General Eisenhower. Somehow these recollections tell more about the greatness of the man and unique place he will always have in the hearts of all Americans.

Some articles follow:

[From the Cedar Rapids (Iowa) Gazette, Mar. 31, 1969]

THEY'LL ALWAYS LIKE "IKE"

This nation isn't in as bad shape spiritually as it sometimes seems, when the long-anticipated death of a former President brings tears to the eyes of millions of Americans young and old. And we suspect that there were few wholly dry eyes throughout the country Friday when the word came from Washington that Ike's long and gallant fight against repeated strains on a weakened heart had ended.

It is significant that to most of those millions Dwight D. Eisenhower was simply Ike, not President Eisenhower or Mr. Eisenhower or even General Eisenhower, the designation he reportedly cherished most. By no means all of his contemporaries rated him as a great President or a great general or a great anything else—although historians may some day agree that he merited such distinction.

The key word for Ike was "good." He came across to people as a good man, in a wide variety of ways. Millions of individuals of all types, in all walks of life—even though they never came in close contact with him—had an instinctive rapport with him and felt that they understood him, and that if they could have been close to him he would have understood them and they would have been at ease together.

It is not exactly that they looked upon him as a hero in a bewildering age when people desperately need and yearn for heroes and find few. Rather it was that many Americans saw in him the personification of what they think a good American should be—not necessarily a faultless paragon but a kindly person, well-intentioned, and trying hard to measure up to life's demands on the abilities God gave him. He made us all feel that we shared something with him.

Among all our public figures, no other projects that same sustaining image. And it is a time when we could use one.

[From the Burlington (Iowa) Hawkeye, Mar. 30, 1969]

MEMO FROM MAC

(By John McCormally)

Remembering President Eisenhower, Burlington Republican leader Jim Schramm recalled Ike's triumphal return to Washington after VE day.

"We all turned out to watch him drive down (it was actually up) Pennsylvania Avenue with his arms high over his head and grinning," Schramm, who was an Army lieutenant colonel stationed in Washington, recalled. "It was one of the most moving sights of my life."

I didn't know Jim Schramm then. Or Eisenhower either, for that matter. But I recalled with a start, when I read Schramm's recollection in Friday's Hawk-Eye, that, by golly, I was in that parade.

For all I know, I was one of the "heroes" he cheered as we paraded up the historic avenue in honor of Ike.

It was one of those crazy episodes which can only happen in war. I'd been preoccupied with the other end of that war and was only a casual reader of Ike's exploits in Europe.

But in the Spring of 1945, I'd worked my way back through a succession of hospital ships, planes, quonsets and wards from the Pacific, and across the continent, until finally I was a patient at Bethesda Naval Medical Center outside Washington.

When Ike returned for his hero's parade and appearance before Congress, someone decided it would add color to the festivities to include a platoon or two of patients from Bethesda and Walter Reed in the parade.

And, in the normal military way of things, I was notified that I had volunteered to be part of the sorry sample of the nation's sacrifice. (Presumably, we were chosen on the basis of looking beat up enough to stir patriotic emotions, but not bad enough to make anyone sick.)

It was an absolutely gorgeous morning: the brilliant sun bouncing off the well-scrubbed avenue and off the marbe walls of the Federal Triangle; the flags whipping, the bands blaring, the troops clumping in splendid cadence.

We rode along, in our gray Navy bus, acknowledging the waves and cheers of the multitude with mock modesty, all the while cracking cynical jokes among ourselves about what the hell we, a bunch of Pacific Island dropouts, were doing in the celebration for the head dogface.

On the east steps of the Capitol, a platform had been erected, on which we were arrayed in our assortment of wheel chairs, crutches, slings and bandages.

When Ike arrived and got out of his car to go into the Capitol, he spied us. With a spectacular grin and a special grimace of recognition, he broke away from his escorts, mounted our platform and shook hands all around.

I remember that the high brass—political and military—stood fretfully waiting for him, while he chatted with several of the wounded, asking where they'd got it and how they were doing.

When he'd left, the mood of these wounded enlisted men had strangely changed.

"You know," someone said, and the others agreed, "he isn't a bad fellow. For a general."

And that, I suppose, is the kind of epitaph he'd like best.

[From the Davenport-Bettendorf (Iowa) Times-Democrat, Mar. 30, 1969]

LEADER IN WAR, PEACE

Dwight David Eisenhower, dead at 78, led the nation with distinction in war and peace. And few if any Americans have won comparable love and respect in public life in our times.

The five-star general directed the World War II invasion of fortress Europe, then stood in a schoolhouse at Rheims to accept Germany's unconditional surrender.

He later became the nation's 33rd President, winning election on the Republican ticket in 1952 and again in 1956.

He finally succumbed after waging a long fight symbolic of the courageous life he lived in behalf of his country. His last, poignant struggles were reminiscent of his decision to seek the second term after he suffered first a heart attack and later a bout of ileitis.

Of his eight years in the White House, his "greatest disappointment" was what he considered a lack of progress in promoting better understanding in the world, particularly between the Communists and ourselves.

While this was his assessment, even critics would concede he expended an enormous amount of time and good will in pursuits of peace.

Having viewed war firsthand, he regarded it with abhorrence, but thought it could be avoided only if this nation remained powerful both militarily and economically.

Of war he said, "It is an evil whose outbreak is the result of human errors, human ignorance, human greed."

Of peace, he said, "An enduring world peace must be founded on justice, opportunity and freedom for all men of good will. It must be maintained in a climate of international understanding and cooperation."

And of his country, he said, "There is nothing wrong with America that faith, love of freedom, intelligence and the energy of her citizens cannot cure."

Mr. Eisenhower showed dislike for the rough and tumble of politics, but proved a formidable campaigner. Some disliked his unpolished syntax and his reluctance to step into party quarrels or to be stampeded on some public issues, among them civil rights. But even those who voted against him found it difficult, if not impossible, to dislike Eisenhower the man. He was an excellent, imaginative cook. His love for golf helped to popularize the game. His trademark was an infectious smile that often lighted his blue-eyed, ruddy face.

He became a national institution; he was cast in the classic American mold. Born to relatively poor people in a small community, he graduated from the United States Military Academy at West Point and advanced through the ranks to become one of our greatest war heroes.

Persuasion was required to pull him into political life and the presidency, and there he did the best commonsense job of which he was capable, just as he contributed a sincere effort in whatever direction he turned.

His name will be etched in our history books as conqueror, liberator, educator, humanitarian, author, diplomat and President. He clearly strove with all his heart to promote better world understanding. It would be premature to try to assess all his achievements. But history will give him high stature as a man who dominated his era and gave greatly of his energies for both war and peace.

[From the Davenport (Iowa) Times-Democrat, Mar. 29, 1969]

HE COULD CUSS, THEN COULD PURR

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Philip D. Adler, of the Times-Democrat, who interviewed former President Dwight D. Eisenhower in Paris in 1951, recalls that day and other meetings with the five-star general in the accompanying article prepared after Ike died Friday.)

(By Philip D. Adler)

Eisenhower's life had many facets. In June 1951, at NATO headquarters in the Hotel Astoria, Paris, I had an hour with Ike.

With me for this interview was Don W. Anderson, publisher of the Wisconsin State Journal. I discovered Ike could pound the table and cuss like a cavalryman, and next moment he could purr like a statesman.

It wasn't an illuminating interview, mostly an extension of the briefing we had received the day before from Brig. Gen. Anthony J. D. Biddle Jr., former ambassador to Poland and Ike's troubleshooter at NATO.

General Eisenhower at this point of his career was a caged lion. He had set up a counterpart of SHAEF in Paris, with open-end authority to organize a European coalition to stop the onrush of Communism. It was a thankless job, and Ike knew it.

In the light of Korea, which had erupted only one year before, Ike and his team of generals were trying with the remnants of the 1944 invasion machine to stem the Soviet tide.

Anderson and I were well aware of the political pressures that were on Ike at that time to go for the Republican nomination for President. We put the question to him squarely, and he simply smiled and said he wasn't interested.

He had said that before we had seen him, to others with special missions, and he said it many times afterward, until friends practically kidnaped him to go to Abilene and announce.

Going back nearly 18 years in memory, I recall Ike as a restless, chain-smoking dynamo of a man. He paced the office constantly while he talked. Every time we would reach for our pads to make notes he would give us the wave-off and talk about Poland or Berlin. I got the impression of a one man NATO, because it was Ike's drive and personality alone which held NATO together.

Before 1951 I had the privilege of hearing and seeing Eisenhower on other occasions, as Columbia University president, and as a five-star general in retirement. There was no perceptible change in Ike in those years. He was always a fighter, and he was fighting back against odds which would have floored most men.

The Eisenhower we saw in the wartime newsreels, returning to London in triumph after D-Day and later as commander-in-chief in the Washington victory reception of 1945, was a strictly one-time phenomenon. He spoke easily then, with determination and conviction. Later as a political campaigner his speech in public was far from the rolling rhetoric of Franklin D. Roosevelt or the sparkling repartee of Harry Truman.

Out of uniform and in the tweeds of a Columbia University president before an Associated Press luncheon, Ike was ill at ease and straining for words. Somehow the direct, dynamic speech of a wartime commander never came through again.

But above all, Ike revealed himself to men who met him and spent time with him as a man endowed with special magnetism, a conscientious patriot doing his duty as he saw it. This is the Eisenhower I'd like remembered, and so would millions of other Americans who mourn him today.

[From the Davenport (Iowa) Times-Democrat, Mar. 26, 1969]

IKE ADDED WARMTH TO GRID EVENT

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Dick Lamb of Bettendorf, news reporter for the Times-Democrat, tells of his meeting with former President Dwight Eisenhower at a Football Foundation Hall of Fame dinner.)

(By Dick Lamb)

It was unseasonably warm that late October evening in New York City 10 years ago. Most who were in the Grand Ballroom of Hotel Astor remember that it was a Tuesday.

That same day, Oct. 28, a beloved Italian named Roncalli had been elevated to a supreme position in his church.

Henceforth he would be Pope John XXIII. For 2,000 of us, the spiritual message of that day was a warm prelude to the excitement of the evening.

President Dwight Eisenhower was to supply the emotional thrill.

Waiting, as I walked to the dais, was the man who had led Allied forces to victory in World War II and was now President of the United States.

The occasion was the annual Awards Dinner of the National Football Foundation and Hall of Fame. My assignment as historian was to present the then President Dwight Eisenhower a program of the 1913 Army-Navy football game.

The presentation was in connection with Mr. Eisenhower receiving the first Gold Medal to be awarded by the foundation to persons prominently identified with the sport.

Mr. Eisenhower glanced over the program. His face broke into a smile as he recalled some of his teammates on that year's Army squad.

He turned to Gen. Omar Bradley, also at the speaker's table and a member of the same team. "You haven't gained a pound in nearly 50 years, have you?" he quipped.

Sitting nearby was Alexander Weyand, an All-American tackle that year.

"They wouldn't recognize you now, Babe," the President said. "You sure wouldn't make All-American to day."

I listened. The infectious warmth of the President was evident. He captivated everyone with his apparent genuine friendliness.

Mr. Eisenhower and I exchanged letters during the month following the dinner. He returned the football program to me for inclusion in the permanent files of the football Hall of Fame at New Brunswick, N.J.

Although Mr. Eisenhower's military and political accomplishments were monumental, it cannot be overlooked that an interest in sports through most of his 78 years also was very significant.

Golf provided most of his relaxation and physical exercise during the last 20 years, but a far more strenuous sport consumed his energies as a youth.

At the Hall of Fame dinner, the President told his audience, "No where is competition, in its very highest form, better expressed than in the uniquely American game of football.

"To understand football," he said, "is to have an insight into an essential part of life."

He stressed that "Morale—the will to win, the fighting heart—are the honored hallmarks of the football coach and player, as they are of the enterprising executive, the successful troop leader, the established artist and the dedicated teacher and scientist."

Football was hardly a refined game of precision, speed or close coordination of men and maneuvers in 1911 when 21-year-old Dwight Eisenhower entered the United States Military Academy at West Point.

He had played tackle for Abilene High School in Kansas, and distinguished himself to such an extent his coach called him "the most outstanding tackle in the valley."

At West Point he went out for the freshman team and was shifted to the backfield. Game accounts at the time accorded him "star" status.

Against Colgate as a sophomore he was unstoppable in leading Army to a 15-7 victory.

Two weeks later, however, in a game against Tufts, Cadet Eisenhower broke his kneecap, his varsity career condemned to comparative obscurity by the permanently disabling injury.

Not content to be entirely severed from the game he dearly loved, Eisenhower turned to coaching the Cullum Hall freshman team.

Although never removing himself from concern over the fortunes of football at Army, Eisenhower fostered a genuine interest in the game in general after his return from Europe following World War II.

But his concern and interest in athletics and its by-products extended beyond the boundaries of the gridiron.

"Fitness—in its deepest and broadest sense—is necessary," he said. "We know that it is far more than a healthy body. It is more than an alert and disciplined mind."

THE WHITE HOUSE, Washington,
Augusta, Ga., November 28, 1958.

Mr. R. M. LAMB,
Football Information Bureau,
Davenport, Iowa.

DEAR MR. LAMB: Thank you very much for remembering our conversation of the night of the National Football Hall of Fame dinner. As you suspected, I was much interested in looking over the Army-Navy program for 1913. My secretary will return the program to you with this note.

With best wishes,
Sincerely,

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.

This is a reproduction of a letter sent by former President Eisenhower to Dick Lamb shortly after Lamb had presented the then President an official program of the 1913 Army-Navy football game. Eisenhower had been an Army football star. The presentation was made in 1958 at a Football Hall of Fame

Awards Dinner in New York. Lamb was historian of the organization. The program now is in the Hall of Fame library archives.

"Fitness is the sum of all values which enable a man to act effectively in his nation's behalf. In this environment, fitness is man's maximum development to make all of us a stronger nation.

"Your fitness, in all its dimensions, is the proper concern of every American. To his task the inspirational coach is as dedicated as the most respected professor.

"And the whole field of sports contributes mightily toward that objective."

[From the Iowa City Press-Citizen, Mar. 29, 1969]

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER

During his life as a public figure—and it continued for more than a quarter-century, an unusually long time—Dwight D. Eisenhower had more than his share of critics.

He wasn't much of a general, said the generals. He wasn't much of a politician, said the politicians. He wasn't much of an intellectual, said the intellectuals. And so it went.

But the American people thought he was a great American. They not only liked Ike, they loved him. And today we all miss the man who remained Ike from the time he first came to public attention in 1942 until his heroic battle for life ended.

He was a professional soldier who rose from relative obscurity at the beginning of the greatest war in history to supreme commander of the greatest army in history; who later served his country for eight years in the highest position of responsibility any man can attain.

Yet he was always "Ike."

Looking back from the turbulent present, the years of the Eisenhower administration seem calm and stable. They were not, but if they seemed so then as well as now, it was only because of the presence of this immensely popular president in the White House. There was something about this uncommonly common man that inspired confidence and unshakable faith that no matter how beset the nation was by crises and challenges, nothing dire would happen as long as Ike was there.

Beset the nation was:

Those were the years when the cold war was frigid; when a man named Khrushchev came to power in Russia to strut the world's stage for a time with his rhetoric of nuclear diplomacy and ballistic blackmail; when a man named Ho Chi Minh was mauling the French in Indochina; when a man named Joe McCarthy was finding Communists in every State Department closet and setting neighbor suspiciously against neighbor; when a man named Faubus in Little Rock, Ark., was fomenting the gravest federal crisis since the Civil War; when a U.S. vice president was being spat upon in South America; when the world hovered on the edge of Armageddon as war broke out in the Middle East; when freedom-loving men everywhere agonized as Hungary was ground under the heel; when the nation plunged briefly into its worst recession since the 1930s; when Americans indulged in the orgy of self-doubt because Russia had launched something into space called a Sputnik; when words like "agonizing reappraisal," "brinkmanship," "U-2" "summit" and "missile gap" became part of the vocabulary of reproach against the administration.

Yet, they seemed calm years, at least in part because Ike was there and because the people trusted him, the people stayed calm.

The years of Eisenhower are still too close for historians to present a balanced and dispassionate summary. Dwight Eisenhower, as general, president and elder statesman, in time will become a historic personage, drained of his humanity, accorded his proper place—no more and no less—among the

heroes of the past as determined by the consensus of historians. That's what happens to all presidents.

But today his contemporaries mourn a man called Ike who, because he was a part of our lives, always will be more than a remote figure in history.

RETIRED FEDERAL EMPLOYEES LEGISLATION

(Mr. SCHWENGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it has been a great concern of mine that through the years we have neglected the plight of Federal employees on retirement. I have recently sponsored 10 bills dealing with a number of inequities which have developed over the years in our retirement system for Federal employees. Three other bills which I have introduced will affect almost all retired people. These bills constitute a legislative program designed to end these inequities and aid our senior citizens. Some of these bills are bills which I have sponsored in prior sessions, and some are new. One of my prime goals in introducing some of these bills in the past, and in particular this year, is to insure that our civil service retirees at least receive a fair hearing on their proposals. This past session, no hearings whatsoever were held on this type of legislation. This is a pretty poor record for the Congress in view of the obvious inequities which exist in so many areas of civil service retirement law. This field is deserving of the most careful and complete study by the Congress.

Another phase of this problem bothers me a great deal. That is the problem of inflation. It is not just the inequities in the retirement laws which hurt our retired personnel, but the inequities compounded by inflation. It is the racing inflation which makes reform in this area particularly urgent. While there has been an increase in the standard of living, and a rise in the general economy during the past several years, the standard of living for our Federal retirees and their survivors has remained almost stationary, and in many cases has been lowered due to the tremendous effect the inflationary trend has had on living costs.

Of an approximate 900,000 retired civil employees and their survivors, more than 279,000 receive a monthly annuity of less than \$100, and 513,000 receive less than \$200 per month. Using a poverty level income of \$3,000 per year, 611,000 plus former employees and their survivors are now living in poverty. Of the 900,000 retired civil employees and their survivors, only 220,000 of them have a yearly annuity income of over \$3,000. The only way we can correct this great injustice is to grant these former Federal employees a substantial annuity increase and provide a minimum annuity for them.

During the past 45 years there have been many changes in our civil service retirement system. For many years, most of the changes were retroactive to provide benefits for those previously retired commensurate with the benefits granted

to those who would retire in the future. However, during the 1950's and 1960's, the liberalizations of retirement benefits have not been made retroactive, with the result that many inequities have arisen. There must be some measure of correlation between the benefits awarded prospectively during the past 15 years and the benefits now paid to those who retired prior to the effective dates of such prospective legislation. Otherwise, how can present Federal employees have any assurance that they, too, will not be forgotten as soon as they leave the active working force? How long can the morale of the present active working force be sustained under such conditions?

Specifically, my bills provide:

H.R. 7769 would change the rate of reduction in Government group life insurance at age 65 or date of retirement, whichever is later, from 2 percent a month to 1 percent a month, and halt the reduction at 50 percent, and finally would restore to 50 percent all insurance now reduced below that amount.

H.R. 7770 provides for increased annuities under the Civil Service Retirement Act. The biggest increase would go to those receiving less than \$200 per month, their increase would be \$26 per month. The amount of the increase would be less for those receiving the largest annuities at the present time. Those now receiving less than \$200 per month would receive a \$26-per-month increase, those receiving between \$200 and \$300 per month would receive a 13-percent increase, those receiving between \$300 and \$400 per month would receive a 9-percent increase, those receiving between \$400 and \$500 per month would receive a 7-percent increase, those receiving \$500 or more per month at the present time would receive a 5-percent increase under the provisions of my bill.

H.R. 7771 provides for minimum annuities for employee annuitants and spouse survivor annuitants. Two hundred and seventy nine thousand annuitants received a monthly income of less than \$100, and in this minimum annuity bill a single person would receive an annuity of no less than \$100 a month, and it provides that a retiree with a family would receive an annuity of no less than \$200 a month. The bill which I introduced has for its purpose a guaranteed annuity for all of our Federal employee annuitants and survivors of at least \$100 per month and \$200 a month for an annuitant with a spouse or dependent. I am sure that my colleagues all agree that it is impossible for a single person to exist on less than \$100 a month, and for a family to live on less than \$200 a month in today's economy. It is embarrassing not only to Members of Congress but to American citizens, and this type of legislation has wide support. I trust that my colleagues will support me in this legislation to at least give a substance of this world's goods to those who have served this Government.

H.R. 7772 would equalize civil service retirement annuities in several respects.

H.R. 7773 provides that if an originally named survivor of a civil service annuitant passes away before the spouse who has provided for the annuity, the

spouse can name a second survivor should he remarry. Under present law a survivor annuity means a reduction in retirement payments. This reduction is not lifted if the survivor expires before the retiree.

H.R. 7774 would amend the Social Security Act to include in the supplementary medical insurance program all prescribed drugs. The drugs would have to be prescribed by a physician participating in the medicare program before payment could be made for the drugs.

H.R. 7775 would amend the Internal Revenue Code to provide that the first \$5,000 received as a civil service retirement annuity from the United States or any agency thereof, will be excluded from gross income.

H.R. 7776 is an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code and would restore to individuals who have attained the age of 65 the right to deduct all expenses for their medical care.

H.R. 8618 would help remedy another inequity. With the multitude of grant-in-aid, and matching programs initiated by the Federal Government, a large number of employees, though technically employed by the United States, are for all practical purposes controlled by the Federal Government. If these employees, for one reason or another, qualify for coverage under the Civil Service Retirement Act, the years they worked under the so-called Federal-State project should be credited for civil service retirement purposes and be applied retroactively to all now retired.

H.R. 7192 would amend the Social Security Act to eliminate the requirement that extended care services follow hospitalization in order to qualify for payment under the medicare program.

H.R. 7065 would amend the Social Security Act to provide disability insurance benefits for any individual who is blind and has at least six quarters of coverage.

H.R. 220 is designed to equalize the retired pay of members of the uniformed services retired prior to June 1, 1958, whose retired pay is computed on laws enacted on or after October 1, 1949.

H.R. 663. One of the main provisions of this bill is an amendment to the Internal Revenue Code to permit individuals to claim a credit against their Federal income tax for taxes paid to State and local governments.

NEED FOR TARIFF RECIPROCIITY ON IMPORTATION OF POULTRY LAYING CAGES

(Mr. NELSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing, for appropriate reference, a bill dealing with the tariff treatment of poultry laying cages. Briefly, the situation which has prompted the introduction of this legislation is this: Poultry laying cages enter the United States duty free under item 666.00 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States which covers farm machinery and equipment. This item has been duty free since the

enactment of the Tariff Act of 1930. On the other hand, Canada at the present time is treating the entrance of poultry laying cages under their tariff item 44603-1 as a manufacture or article of iron and steel not otherwise provided for in the tariff, and as such dutiably at 22½ percent. There has recently been a large influx of these cages into the United States from Canada under these favorable conditions. The A. R. Wood Manufacturing Co. of Luverne, Minn., who manufactures this type of cage has informed me that while some cages being imported from Canada are of a slightly inferior construction, the prices they are able to charge are so low that the Wood Manufacturing Co. simply cannot compete.

Mr. Speaker, it is only just and fair that there should be reciprocity between countries as far as duties on like products are concerned. There is no arguable basis that on a single item such as this, American manufacturers should be charged a 22½-percent import duty in Canada, while their Canadian competitors can export this item to the United States duty free.

The legislation which I am introducing would do this: If any country restricts the importation of poultry laying cages by imposing an import duty or other charge, the President may then enter into negotiations with that country to secure the removal of the duty, and, if these negotiations fail, there will then be imposed on all cages imported into the United States from that country a duty or charge equal to that imposed by such country on like cages.

It is my feeling, Mr. Speaker, that following the negotiations provided for in this bill, that common agreement will be reached between the countries involved, and that agreement will provide for like treatment by both countries on this item, which is only reasonable, fair, and necessary for our domestic industry in this instance. I would urge early consideration of this measure by my colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee in order to minimize the damage being done to the industry involved as a result of their being placed in the present adverse competitive position.

I place the text of my proposal in the Record at this point in my remarks:

H.R. 9953

A bill relating to the tariff treatment of poultry laying cages

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That if any country shall restrict the importation of poultry laying cages by imposing an import duty or other import charge of any kind whatsoever, the President may enter into negotiations with such country to secure the removal of such duty or other charge, and if it is not removed he may, by proclamation, declare the failure of such negotiations, setting forth the facts. Thereupon and until such duty or other charge is removed, there shall be imposed upon poultry laying cages provided for in item 666.00 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States, when imported into the United States either directly or indirectly from such country, an amount equal to the highest import duty or other import charge imposed by such country on poultry laying cages.

CALIFORNIA'S CLOACA MAXIMA

(Mr. WALDIE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, it is apparent that the public in this Nation have taken up the cause and the purposes of conservation of late in an unparalleled display of concern for the preservation and protection of our natural resources and our environment.

In my State of California the publication *Cry California* is among the most outspoken and persistent voices reflecting the public's concern.

In the most recent issue of this publication, Frank M. Stead, former chief of the Division of Environmental Sanitation, California State Department of Public Health, has written a most incisive and thoughtful article on the real hazards posed in the San Francisco Bay-Delta and San Joaquin Valley regions by a proposed master drain that would empty the agricultural wastes of a large area into the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta.

The subject matter of this article is so important to all of California, if not the entire Nation, that I think that each Member of the House of Representatives would benefit by reading it. The article follows:

THE SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY MASTER DRAIN—CALIFORNIA'S CLOACA MAXIMA

(By Frank M. Stead)

History is replete with tragic examples of the consequences of placing the short-range gain above any concern for environmental preservation in the management of water resources. From the Plain of Shinar, that cradle of civilization lying between the Tigris and Euphrates Rivers, to the vast stretches of the high plateau of Rajasthan in India, only vestiges remain to remind us of past glories when these lands were fertile garden spots. For over 5,000 years in this great Fertile Crescent, man has tried to intensify the productivity of the land by irrigation without respecting the inexorable law of "salt balance," and the failure of civilization after civilization has resulted.

Unless California takes a hard look at the long-range effects of her own irrigation practices, mindful of the lesson of history, the great San Joaquin Valley could join the long parade of lost civilizations.

ROBBING PETER TO PAY PAUL

Probably no issue in recent years in California has aroused more acrimony than the joint determination of the California Department of Water Resources and the Federal Bureau of Reclamation to construct a huge agricultural drain in the San Joaquin Valley which would discharge waters heavily laden with chemicals into the western end of the delta near the Antioch Bridge. The outcry, coming from many diverse segments of society, unmistakably voices a conviction that a massive injustice is being perpetrated; that the problems of one area are simply being "thrown over the fence" into an unsuspecting neighbor's yard; that we are "robbing Peter to pay Paul."

The proposal will rob Peter all right, but the real tragedy is to be found in how well it will pay Paul. For by the analysis of its very proponents, the Master Drain will not solve the long-range drainage problem of the San Joaquin Valley. The most that can be said is that it will relieve an immediate problem, and by so doing avoid facing up to the real issue: establishment of a true salt balance in the San Joaquin Valley. (The term

"salt" is used in this discussion to mean those chemical compounds formed by the bonding of sodium, potassium, calcium, magnesium and other metallic elements with chlorine or combinations of oxygen and nitrogen, sulphur and carbon. "Salt balance" is achieved only when the total amount of salt present in water entering the valley, or added to water during use, is matched by the amount of salt leaving the valley in its waste waters and, to a small degree, in harvested crops.)

But let us not jump to the quick and easy conclusion that, because the drain plan is environmentally unsound in the long haul, the engineers who propose this drain are incompetent or venal. I know this to be not true. The problem stems from the short-sighted basic precepts that guide our efforts in the management of environmental resources in both the public and private sectors.

If we want something better than the San Joaquin Master Drain, you and I are going to have to change the environmental management ground rules.

HYDROLOGY OF THE SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY

The San Joaquin Valley is a great trough, 50 miles wide and 300 miles long, closed on three sides by mountains and opening at the north into the delta. A low divide interrupts the gentle downward slope of the valley floor and deprives the southern one-third of the valley of any natural drainage outlet. Four major mountain streams on the western slope of the Sierra Nevada discharge into this landlocked basin (Tulare Basin) and historically they produced large lakes (Tulare and Buena Vista Lakes, mostly dry) in the trough of the basin.

North of the low divide, eight major streams (the San Joaquin River and seven tributaries) empty onto the valley floor and flow northward, as the San Joaquin River system, to the delta.

The broad, gently sloping floor of the San Joaquin Valley comprises over eight million acres of the most fertile land in the United States. It is underlain by deep, porous, water-bearing formations as a result of the occurrence in an earlier geological period of a great inland sea filling the entire Great Central Valley. The ground-water capacity under the floor of the San Joaquin Valley is far greater in quantity than all the surface reservoirs now built or proposed in the state.

A ground-water reservoir has three fundamental advantages over a surface reservoir: it does not use up valuable land surface; it does not lose water by evaporation, and by underlying vast areas it eliminates the need for a network of distribution conduits. Protection of the quality of this ground-water reservoir is therefore a matter of paramount importance.

The first water used for irrigation in the valley was diverted directly from the streams running across the valley floor. But supply from this source was undependable, especially during the summer, and farmers early turned to pumping of ground water to supplement surface sources.

Pumping was expensive, however, and the lure of surface water at low cost led in the 1870's and 1880's to the construction of diversion dams and canals to transport water considerable distances from the major streams.

By about 1930, the valley had reached its irrigation capacity using the "natural" system of streams and wells and a little over two million acres were under irrigation. It is interesting to note that at this time the bulk of the two million acres of wet lands spread throughout the valley deeded to the state by the federal government under the Swamp Land Act of 1850 was still intact. Each year the winter rains filled the tree-lined river bottoms, the tule sloughs, and inland lakes and overflowed onto these extensive flood plain marshes and grasslands to

furnish a vast habitat for migratory wild fowl as well as a wide spectrum of other wild life, and to replenish ground-water basins.

In the 1940's man began his major transformation of the hydrology of the valley with construction of Shasta Dam on the Sacramento River and Friant Dam on the main stem of the San Joaquin. Two canals (Friant-Kern & Madera) were built to carry water from Friant Dam south and north along the east side of the valley for irrigation. Simultaneously, the Canal Delta Mendota was constructed along the west side of the valley to bring Sacramento River water south from the delta to replace waters taken from the San Joaquin River. The effect of these new features was to drastically change the water system of the San Joaquin Basin, which was naturally fed (and drained) by a river flowing down its centerline, and to establish a system of "rivers" on the outer edges of the valley for supply, still using the original river channel in the trough of the valley as a drain. But this changeover was only partial, and the San Joaquin River, although its flow was reduced to a fraction of its original magnitude, continued to serve as both a water supply and a drain.

In the intervening years most of the remaining flow in the San Joaquin River tributaries has been intercepted and new canals (the California Aqueduct and the Eastside Canal) are being completed to supply the valley with water. When these new "rivers" are completed and placed into operation, the transformation of the valley's water pattern will be complete.

What then of the San Joaquin River System? This natural water resource, once the chief water supply for the valley, has already become, de facto, a drain and the water in most of its length is too degraded for use in agriculture, but it has never been declared openly by the state or the federal government to have been dedicated to that use. The current plan is to construct an artificial drain to take the agricultural waste water from all the land to be newly irrigated on the west side of the valley, but only a portion of the waste waters from the currently irrigated lands now discharging waste water into the San Joaquin River. Under this plan the San Joaquin River will continue in a sort of twilight role, half river, half drain. It cannot be deliberately converted in the San Joaquin Valley to a simple conduit for agricultural waste water because when it reaches the delta it is still counted upon as an historic natural river. Neither the residents of Stockton nor the recreationists and sportsmen on the delta have agreed to give up this historic river as a natural waterway belonging to all the people.

THE QUESTION OF SALT

Water is the near universal solvent. It is capable of taking into solution most of the chemical compounds occurring in nature and made by man. Thus as rain falls, even before reaching the ground, it dissolves oxygen, carbon dioxide and nitrogen oxides. Reaching the ground it dissolves salts of sodium, calcium, magnesium and other elementary substances as it flows over and through the rocks and soil formations, so that in a natural state, both surface and ground waters become increasingly laden with dissolved mineral salts as they move from the mountains to the sea. The activities of man greatly accelerate this process. In homes, industry and agriculture, man uses a vast array of chemicals and a sizeable percentage of these chemicals becomes incorporated into the waste waters from these three theaters of operation.

It is simple logic that if these mineral salts are not removed from a basin as fast as they enter, thus maintaining a salt balance, they will build up in the surface and ground waters or in the soil, and this is exactly what has happened in the San Joa-

quin Valley. It is estimated that 400 million tons of salt have built up in the soils of the valley floor, and the ground water itself in some areas has a high enough content of dissolved salts to be toxic to plants.

Under natural conditions, salts from a basin are removed by large-volume-of-flow rivers draining to the ocean. The San Joaquin River once provided such a system for most of the valley, as mentioned, but its diluting volume has already been cut off so that it has become a waste-water conduit with insufficient flow to either dilute the salts or carry them to the ocean and is, in its lower reaches, too salty for use. Having destroyed the natural system of maintaining salt balance in the valley it is now incumbent upon us to substitute a new one. The proposed Master Drain is not such a system.

To understand the role intended for the Master Drain it is necessary to look a little more closely at the process of irrigation. Irrigation is a process that greatly intensifies the salt problem. In irrigation an attempt is made to keep the soil layers in the root zone of plants continuously moist and continuously supplied with nutrients. In effect then, in irrigation we are maintaining a "damp blotter" situation in the top few feet of soil. The unwanted result is that water from this "damp blotter" is continuously evaporating and leaving behind its dissolved salts. In an effort to "rinse" the salts out of the blotter we apply enough extra water so that some of it percolates down out of the root zone. This leaches salts out of the soil but carries them down into the ground water, from which there is no route of escape. The only way to avoid this trap is to intercept the percolating water before it reaches the ground water, and this is done by means of shallow drainage systems specially designed for this purpose. This procedure works because most of the valley floor is underlain by intermittent layers of relatively impervious materials which slow the downward travel of water leaving the plant root zone. In fact, in many areas the root zone itself would become flooded and waterlogged were it not for these drainage wells. It is only the brackish water from these drainage wells that the Master Drain is designed to remove.

THE PROPOSAL

In brief, the proposed Master Drain is a joint venture between the State of California and the federal government to construct a lined canal along the west side of the valley floor. The drain is proposed to be built in stages but would ultimately extend from the site of the old Buena Vista Lake near Bakersfield, northward for 280 miles until it reaches the San Joaquin River in the broad stretch just east of the Antioch Bridge. A detention reservoir capable of holding the total expected annual flow in the early years of operation would be constructed in the northern portion of the valley near Turlock. Provision would also be made to pump water from some convenient point in the delta into the drain for purposes of dilution just before discharge into the San Joaquin River at the terminus point.

The proposed drain would be the sole drainage outlet for lands soon to be irrigated by the California Aqueduct, and would also serve those presently irrigated lands where excess salt in the soil profile or high water tables currently threatens the production of high crop yields.

By no means would all surplus irrigation water be permitted to enter the drain. Both the excess irrigation water running off the fields and the water pumped from drainage wells would be required to be reused until the salt tolerance of crops is reached. Water, percolating downward and not intercepted by drainage wells, would of course reach the ground waters with its load of salt leached from the soil.

Seen over a long period of time, therefore, the proposed Master Drain cannot be con-

sidered as a master drainage system which will enable the valley to restore its vast ground-water supplies to their original high quality and maintain them so, but rather as a palliative measure which will slow down but not stop the present trend of degradation. Without considering any of the side effects, therefore, this must be the assessment of the proposal in terms of its central purpose. This conclusion raises the very crucial question of the responsibility of state and federal governments to posterity when they undertake massive rearrangements of natural hydrologic systems with no hope of anything except progressive degradation.

THE SIDE EFFECTS

Notwithstanding that we should be concerned about the ruination of the valley itself, virtually all of the opposition to the Master Drain has stemmed from its anticipated adverse environmental effects *outside* the valley. The central concern has been that the discharge of water from the drain would have a disastrous impact upon the ecology of the San Francisco Bay and the delta systems as a result of nutrients, pesticides and salts in the drainage water. These questions have received careful and extensive study by the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration with findings set forth in a report in January, 1967. Whatever one might think of the objectivity of a report by the very agency (the Department of Interior) which houses one of the parties (the Bureau of Reclamation) to construction of the drain, certainly no one would expect the report to over-emphasize the adverse effects. The following excerpts from the report's conclusions are therefore worthy of consideration:

"The nitrogen content of the master drain waters would, if discharged untreated at Antioch, stimulate the growth of large quantities of planktonic algae and other aquatic plants in the receiving waters. The presence of these plants in great density would have significant adverse effects upon the fishery of the Bay-Delta system. Their presence would also significantly reduce the recreation and aesthetic value of these waters and increase costs associated with their use for boating, navigation, industrial cooling, and other purposes. The monetary value of those detrimental effects for which costs can be estimated is placed at \$11 million annually.

"Augmentation of Delta outflow would be relatively ineffective in reducing losses attributable to the nitrogen content of drain waters."

Nitrogen is one of the elements necessary to plant growth. It is frequently present in such small amounts that it is the limiting factor to growth. Deliberate addition of nitrogen in agriculture makes possible large crops and is therefore referred to as a nutrient. When large amounts of nitrogen are applied to irrigated land some of it washes off and shows up in the waste water.

Nutrients in the drainage waters are unquestionably a major problem. Californians are beginning to realize that the threat of nutrients, seldom discussed ten years ago, is a major one when the function of water environments in enriching the quality of living is taken into account. We do not expect Lake Tahoe transparency in San Francisco Bay and the delta, but we will not tolerate the conditions that have plagued Clear Lake, where masses of decaying algae kill fish, create odors, and pile up in unsightly windrows on shore.

The proposed drain is therefore utterly unacceptable to Californians unless the nutrient problem is adequately taken care of. So far solutions have been discussed in general terms but not actually built into the plan.

The problem of pesticides, which loomed large in the early discussions of the drain, appears now to be less serious than first feared. The plan to exclude surplus irrigation water running directly off the fields,

and accept into the drain only pumped drainage water which has passed through the soil, to a large extent insures that the pesticides will be retained in the soil. Samples collected of pumped drainage water have shown levels of insecticides no higher than those now present in San Francisco Bay and delta waters.

The quantity of pesticides reaching the waters of the state will always be a matter of great concern. The point being made here is that this is a continuing statewide problem, requiring statewide solution, and the Master Drain in the San Joaquin Valley will probably not present any special problem in this regard. The ultimate solution of the pesticide problems will in any event be achieved, not by measures applied to waste waters, but by changes in the types of compounds used and by controls of the application practices themselves.

When one examines the question of the effect of the salt content in drainage water on the bay and delta, one finally opens up a really fundamental issue; namely, the disastrous consequences which will follow if the quality of delta water is permitted to drop to currently proposed state standards. The report just quoted contains the following very interesting conclusions on this subject:

"The effect of the dissolved mineral salts contained in the drain discharge on the waters of the Delta would be determined by the level at which the minimum outflow from the Delta is controlled in the future. At a minimum Delta outflow of 1500 cubic feet per second, as proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation, the drain discharge at Antioch would have a *beneficial* effect by reducing the mean total dissolved solids content of Delta waters used for agriculture, since at that level of sustained outflow the receiving waters would be of a *poorer* mineral quality than the drain waters." [Emphasis added.]

What this means, of course, is that the proposed management of the delta is to convert it to a waste-water system too saline to support agriculture and completely disruptive to the ecology. The rationale applied is that if this is to be done, then there is no possible drawback to emptying the Master Drain into these waters, in fact, if anything, there is a benefit. This tortured logic has never been presented to the people in straight-forward language.

How large an area are we talking about relegating to drainage purposes? Not only is the major portion of the 400,000-acre delta included, but the entire San Joaquin River, the Sacramento River below Hood and in fact the Sacramento ship channel clear to Sacramento itself, amounting to all of several hundred miles of river and slough.

The immensity of the area thus summarily denied of its fresh water heritage and assigned a brackish future dramatically illustrates the glibness with which far-reaching environmental decisions having impact on society for centuries to come can be made in our age of single-purpose, special-interest planning.

Certainly no objective person could accept this line of reasoning as justifying the discharge into the interior fresh waters of the state a waste stream so brackish as that anticipated here.

THE ALTERNATIVES

It is customary in large engineering projects, even those having unintended adverse effects on parties other than the "client," to examine the available alternative methods of accomplishing the objective and select the alternative of least cost to the client. This has been done for the Master Drain, and in this case the client is agriculture in the west side of the San Joaquin Valley. The alternatives considered were evaporation, desalination, and exportation to San Francisco Bay proper or directly to the Pacific Ocean.

Two of these alternatives would have far-reaching benefits over and beyond getting rid

of the waste water. Evaporation would entail extensive continuously flooded areas that could serve as wild-fowl refuge areas. Desalination would not only salvage much of the water itself, but would stretch the available supply even further by blending the demineralize water with other water now too salty for use. These two methods were rejected early in the study on the grounds that either one would cost more than the construction of an export drain system.

Having, then, discarded the two alternatives which would have had no impact outside of the area to be served by the project, the proponents of the project placed principal emphasis on exploring the most likely routes to the ocean.

They discovered that the three most likely routes directly to the Pacific Ocean would cost from two to eight times as much as the valley route to Antioch, if pumping costs were included over the life of the project. The great fault in evaluation of alternatives was the failure to include the cost of damage to the quality of delta and San Francisco Bay water or the benefits of restoration of quality of ground waters of the San Joaquin Valley as a whole. All these routes were discarded.

The alternate of an initial discharge directly to San Francisco Bay proper was not seriously considered. Instead, estimates were made of westward extension (if ever needed) from Antioch to Martinez on Suisun Bay and Rodeo on San Pablo Bay at a total cost of a little over twice that of the route terminating at Antioch. The decision was then made to terminate the drain at Antioch and to wait and see how it worked.

The alternatives, evaporation and desalination, which should have been pursued in depth were virtually ignored. And yet these logical solutions could be applied within the valley itself.

In the Tulare Lake Basin, presently unused land of low agricultural potential could be dedicated as a wildlife refuge and used as a sink to receive and evaporate agricultural drainage in the same manner that Salton Sea is used in the Imperial and Coachella Valleys. The area could be divided into a series of ponds so that progressively concentrated waters could be moved toward central areas for final evaporation in the same manner as is done in the salt ponds in San Francisco Bay. The final evaporation ponds would require lining or treatment of the bottoms to prevent percolation down to underlying ground waters. This proposal was acknowledged by the Department of Water Resources as entirely feasible technically. It is clearly the best long-term solution for agricultural waste water disposal for the southern half of the San Joaquin Valley.

In the San Joaquin River Basin to the north, the San Joaquin River is now the drainage facility, but as mentioned earlier, the drainage water has so deteriorated its quality that not only is it unsafe for agriculture in its lower reaches, it constitutes a threat to both ground waters in the basin and surface waters in the delta. Obviously, it would be a fatal mistake to drain the lands to be newly irrigated on the west side of the valley directly into this already degraded river. But there is an alternate solution that must ultimately be employed in any event. That solution is *desalination of all drainage water in the San Joaquin River Basin*. By evaporating the Tulare Lake Basin drainage waters in the south valley, and by desalinating the river waters in the north, the need for the Master Drain would vanish.

Water resource people, and particularly agriculturists, have utterly rejected the idea of desalination of inland waters, the reason given being unbearable costs for the water user. By this they mean that water might cost the user about twice as much as in the past. But let's examine the question of the worth of water a little more closely.

Water is by all odds the cheapest of salable commodities in our society. What other commodity can be purchased for a few cents a ton; yet, this is all that the city dweller pays for treated water delivered to his tap. The explanation is that no one really buys water. Traditionally the taking of water from natural surface or underground sources for "beneficial use" has been recognized as a right which, once established, entitles the taker to free perpetual ownership of a sizable portion of the great "common wealth." Only the cost of diverting, pumping, transporting, treating and delivering water is charged to the user; the water itself as a commodity is free. In recent decades the costs of treating the waste water (sewage and industrial liquid wastes) have been added to the delivery costs, increasing the charge by a modest amount.

How do these "marketing" charges compare with the real worth of water itself? Water is so essential to every part of our society that its real worth is never computed. Instead one merely looks for the "available" source that can be delivered at the lowest cost, knowing intuitively that this cost is but the tiniest fraction of the real worth. This relationship was cryptically articulated in the expression commonly voiced in water circles in Southern California in the 1920's—"Water is worth whatever it costs."

It is therefore a fundamental fallacy to say that we cannot afford the cost of desalination of waste water even though these costs exceed what we pay for the water at point of use. The long-range cost of *not* preserving the quality of the natural waters of the state are infinitely greater than the token costs we are talking about here. We must determine true costs and then work out methods of assigning the costs according to benefits.

If we were starting with a clean slate in the San Joaquin River Basin, we would recycle the desalinated waste water back to the land directly, and ultimately this will probably be the pattern. But we don't have a clean slate. Both the river itself and the ground water in the lower (northern) portion of the basin must have their original high quality restored. The problem for the next ten years or so, then, is to desalinate all of the pumped drainage water from both the old and new irrigated areas and blend some of this high-quality water with the irrigation water supply itself, where it is highly mineralized, and blend the remainder with the reduced regular flow of the San Joaquin River. Whether this desalination be accomplished by distillation, electrical dialysis or reverse osmosis (the three currently available methods), the resulting brines would probably be evaporated either in the areas previously discussed or in a separate wildlife refuge area in the San Joaquin River Basin itself.

Concerning wildlife refuge areas which are also evaporation facilities for waste water, studies conducted by the Department of Fish and Game not only point up the workability of this idea from a biological viewpoint, but clearly indicate that the value of such resources in preserving the integrity of the flyway for migrating fowl is unquestioned.

THE BASIC ISSUES

In summary, the basic issues involved in this whole controversy are not ones of engineering but of basic environmental principles. For a hundred years or more it has been the practice to base engineering decisions on the lowest cost of accomplishing a job for a "client." Environmental costs to society have not been taken seriously unless they could be converted to out-of-pocket expenditures. The tacit assumption has been that major transformations in the basic environmental system of a vast area can be evaluated and justified solely on what might be termed utilitarian values.

We have now reached the point in California when this approach will no longer do.

The time has come when every major proposal to make environmental modifications must be subjected to the most searching scrutiny to determine its long-range effects on the environment, and long-range costs, under the controlling principle that no modification should be made which will impair the quality of the environmental system at large. In other words, instead of comparing several alternatives and selecting the one of lowest direct capital and operating cost to a client, no proposal should be considered in the first place until a determination has been made that it does not presage environmental impairment.

This idea, that the integrity of the environment comes first, has never been established as public policy because we have never seriously considered that the environment was threatened. Confronted with this prospect and really understanding it, would the people place environmental quality above material gain to a limited segment of the society? I believe that they would and that not to inform them that this kind of choice confronts them is irresponsible. In fairness to the people, not only the Master Drain proposal but the entire proposal for management of the delta and the San Joaquin Valley, indeed the entire California Water Plan, should be restudied. And this time, only those alternatives which will restore and fully preserve the historic environmental qualities of this great land and water resource area should be considered.

To this end, Congress and the state legislature must re-examine the entire program, and as a first, basic step, direct the federal Bureau of the Budget and the state legislative analyst to reassess the proposal from the standpoint of the total public welfare.

SECOND VIETNAM ROLL OF HONOR

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, On March 25 I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the names and hometowns of the 31,379 American soldiers killed by hostile action in Vietnam from the beginning of the war through the end of January of this year.

The listing, covering 121 pages, set forth the dimensions of the Vietnam problem inherited by President Nixon.

Today I insert in the RECORD the names of those killed in hostile action since then. They cover a 2-month period, February 1, 1969, to March 26, 1969, and total 2,148. They show the grim momentum of the war.

Since Friday there has been a genuine and justified outpouring of praise for General Eisenhower. We have been reminded that while there may be no indispensable man, some men are irreplaceable. Such a man was Eisenhower. As Ralph Waldo Emerson recalled:

When nature removes a great man, people explore the horizon for a successor; but none comes and none will. His class is extinguished with him.

Eisenhower's was a complete human life, unmarred, unified by intelligent purpose and uninterrupted accomplishment, blessed by great talent, employed in the worthiest activities with a deserved fame never dimmed and always growing. He was blessed, too, with the Biblical three score and ten years, with several to spare.

The young American men who died in

Vietnam in February and March, whose names I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today, are also irreplaceable, like Eisenhower. They are irreplaceable to their families, their communities, and their Nation. Their lives, unlike Eisenhower's, were not complete; they were cut short. Most of them were under 24 years of age. There will be no unity of intelligent purpose—save what has already been spent—and no uninterrupted long-term accomplishment. Lost forever is the possibility that these men could have been employed in worthy activities with a deserved fame never dimmed and always growing. Few, of course, would likely have become great in the sense of national recognition. But, who knows, one of them might have been instrumental in discovering a cure for cancer. Another might have served in high office, or written great literature, or a symphony, or otherwise enriched our civilization.

These losses must weigh heavily upon those of us in the Congress. After all, we have the primary responsibility under the Constitution for fundamental war-making decisions and for the regulation of the Military Establishment. In all candor, we have neglected this responsibility in the past and do so today.

The second listing of the Vietnam roll of honor, consisting of the periodic announcements by the Department of Defense, beginning with the report of February 3, 1969, and ending with the report of March 28, 1969:

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION,
FEBRUARY 3, 1969

ARMY

California

John H. Gordon.
William R. Neville.
Mario M. Laguna.
Raymond W. Sullivan.
James A. Nicholson.
Lawrence M. Welche.
Gregory C. Tucker.

Florida

James E. Taylor.
John F. Darby III.
Harry J. Cloud.

Illinois

Robert E. Miller III.

Indiana

Charles W. Richardson.
David E. Brookins.
James L. Woodworth.
Michael P. Biedron.

Kentucky

Lanny W. Banta.

Massachusetts

William G. LeClair.

Michigan

Norman A. Freda.

Missouri

Harold H. Hunter.
LaValle Walker.

New York

Irvin W. Prosser, Jr.
William P. Noglewich.
Richard R. Bellwood.

North Carolina

Bobby D. Anthony.

Ohio

Carl D. Pipher.
Gary E. Collins.
John W. Eutsler.
Raymond F. Beauchamp.

ARMY—continued

Pennsylvania

Edward L. Eby.
Dennis C. Eshleman.

Texas

Charles D. Bullard.
L. C. Smith.

Utah

Alton D. Percival.

Virginia

Larry A. Stephens.

Wisconsin

Jerrald L. Bullin.
Ralph L. Blauvelt.

NAVY

Alabama

Larry F. Hunt.

Nebraska

Dennis L. Kurz.

New York

William R. Gray, Jr.
James W. Thomas.

MARINE CORPS

Alabama

Charles D. Drysdale.

Arkansas

Marvin Cook, Jr.
Michael W. Bailey.

California

Joseph Y. Ramirez.
James R. Russell.

Connecticut

Russell L. Equi.

Illinois

Ronald A. Vanwambeke.

Indiana

Cal T. Hammack.
Steven M. Steinbacher.
William M. Thomas.

Iowa

Philip B. Jones.
Gary L. Squalers.

Louisiana

Henry R. Broadtman, Jr.

Maryland

Bobby D. Rogers.

Massachusetts

Alvin R. Gale.

Michigan

Jerry R. Cole.
William J. Murphy.

New Hampshire

William R. Douillette.

New Mexico

Jesus Quezada.

New York

Charles A. Brezinski.
Bernard G. Purvis.

North Carolina

Dan L. Jenkins.
Robert M. Campbell.

Oregon

Donald G. Helder.

Pennsylvania

Samuel Rodriguez.

South Dakota

Douglas D. Janssen.

Tennessee

Larry R. Harris.
Edwin Blakley, Jr.
William L. Mott.

Texas

Samuel D. Reeves, Jr.
Thomas P. Duggan.

Virginia

Wallace T. Corbitt.
Martin J. Gimbert.

MARINE CORPS—continued

West Virginia

Frank M. Koerner.

AIR FORCE

Utah

Remi H. Greeff.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS

Illinois

William Daley.

New Jersey

John M. Lamanna.

Texas

William T. Robertson.

Wisconsin

David F. Cleereman.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

Alabama

Richard Clark.

Iowa

Roger C. Beall.

Missouri

Edward Smith, Jr.
Robert A. Firebaugh.

New Jersey

George A. Baker.

New York

Andre R. Bellemare.

North Carolina

Gerald F. Apperson.

Texas

Juan E. Cortez.

Virginia

John D. Keel.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION,
FEBRUARY 4, 1969

ARMY

Arizona

Billy J. Simmons.

Arkansas

Ricky C. Bradley.

Georgia

William E. Finley.

Illinois

James W. Ambrose III.
Ronald L. Ostenson.

Indiana

Robert D. Cody.

Iowa

Norman R. Bettis.

Maine

Neil H. Mackillop.

Michigan

Donald M. Michels.
Henry L. Gutierrez, Jr.

New York

Henry G. Schulte.
John J. Senor.

North Carolina

Melville B. Rose III.

Ohio

Russell H. Ellis.

Oregon

Jon S. Rasmussen.

West Virginia

Rell Crigger, Jr.

Wisconsin

Tom R. Mueller.

Guam

George S. Sanchez.

NAVY

California

Robert M. Langslow.

Kentucky

Lloyd I. Luttrell.

NAVY—continued

Maine
Harvey J. Douglas.
Philippines
Ray L. Sharp.
MARINE CORPS
Hawaii
John R. Kaawa.
New York
Anthony M. Cusumano.
South Carolina
Alvin J. Derrick.
DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS
Indiana
Ronald Sabin.
MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY
California
Steven D. Bartman.
Kentucky
Joseph E. Greenwell.
Minnesota
Lyle W. Schroeder.
Washington
Robert D. Case.
Wisconsin
Frederick Schmitt.
KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION,
FEBRUARY 5, 1969
ARMY
California
Gordon D. Gardner.
Connecticut
Ronald L. Gagne.
District of Columbia
Calvin S. Day.
Illinois
Larry R. Maddy.
Maryland
Edward A. Lamb.
Michigan
James J. Morrison.
Mississippi
Jerry R. Davis.
North Carolina
Jimmy E. Abernathy.
James W. Tuck, Jr.
Ohio
John D. Freppon.
Stephen R. Kutschbach.
Pennsylvania
Lee F. Linch.
Tennessee
Larry W. Neill.
MARINE CORPS
Arkansas
Boyce D. Burgett.
California
Daniel P. Rose.
Paul G. Telles.
Colorado
Garland G. Whalen.
Maryland
Thomas R. Davis.
Ohio
Richard A. Moore.
West Virginia
Kenneth H. Shelleman.
DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS
California
Edward P. Vandervort.
New Jersey
Richard Sincavage.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

Delaware
Daniel A. Tressler, Jr.
Georgia
Allen D. Cheshire.
Michigan
Carl J. Andrus.
New York
David Rodriguez.
Tennessee
Larry G. Curtis.
Virginia
Joseph B. Rush.
KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION,
FEBRUARY 6, 1969
ARMY
Alabama
David Howze, Jr.
Larry E. Boyer.
Colorado
Clifford M. Gardell.
Florida
Dewey D. Ruis.
Clarence L. McKinnon.
Georgia
James E. Skipper.
John T. Walls.
Idaho
Glen L. Atkinson.
Illinois
Alan R. Ramsey.
Iowa
James D. Camp.
Michigan
William A. Tennant.
Minnesota
Ernest A. Spong.
Lee H. Harra.
Missouri
Gary L. Glear.
North Carolina
James M. Robinson.
Harold R. Richardson.
Ohio
Michael O. Cassidy.
William H. Miller.
Wisconsin
John R. Poff.
MARINE CORPS
Connecticut
Frankle R. Williams.
Illinois
Ronald C. Jensen.
New York
Malone B. Temple.
William R. Larkin.
North Carolina
Wayne R. Hoyle.
Vermont
William F. Lestage.
DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS
Michigan
Rickey C. C. McCoy.
Tennessee
Houston F. Thomas.
MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY
New Jersey
Thomas R. Grover.
Oregon
Kenneth C. Clifton.
Pennsylvania
David F. Heiser.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION,
FEBRUARY 7, 1969

ARMY
Arizona
Dennis V. Lee.
California
Otis J. Darden.
Hildefonso M. Ramirez.
Connecticut
Russell T. Fant.
Georgia
Robert W. Hamlin.
Michigan
John R. Rebitts.
Missouri
Dennis R. Whicker.
Charles E. Inlow.
New Jersey
William J. Pryor.
New York
Salvatore Mancuso.
Reginald M. Herbert.
North Carolina
Isiah Barnes Jr.
Ohio
Steven M. Britton.
Tennessee
Tony L. Griffith.
Washington
John W. Spafford.
NAVY
Massachusetts
Robert L. Blais.
MARINE CORPS
Alabama
Leonard H. Holmes.
Colorado
Joseph Romero.
Indiana
Ronald G. Baughman.
Kentucky
Donald C. Berry.
Tennessee
Leslie A. Jerstad.
Wisconsin
Dale W. Schwefel.
DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS
California
Anthony L. Quinn.
Georgia
Thomas Clark.
MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY
Michigan
James T. Feeney.
New York
Arthur Watson.
Pennsylvania
Charles H. Watkins Jr.
KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION,
FEBRUARY 10, 1969
ARMY
Alabama
George E. Jackson.
California
Robert M. Davenport.
Dennis M. Keith.
Rodney D. Wise.
Florida
Edgar Lee.
James L. Ward.
Illinois
Daryl G. Scalf.
Louisiana
Roland L. Harris.

ARMY—continued	MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY—continued	MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY—continued
Nebraska	Michigan	Louisiana
Robert L. Eaton.	Wayne D. Groat.	Lonnie Bridges.
Fred A. Neubauer.	Utah	Michigan
New Jersey	Arthur A. Callister.	David F. Head.
James L. Francisco.	_____	New York
New York	KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION, FEBRUARY 11, 1969	Texas
Russell E. Reinel.	ARMY	Gary J. Coyle.
Robert E. Hendrix.	California	Otha L. Poole.
Orville E. Hill.	Christopher S. Smith.	William M. Harrison.
James R. Smith.	Colorado	Gary M. Johnson.
Juan Rivera.	Lyman R. Ditson.	Virginia
North Carolina	Connecticut	George L. Kellam.
James T. Edmonds.	Bradford P. Sawyer.	_____
Ohio	Florida	KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION, FEBRUARY 12, 1969
Thomas J. Gildow.	Perry D. Johnson.	ARMY
Terrence P. Kilbane.	Michael L. Mitchell.	California
Tennessee	Richard B. Garrett.	Miguel A. Puentes.
James L. Clark.	Kansas	Andrew P. Garcia.
NAVY	Arthur L. Klaus.	Phillip A. Tritsch.
Ohio	Michigan	Connecticut
John A. Durham.	Donald K. McLean.	Albert Christy Jr.
Robert K. Hall.	Richard L. Skouby.	Georgia
MARINE CORPS	James B. McKnight.	Russell B. Adams.
Arizona	New York	Iowa
Richard Andrade.	Albert A. Davenport.	Carroll P. O'Neill.
Arkansas	Gerald R. Carr.	Kansas
Raymond N. Rivera.	James M. Skomski.	William A. Phalp Jr.
California	North Carolina	Kentucky
David B. Graham.	Richard L. Allen.	Joe E. Hester.
Michael S. Massone.	Alexander S. Peoples.	Maine
Florida	North Dakota	Daniel A. Foss.
Russell E. Moke.	David P. Haegele.	Nebraska
Kentucky	Ohio	Milton A. Ross.
Homer West.	Robert D. De Board.	Nevada
Maine	Oklahoma	Rick V. Jensen.
Rodney G. Shank.	Fred R. Frazier, Jr.	New York
Lewis C. Jones, Jr.	Lloyd J. Hucks.	Michael T. Decker.
Minnesota	Texas	Ohio
Robert A. Bye.	Alvin L. Shadwick.	Larry Stevenson.
New York	Kerry F. Wilson.	Pennsylvania
John V. Kuchta.	MARINE CORPS	William S. Ogden.
Ohio	Arizona	Texas
Dwain L. Bibey.	John D. Harrington.	NAVY
Dana L. Zaleski.	William T. Cumble.	California
Pennsylvania	Michigan	Bruce B. Bernstein.
Lawrence E. Houck II.	Gary R. Haley.	New York
Robert E. Sherlock.	Otis Green.	Walter R. Tyrell.
Texas	North Carolina	Oregon
Gerald L. Thomas.	Rodger D. Howard.	Gary N. Young.
Dennis W. Schonberg.	Ohio	DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS
Virginia	Andrew M. Haglage.	Washington
Anthony A. Koster.	Pennsylvania	William C. Ingram.
Washington	Joseph H. Brubaker, Jr.	MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY
Gregory J. Niccoli.	South Dakota	California
West Virginia	James D. Opsahl.	Manuel G. Ulloa.
Charles W. Miller, Jr.	West Virginia	Alfred A. Gates.
DIED OF WOUNDS—ARMY	Kenneth E. Jackson.	MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—AIR FORCE
North Carolina	DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS	Colorado
Linwood R. Cumbo.	Georgia	Harper B. Keeler.
Texas	Frankie Young, Jr.	_____
James G. Brown.	MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY	KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION, FEBRUARY 13, 1969
DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS	California	ARMY
Michigan	Peter L. Alagna.	Arkansas
Glenn R. Urquhart, Jr.	Florida	Chester E. Hill.
Pennsylvania	William C. Hix, Jr.	California
Michael A. Barnes.	Georgia	Linus R. Roe.
MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY	Thomas T. Staples II.	Connecticut
California	_____	Thomas M. Neal.
James D. Stuessel.	Florida	James R. McNish.
Robert E. Beaumont.	Georgia	Georgia
Paris W. Montanez.	_____	James E. McKee.
Illinois	_____	Billy G. Langley.
Harry D. Brueske.	_____	_____
Louisiana	_____	_____
William H. Denney, Jr.	_____	_____
Massachusetts	_____	_____
Chester J. Kmit.	_____	_____

ARMY—continued
Illinois
 Ronald E. Boyer.
 Gary E. Reynolds.
Indiana
 Charles K. Larkins.
Michigan
 William D. Gouger, Jr.
 Dennis A. Jezlorski.
Minnesota
 Steven R. Bauer.
Missouri
 Dale R. Jackson.
Nebraska
 Dewey I. Struebing.
Ohio
 John L. Wehr.
Oregon
 Joel L. Gabriel.
Pennsylvania
 Edward M. Holtzman.
South Carolina
 Joseph O. Strickland.
Texas
 Macario S. Banda.
Utah
 Russell L. Harris.
Wisconsin
 Michael W. Schumacher.
 MARINE CORPS
Arkansas
 Billy J. Curbow.
California
 Wallace C. Bergstrom.
District of Columbia
 Ronald J. Floyd.
Florida
 Cesar R. Rodriguez.
Massachusetts
 Robert W. McCluskey.
New York
 Thomas P. Noonan, Jr.
Pennsylvania
 William R. Prom.
Texas
 Jose M. Trejo.
West Virginia
 Raymond E. Glover.
 DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS
Michigan
 Michael M. Davidson.
Missouri
 Larry H. Coleman.
Ohio
 Daris W. Nickels.
 MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY
California
 Donald L. Kipp.
Colorado
 Ward C. Evans.
Florida
 Edward Clemons.
Georgia
 James Gaines, Jr.
Illinois
 Leonard A. Morse.
Indiana
 Robert L. Howell.
Kentucky
 Jerry D. Jones.
Louisiana
 Gilton W. Johnson.
Michigan
 Lee E. Burnor.
 Theodore L. Gyulveszli.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY—continued
Missouri
 Gayland E. Keroher.
Texas
 Benito E. Conchola.
West Virginia
 Michael J. Wilson.
 KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION,
 FEBRUARY 14, 1969
 ARMY
Missouri
 Robert B. Maddox.
Mississippi
 Billy F. Harper.
Texas
 Russell D. Woollard.
 Salvador D. L. S. Rios.
West Virginia
 Danny J. Dodd.
 NAVY
Michigan
 John A. Belford.
North Carolina
 Lonnie E. Hooplaugh.
 MARINE CORPS
Florida
 Harvey E. Lott.
Illinois
 Barry V. Detrempe.
 William P. Welmer.
Illinois
 Michael J. McGlothlin.
Massachusetts
 Richard L. Cotter.
West Virginia
 Carl E. Goldsmith, Jr.
 DIED OF WOUNDS—ARMY
New York
 Benjamin Maldonado-Aguilar.
 MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY
California
 Gregory M. Leinen.
Illinois
 Johnnie W. Ator.
New York
 George J. Canamare.
 MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—MARINE CORPS
Illinois
 John A. Prombo.
 KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION
 ARMY
Alabama
 James T. Pence.
Arizona
 Frank A. Jensen.
California
 Dana R. Barker.
 Antonino Ruggeri.
 Allen D. Muller.
Florida
 George K. Hamilton.
 Richard M. Hilt.
Georgia
 Walter N. Crawford.
 Stephen C. Walker.
Hawaii
 Alvin J. Ho.
Illinois
 Michael J. Spear.
 Phillip R. Frankiewicz.
Indiana
 Fred D. Whitaker.
Louisiana
 William E. Brown.

ARMY—continued
Massachusetts
 David A. Hill.
Michigan
 Richard A. Paton.
 Gerry A. Polega.
Minnesota
 Wesley P. Hendrickson.
 Stephen L. Schumacher.
Nevada
 Donald B. Schroeder.
New Hampshire
 Vern C. Kelley.
 David L. Bell.
New Jersey
 Joseph J. Smith.
New York
 Richard P. Gates.
 Robert T. Hamilton.
Ohio
 Thomas G. Fisher.
 Roger D. Lewis.
Oklahoma
 John D. Benien.
 John M. Holloway.
Oregon
 Norman A. Jensen.
South Carolina
 Joe J. Miles.
 Claude E. Bragg.
 David W. Smith.
Tennessee
 Robert D. Shoemaker.
Texas
 Robert W. Hook.
 Ruben Anguilano.
Virginia
 Gary R. Reed.
 Kenneth R. Sawyer.
Wisconsin
 Richard D. Bartholomew, Jr.
 William D. Bakken.
 NAVY
California
 Larry J. Lockett.
Indiana
 Huger L. Phelps.
 MARINE CORPS
Arizona
 Dale E. Crick.
 Larry A. Cochran.
Arkansas
 Robert L. T. Ramsey, Jr.
California
 Kevin L. Day.
 Lynn P. Naylor.
Florida
 Stanley H. Newman.
 Mark F. Powers.
Georgia
 Terry K. Jackson.
 Larry K. Wheeler.
 Wilbur L. Milam, III.
Illinois
 James Palmer.
Indiana
 Bradley E. Suchka.
Iowa
 Steven L. Wissink.
Kentucky
 Michael A. Shepherd.
Maryland
 Mark L. Kline.
 Michael P. Taylor.
Massachusetts
 Thomas R. Dickey.
Michigan
 Rodger C. Nesbit.

MARINE CORPS—continued

Mississippi
Garson F. White.
Nebraska
Lawrence C. Looby.
New York
Robert L. Johnson.
James W. Smith, Jr.
Ohio
Danny K. Crothers.
Oklahoma
Charles N. Bondi.
Pennsylvania
Thomas W. Kustaborder.
Tennessee
Larry G. Whitehead.
Texas
Donald N. Kennon.
Thomas E. Creek.
Calvin W. Wilkins.
Billy D. Roberts.
Virginia
Fred L. Pettigrew.
Wisconsin
Thomas L. Armitage.
AIR FORCE
New York
Vincent Colasuonno.
DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS
Ohio
James P. Witt.
Oklahoma
Reginald D. King.
Washington
Leldon E. Hock, Jr.
MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY
Florida
Lawrence C. Hawley.
Maryland
Robert L. Hettinger.
North Carolina
Bedford M. Morris Jr.
Oklahoma
John L. Hawkins, Jr.
Oregon
Jack E. Schultz.
Pennsylvania
Samuel D. Shimek.
South Carolina
Theus J. Pound.
Tennessee
Ralph Cannon.
Bobby G. Gamble.
KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION,
FEBRUARY 18, 1969
ARMY
Indiana
William S. Riggs.
Kentucky
Thomas S. Hamilton.
Louisiana
Edward E. Cox, Jr.
Ohio
Gary L. Dubach.
Texas
Jack D. Wadley.
Kurt L. Starkey.
MARINE CORPS
Arizona
Daniel L. Henry.
Ohio
Raymond J. Baldauf.
North Dakota
Roger D. Knudtson.

MARINE CORPS—continued

Texas
Lawrence H. Moore.
MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY
Massachusetts
Donald M. Ashton, Jr.
Pennsylvania
Kenneth C. Hess.
Lewis R. Valentine.
West Virginia
Thomas W. Bennett.
MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—AIR FORCE
Texas
Ludwig G. Baumann.
DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS
Illinois
Michael J. Wyman.
KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION,
FEBRUARY 19, 1969
ARMY
Minnesota
Vernon G. Knutson.
Ohio
Robert H. Parcher, Jr.
Virginia
Gary L. Miller.
MARINE CORPS
California
Jeffrey H. Foulke.
Massachusetts
Thomas M. Casey, Jr.
David O. Sullivan.
New Mexico
Juan J. Wilson.
New York
John V. Kuchta.
North Dakota
Ernest E. Bartolina, Jr.
Oklahoma
Benjamin F. Bolding.
Fred E. Pitts.
Washington
Bill "W" Gentry.
DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS
Florida
Marwick L. Kemp.
MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY
California
Juan R. Pequeno.
Illinois
Dennis E. Dawson.
Mississippi
Charles Boyd.
New Jersey
John W. Mendez.
Wisconsin
Clarence C. Adams.
KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION,
FEBRUARY 20, 1969
ARMY
California
Salvador O. Ricardo.
Georgia
Rodney R. Green.
Indiana
Gerald Q. Hancock.
Kansas
Harold H. Hladik.
Massachusetts
Arthur L. Brown, Sr.
Minnesota
Richard M. Kulavik.

ARMY—continued

Pennsylvania
Patrick J. Dugan.
Ronald L. Raker.
NAVY
Ohio
Cornelius A. McCafferty.
Oregon
Marlin M. Jones.
MARINE CORPS
California
Randolph Brown, Jr.
Illinois
Robert W. Whitney.
Massachusetts
Eric A. Fisher.
Ohio
Thomas W. Sander.
Pennsylvania
Dennis L. Riley.
Tennessee
Phillip E. Minton.
Texas
Michael R. Coon.
Washington
Craig M. Hemphill.
Wisconsin
William H. Farvour.
Kenneth G. Liebhaber.
MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY
Arizona
Lincoln Hardy.
California
John S. Pinney.
New Jersey
Harold J. Van Winkle, Jr.
New York
William Rivera-Garcia.
Oklahoma
Lonnie D. Loyd, Jr.
MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—NAVY
Texas
William C. Niedecken.
KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION,
FEBRUARY 24, 1969
ARMY
Alabama
Roy D. Stoffregen.
Arkansas
David G. King.
California
Robert G. Wimp.
Rick A. Oliver.
Michael T. Rowe.
Colorado
Robert J. Hall.
Delaware
Richard J. Curry.
Florida
Joseph H. Pierce, Jr.
Herbert H. Sweat, Jr.
Georgia
Edwin A. Ackerman, Jr.
Allen C. Yeomans III.
Allan B. Callaway.
Illinois
William W. Dickey.
Ronald J. Corbin.
Junior F. Roniger.
Kentucky
Billie J. McClure.
Louisiana
Charles M. Downs.
Howard L. Early.

ARMY—continued

Michigan
Cleveland E. Dykes.
Earnest L. Kauffman.

Minnesota
David H. Sundquist.
Raymond Suarez, Jr.

New Jersey
Charles Foulks, Jr.

New York
Robert I. Meeker.

New York
Richard R. Hurlihue.
John A. Kucich.
Duane C. Romeo.
Carl J. Tanzola.
Christopher W. Meagher.

North Carolina
Gerald Wrazen.

Ohio
Thomas R. Preston.
Thomas M. Blackwell.

Oklahoma
Virgil C. Combs.
James W. Pendergrass.

Pennsylvania
Frederick W. Kulicke III.
Herbert H. Stauffer.
Dan R. Byham.

Rhode Island
James V. Cavanaugh.
Ronald J. Wilkinson.

Texas
Michael D. Adams.

Utah
Quenton L. Christensen.

Virginia
Raymond W. Callahan Jr.
Donald W. Miller.
Charles R. Main.

Washington
Daniel L. Poff.

Wisconsin
Jon P. Robbins.

NAVY
New Jersey
Mack H. Wilhelm.

Pennsylvania
George D. Tinko.

MARINE CORPS
Arkansas
"E" "G" Mays Jr.

California
Clyde Callahan.

California
Ralph E. Ebbs.
John P. Cook.
Reginald J. Rodriguez.
Charles R. James.
Roy E. Pitts.

District of Columbia
Roscoe C. Gray, Jr.

Florida
Stephen Blann.

Georgia
Weldon G. Lynn.

Idaho
Ronald D. Shaff.

Illinois
James W. Bell.
Robert Dunbar.

Indiana
Dennis W. Cripe.

Kentucky
Dickie G. Keeler.
Steven D. Tanner.

Maryland
Howard E. Wright.

MARINE CORPS—continued

Missouri
Thomas M. Skally.

New Hampshire
Russell W. Wendler.

New Jersey
William O'Shea II.

New York
Dennis J. Kane.
Michael A. Clute.
Daniel J. Foster.
Frank R. Howe.
Abrael Maldonado.

Ohio
Eddie V. Oliver, Jr.
David A. Schneider.
Michael Wilson.

Oklahoma
Roger L. Elkins.

Pennsylvania
Roger L. Pifer.

South Carolina
Wesley E. Flanigan.
Nathaniel L. Johnson.

Texas
Alfredo J. Villanueva.

Washington
Donald L. Kujawa.

AIR FORCE
South Carolina
Charles L. McMahan.

DIED OF WOUNDS—ARMY
Maine
Alonzo W. Wight.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS
Illinois
Ronald M. Nowak.

Maryland
Barry W. Smith.

Minnesota
Rickie N. Gunderson.

Ohio
Edward W. Bolan.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY
Alabama
Ralph G. Dunn.

California
Larry T. Ross.

Florida
Dennis C. North.

Georgia
Harold R. Tyson.

Hawaii
Larry M. Alcos.

Kentucky
Edwin H. Hardesty, Jr.
Harold Sullivan.

Maryland
Normand P. Perron.

Michigan
Larry A. Bodell.
James T. Fields.

Mississippi
Arthur L. Papale.

New Jersey
Francis K. Kulbatski.

New York
Ismael Laureano-Lopez.
David Q. Patterson.
Ronald J. Hillman.

North Carolina
Richard L. Waycaster.

Ohio
James W. Dalton.

Pennsylvania
Jack L. Rightmyer.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY—continued

Texas
Alvin R. Fritz.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION,
FEBRUARY 25, 1967
ARMY
Alabama
De Wayne Taylor.
Nathan E. Hullett.

Florida
Arthur J. Anderson.
Randolph Eubanks.
Ronald L. Groves.

Georgia
Robert L. Jones.
Henry E. Strobo.
Charlie L. Wilder.

Illinois
James A. Azbell.
Richard J. Rochacz.
Randall F. Schwartz.
Kenneth E. Steinhelbel.

Iowa
Guy F. Abbott.
Randall L. Brockway.

Kentucky
Robert J. Blaut, Jr.
Edwin D. Caswell.
Clarence D. Russell.

Maryland
James Berends.

Massachusetts
Kenneth R. Johnson.

Michigan
William J. Allen.
Robert L. Shiroda, Jr.
Jimmie S. Warren.
Lewis M. Forman.

Mississippi
Ronald C. Weems.

New York
Winford A. Nass.
Roberto Acevedo.

New York
John H. Davis.

North Carolina
Willie L. Williams.
Ronald L. Harkey.
John W. Thomas.
Roger M. Tyner.
Kenneth E. Wade.

Ohio
Robert R. Buck.
Jerry D. Spradlin.

Oklahoma
Ray G. Wilson.

Pennsylvania
Dennis J. Lorenzini.
Dale C. Fisher.
Richard S. Mark.

South Carolina
Bobby Sanderson.

Tennessee
Ernest W. Swoner.
Manfred W. Fitzgerald.

Texas
John S. Wilson.
Charles E. Wilson.
Jesse B. Montez.
Robert D. Law.
Earnest W. Graham.
Lee A. Kelth.
Robert C. Mora.
Paul W. Motley.
Kevin E. Tweedle.

West Virginia
Marvin D. Canterbury.

Wisconsin
John A. Buschke.
Carl J. Riederer.

NAVY
Illinois
Warnell E. Aten.

MARINE CORPS
Arizona
George E. Dusch.

California
John R. Hill.

Florida
Thomas G. Stevenson, Jr.

Louisiana
Tommy L. Wyatt.

Ohio
James D. Snyder.

DIED OF WOUNDS—ARMY
California
William J. Levett.

Kentucky
Jimmy L. Myers.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS
New Jersey
Nathan C. Lunapiena.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY
Indiana
Gary R. Genth.

Michigan
Phillip A. Johnson.

Tennessee
Donald V. Saller.

—
KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION,
FEBRUARY 26, 1969

ARMY
Arkansas
Walter Sturgeon.

California
Adalberto R. E. Verdugo.
Christopher Caslas.
Erskine L. Crump.

Colorado
Gilbert M. Chavez.

Florida
Kyle A. Addair.

Georgia
John W. Washington.
Morrie C. Barber.

Illinois
Michael T. Calandrino.
Robert D. Eickleberry.

Indiana
Jesse D. Carpenter.

Iowa
Byron D. McQuinn.

Kansas
Michael N. Hubert.

Massachusetts
Richard E. Olson.

Maryland
Richard L. Shuck.

Michigan
Daniel F. Cahill.
Douglas L. Hinkle.
Edward L. Griggs III.

Minnesota
James F. Uttermark.

Mississippi
Charles R. Ornsbey.

New Jersey
Andrew J. Kiefhaber.

New York
Kevin F. Oregon.
Theodore J. Pawlowski, Jr.

North Carolina
Myron E. Rhue.

Oregon
Edward L. Handy.

ARMY—continued
Rhode Island
Donald H. Sisson.

South Carolina
Reid M. Naney.

Tennessee
James C. Alderidge.
Freddie R. Guinn.

Virginia
Gerald W. Gwaltney.

Washington
Paul F. Clark.

West Virginia
David W. Dunford.

Wisconsin
Paul H. Tober.

NAVY
Ohio
Nichols I. Pyle.

MARINE CORPS
District of Columbia
Michael J. St Onge.
Wingfield Page, Jr.

Florida
Woots E. Wadkins.

Georgia
Ronald L. Smith.
James D. Tyus, Jr.

Illinois
Edward D. Powers.

Massachusetts
Michael J. Brady.

Michigan
Richard A. Penke.

New Jersey
Randall M. Carlton.

New York
John F. Walker.
Walter A. Joyce.
Richard E. Parker.
William R. Yaskanich.

Ohio
Duane M. Davis.
Leslie H. Shafer.

Texas
Henry L. Ashford.

Wisconsin
Gary R. Miracle.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS
District of Columbia
Henry M. Robinson, Jr.

Oklahoma
Jerry W. Stanberry.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY
Maryland
Franklin B. Gilbert.

New Jersey
Ralph E. Johnson.

New Mexico
Floyd S. Atole.

—
KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION,
FEBRUARY 27, 1969

ARMY
Arizona
Jose L. Gonzalez.

California
Xavier A. Arvizu.
Jay L. Robbins, Jr.

Georgia
Curtis Darrisaw.

Indiana
Rodger D. Holmes.

Kentucky
Charles E. Carpenter.

ARMY—continued
Maryland
Robert W. Hartssock.
James W. Leaf.

Michigan
Dale A. Nicholl.
Duane A. Downing.
Michael E. Sidor.

Michigan
Daniel W. Gleason.
Andrew M. Mattie.

Minnesota
Gene L. Salzer.

Missouri
Larry L. Brooks.

New York
Edward F. Barry.
Ronald A. Monish.
William C. Clinger III.

North Carolina
Steven J. Pastula.
George L. Davis, Jr.
Gary E. Johnson.

Pennsylvania
Donald W. Hallow.
Lemuel Isabelle.

Texas
Walter S. Hamner.

Virginia
Roosevelt Hardy, Jr.

NAVY
California
Jose A. Ollivier.

MARINE CORPS
Arkansas
Larry D. Staggs.

California
Robert D. Christiansen.
Donald M. Edwards.
Norman M. Harmon.
Robert A. Horcajo.
Kelly W. Weitzel.
Robert M. Ysguerra.
Stephen D. Facchini.

Delaware
Richard C. Stevenson.

Florida
Fred Butler III.

Georgia
Richard P. Hodges.
William R. Hodge.

Hawaii
Lawrence P. O'Toole II.

Illinois
John R. Baird, Jr.
Timothy L. Gilson.
Pete G. Heckwine.
Lester W. Weber.
Daniel Coleman.

Indiana
Fred L. Thomas, Jr.

Kentucky
Edward S. Gum.
Michael L. Cruse.
Ronald McIntosh.

Massachusetts
Robert W. Topham, Jr.
John J. Kenney.

Michigan
David J. Pelloasma.
Richard J. Rlker.

Minnesota
Victor A. Rabel.

Missouri
James B. Rice, Jr.

New York
John F. Dedek.
James E. Cummings.

MARINE CORPS—continued

Ohio
Bruce E. Robinson.

Oklahoma
Ronald G. Moss.

Pennsylvania
Paul J. Mitchell.
John P. Ziegler.

Pennsylvania
Norman P. Chittester.
Alfred A. Purvis.

South Carolina
Bobby D. Timmons.

Texas
George Meerdink, Jr.
Lee R. Herron.
Jessee M. Nunez.
Freddie L. Tipton.
Larry Boehm.

West Virginia
John L. Brumbauch.
Charles K. Nowell.
William E. Null.

Wisconsin
Thomas H. Crook.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS
Nevada
Gary D. Judd.

North Carolina
Andrew L. Belfield.

Texas
Larry A. Wessinger.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY
Kentucky
Ulysses Battle.

Nebraska
Douglas J. Winchell, Jr.

New York
Carl N. Kozma.

North Carolina
Hugh R. McKinney.

Oklahoma
Larry D. Barker.

Texas
Alan R. Graham.

Puerto Rico
Miguel A. Gonzalez-Rivera.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION,
FEBRUARY 28, 1969
ARMY
California
Robert L. Bennett.

Florida
Henry L. Qulgey.

Indiana
Barry G. Sowders.

Kansas
Sammy E. Kinnamon.

Maine
Jon Bailey.

Maryland
Harold D. Biller.
Joseph F. Bauer, Jr.
Terrance L. Snyder.

Massachusetts
James E. Palmer.

Michigan
Edward M. Ruditys.
James E. Scott.

Mississippi
Angus W. McAllister, Jr.

New Jersey
Stanley M. Reed.
Joseph B. Oliphant, Jr.

New York
Daniel A. Widomski.

ARMY—continued

North Carolina
Martin T. Batchelor, Jr.

Ohio
Larry L. Woolum.
Jerry L. Alferink.

Oklahoma
Larry R. Short.

Tennessee
James E. Wise.

Texas
Arthur W. Bartlett, Sr.
Jesse R. Ellison.

Wyoming
Richard J. Sweeney.

NAVY
Kentucky
Earl F. Houck, Jr.

California
Charles D. Jones.

MARINE CORPS
Arizona
James S. Reynolds, Jr.
Oscar P. Austin.

California
Thomas G. Price.
Jerry L. Taylor.
James E. Wells.

Colorado
David A. Chacon.

Florida
Robert M. Lough, Jr.
Adrian J. Smith.

Georgia
Daniel G. Ely.
Calvin L. Howell, Jr.
Tommy Johnson.

Illinois
John C. Odle.

Indiana
Victor L. Poor.

Maryland
William J. Christman III.
Joseph M. Van Daniker.

Michigan
Victor S. Schlichting.
James F. Laird.
James M. Root.

Minnesota
Christopher D. Prather.

Montana
Raymond A. Cole.

New Jersey
Michael R. McCabe.

New York
Gerard F. Paulsen.
Edward D. Merkle.

North Carolina
Billy L. Underwood.

Ohio
Jerry R. Howerton.
Samuel R. Wall.

Rhode Island
David E. Belver.

Tennessee
Ronnel L. Waugh.

Texas
Michael J. Drobena.
Bennye W. Cowley.
Wayne L. Thomas.

Virginia
Willard F. Prochaska.
Anthony L. Johnson.

Washington
Michael B. Duffy.

Wisconsin
Vasilios Demetris.
John A. Peterson.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

California
Abel J. De La Paz.

Florida
Gregory T. Lindsay.

Hawaii
Earl C. M. Au Hoy.

Illinois
Robert M. Lee.

Pennsylvania
Thomas M. Brown.

Wisconsin
Dale E. Rauber.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION,
MARCH 3, 1969
ARMY
Alabama
Franklin D. Bryan.

Arkansas
Mounce E. West.

California
Larry B. Curtright.
John C. Schiffhauer.
Charles E. Clay.
Robert P. Levin.
John Lopez.
Van H. Pearson.

Colorado
Jerry W. Gobbo.

Connecticut
Donald C. Le Blond.

Florida
Arthur L. Andrews.
Irwin Beyda.
Isaac Stringer, Jr.
Wilbur L. Hicks.

Illinois
James T. Fernandez.

Indiana
David C. M. Jackson.
Michael R. Rommel.

Iowa
Warren G. H. Lizotte, Jr.

Kansas
Phip D. Johnson.

Maryland
Donald M. Jennings.

Michigan
Gordon P. Gipner.

Minnesota
Keith C. Buckingham.
Larry C. Koski.

Missouri
Charles M. Hobbs.

Montana
Richard M. Johnson.

New Jersey
Rudolph Swoope.
Douglas J. Markovich.

New Mexico
Russell J. Holland.

New York
Christopher Brow.
Richard A. Carapezza.
Henry Madison, Jr.
Louis V. Marciano.
Burt J. Meyer, Jr.
William B. Wilson.
Walton G. Daley.
Vito Vitro.

North Carolina
James K. Sutton.
Clarence Robinson, Jr.

Ohio
James E. Titus.
Richard P. Ritzler.

ARMY—continued

Oregon

David G. Cummings.
Jim L. Dickson.

Pennsylvania

John E. Marpo.
Duane A. Hipple.
Howard Atkinson.
Thomas C. Warner.
Philip C. Miller, Jr.

South Carolina

John W. Massey, Jr.

Tennessee

Hobart E. Covington.

Texas

Gary L. Johnson.

Virginia

Thomas A. McAdams.
William S. Potter.
Wilford H. Alderman.
Thomas A. Garman.

Washington

Randal L. Rogers.

Carl F. Belding, Jr.

West Virginia

Howard T. Haught, Jr.

John R. Tennant.

NAVY

Arkansas

William A. Hanna.

Connecticut

Donald K. Walsh.

Florida

Eugene S. Hancock.

Illinois

Larry A. Hartigan.

Pennsylvania

Eugene J. Garrity, Jr.

Ohio

John J. Seery.

MARINE CORPS

Alabama

Marshall L. Calender.

Arizona

Steven V. Garcia.

Salvador L. Norzagaray.

Arkansas

Marion W. Lyons.

California

James K. Hall.

David K. Jacobsgaard.

Jeffrey M. Barron.

Richard W. Heim.

Douglas B. Bastyr.

George L. Silva.

Louis F. Griffin.

Edwin T. Keen.

James D. Peschel.

Calvin R. Prater.

Allen M. Sharp.

Connecticut

Kenneth A. Lavine, Jr.

Thomas E. Parker.

Norman R. Suprenant.

Delaware

Frank W. Nelson, Jr.

District of Columbia

Roosevelt Johnson, Jr.

Florida

Clarence S. Miller.

James E. Tucker.

Georgia

Wolfram J. Kretschmann.

Illinois

Tommy N. Miller.

William J. Brencich.

Charles O. Craig, Jr.

Johnny G. Williams.

MARINE CORPS—continued

Iowa

Samuel A. Eklofe.
Thomas J. Burgeson.
David L. Rutgers.

Kansas

William C. Matthews.

Kentucky

Kenneth R. Gilliam.
Donald R. Lewis.
Ronald T. Varney.

Louisiana

Richard Pollard.

Maryland

Henry D. Custen.

Massachusetts

Edward J. Wolfendale.

Michigan

James D. Logan.
Lawrence Poet.
Gerald Przybylinski.
Joseph G. Taraszklewicz.

Minnesota

Roger M. Kittleson.

Douglas B. Forsberg.

Missouri

Walter L. Lamarr.

New Jersey

William H. Satterfield.

New Mexico

Raymond Yazzle.

New York

Woodrow W. Adams.

Albert Erskine.

Juan Gaston.

William B. Jones.

Robert A. McCarthy.

Robinson Santiago.

North Carolina

Fred L. Roach, Jr.

Odell Dickens.

North Dakota

Larry J. Sikorski.

Ohio

Gerald D. Zawadzki.

Keith T. Landers.

Robert H. Brogan.

Kenneth R. Heifner.

Randolph R. Ramsey.

Oregon

Peter S. Timmerman.

Pennsylvania

Edwin A. Keeble.

William D. Morgan.

John S. Shoemaker.

Lawrence G. Donaldson.

Dennis K. Millison.

South Carolina

William H. Hunt.

Garold R. Simmers.

Texas

Norman W. Kellum.

Manul Gonzales.

Porfirio M. Ovalle.

Willie F. Smith.

William B. Tarrance.

George W. Weldy, Jr.

Virginia

Bruce A. Saunders.

Michael L. Jenkins.

Joseph R. Schnell.

Washington

Harry D. C. Kellar.

Wisconsin

Gary W. Smith.

Rickey J. Whitehead.

DIED OF WOUNDS—ARMY

New York

Chris F. Brunn.

DIED OF WOUNDS—NAVY

California

Mike M. Godines.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS

Massachusetts

Michael C. Burns.

Missouri

James W. Simms.

Wisconsin

Michael A. Harvey.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

California

Arlan L. Hahn.

Georgia

Harold K. Ring.

David E. Thomas.

Indiana

Wayne A. Wilcox.

Massachusetts

John G. Joyce.

Montana

Thomas N. Grose.

New Jersey

Howard S. Biesantz.

New York

Stephen A. Shortall.

Lawrence J. De Felice.

Oklahoma

Ronald L. Sanders.

South Carolina

Herbert R. Grant.

James Nickens.

Texas

Jimmie R. Tice.

Alfredo Riveria.

Virginia

Nathaniel Irving.

Washington

John C. Browning.

Ronald L. Quigley.

Wisconsin

Alan M. Royston.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION,
MARCH 4, 1969

ARMY

Arkansas

Phillip E. Rosson.

California

William J. Bruce.

Larry G. Higginbotham.

Richard A. Burns.

Antonio M. Garcia.

Florida

James W. Wright.

Georgia

Frank Meszar III.

Dennis S. Coker.

Illinois

Eugene Couturiaux.

William D. Ryan.

Indiana

Donald L. Rhodes.

Kentucky

George F. Evans.

Massachusetts

Michael C. Whalen.

New Jersey

James P. Hanlon.

New York

Merle F. Butler II.

Bruce E. Reed.

Ohio

Steve Mirick, Jr.

Tennessee

Gary V. Hall.

Ronald J. Allen.

ARMY—continued
Washington
 Orlan M. Nelson.
 Alan C. Burtness.
Wisconsin
 James T. Liebnitz.
 Kenneth L. Strittmater.
Guam
 Enrique S. Cruz.
 NAVY
California
 Manuel Martinez.
 John M. Sullivan.
Illinois
 Gregory L. Koupe.
Massachusetts
 Robert E. Peschke.
 MARINE CORPS
Alabama
 Sam W. Busby.
 Joel K. Watkins.
California
 Jerry R. Frazier.
Connecticut
 James P. Carney, Jr.
Florida
 David W. Denlinger.
 Michael G. Dinkins.
 Samuel C. Macon.
Georgia
 Freddie Usher.
 Carey W. Smith.
Illinois
 Thomas H. McGrath.
 Michael J. Frencl.
 Larry S. Rainey.
Kentucky
 Robert A. Coffey.
Louisiana
 Glenn B. Rao.
Maryland
 John T. Hare.
 Robert H. Trall III.
Massachusetts
 Richard L. Desper.
 Patrick J. Muraca.
Minnesota
 John H. Erbes.
Missouri
 Clifford D. Combs.
New Jersey
 Charles J. Kurtz.
New Mexico
 David A. Mallory.
New York
 Craig N. Demichelle.
North Carolina
 James J. Johnson.
Ohio
 Timothy P. Bauer.
Pennsylvania
 David A. Parker.
 Fred L. Ricard, Jr.
South Carolina
 Vincent N. Banks.
Tennessee
 William H. Moore.
 Robert L. Roebuck.
 David S. Whitman.
Texas
 Edward C. Sanchez.
Wisconsin
 Royce E. Roe.
 Donald C. Voltner.
 DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS
Florida
 George P. White.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY
Louisiana
 Clarence J. Babin Jr.
Oregon
 Robert A. Brothen.
 Iria D. Barnett.
 Francis W. Cody.
 MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—NAVY
California
 Bruno W. Damata.
Massachusetts
 Albert C. Tavares.
Pennsylvania
 Ronald P. Yuhas.
Tennessee
 Charlie M. Ellison.
 KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION,
 MARCH 5, 1969
 ARMY
Alabama
 Henry Caldwell, Jr.
 Ralph E. Nathan.
California
 Thomas D. Thompson, Jr.
 Edward B. Steele.
 Stephen S. Niederhause.
Illinois
 Carter J. Freund.
 Glenn A. Tompkins.
Michigan
 Robert J. Frankowiak.
Minnesota
 Jerry S. McDonald.
New Jersey
 Joseph L. Biddle.
New York
 Jose Crespo.
Ohio
 Thomas V. Pilson.
 George H. Ripplé.
Oklahoma
 Michael D. Hyatt.
Tennessee
 Eugene Copeland.
Virginia
 Alvin C. Toombs, Jr.
Washington
 Marvin H. Brown.
Wisconsin
 Dennis A. Groff.
 NAVY
Montana
 Russell D. Flanagan.
 MARINE CORPS
California
 Robert D. Calhoun.
 John A. Burich, Jr.
District of Columbia
 Jerome M. Jones.
Florida
 Clyde W. Ganzy.
Georgia
 Stanley E. Ur.
Illinois
 David Ybarra.
Iowa
 Michael L. Zappia.
Maryland
 Billy H. Best.
 Paul A. Cumberland.
Massachusetts
 Clifton L. Broyer.
New York
 Frank P. Evangelista.
 Raymond L. Flint.

MARINE CORPS—continued
Pennsylvania
 Vernon W. East.
Texas
 Elroy Morris.
Washington
 Daniel J. Minor.
 DIED OF WOUNDS—ARMY
Georgia
 Edward L. Gilliard.
 MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY
Ohio
 Frederick R. Ratliff, Jr.
Pennsylvania
 Richard A. Wallick.
Rhode Island
 Richard L. Lanctot.
South Carolina
 Ernest C. Howle.
 KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION,
 MARCH 6, 1969
 ARMY
California
 Carl L. Radtke.
 Robert L. Heinmiller.
Illinois
 Dean W. Moehring.
Kentucky
 William O. Walters.
New York
 Ryuzo Somma.
 Kenneth R. Kent.
 Marvin A. De Vault.
 Gary L. Vanderbrook.
North Carolina
 Warren L. Beacham.
Oklahoma
 Vencen Ackerson.
Oregon
 Marvin D. Barnes.
Pennsylvania
 Robert E. Diehl.
South Carolina
 Austin I. Edwards.
 Willie E. Madden.
Virginia
 Calvin Edmunds.
Washington
 Jacob C. Laan.
 Brian R. Estes.
 NAVY
Colorado
 Douglas F. Menard.
New Jersey
 Walter P. Seel, Jr.
Ohio
 Kenneth Davis.
Pennsylvania
 Delbert L. Singler, Jr.
 MARINE CORPS
Massachusetts
 Robert M. Cookson.
Michigan
 James C. Burks.
New Jersey
 Gordon L. Sargent.
North Carolina
 Joseph R. King, Jr.
Ohio
 Joseph N. Decker.
 Benjamin F. Stoffer.
Texas
 Raymond E. Delgado.

MARINE CORPS—continued

Virginia

Byron L. Tennant.

DIED OF WOUNDS—ARMY

California

Ronald P. Russell.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

Arizona

William R. Lawson.

California

Steven R. Segura.

Connecticut

Arthur A. Crosby, Jr.

Georgia

Gregory A. Marvin.

Kentucky

Ben H. Wilkins, Jr.

Minnesota

Harold J. Smith.

Mississippi

Charles Brown.

Frank Wilder.

Missouri

Donald R. Mayberry.

Pennsylvania

John P. Grimenstein, Jr.

Texas

Mario J. Mendias.

Virginia

Richard M. Donlan.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION,
MARCH 7, 1969

ARMY

California

Clyde E. Rains.

Darryl W. Shuster.

Bruce W. Thompson.

New Jersey

Richard C. Brunn.

New York

Walter W. Rudolph.

Lauri Kangro.

South Carolina

Vernon E. Scott.

Wisconsin

Randy R. Mueller.

David F. Van Den Heuvel.

NAVY

Minnesota

George P. Collins.

MARINE CORPS

Alabama

Raymond E. Tolsma.

California

Richard A. Deleidi.

Clyde Callahan.

Florida

Gregory E. Hankins.

Illinois

Samuel N. Hart.

Indiana

Harold E. Musselman.

John J. Meyer.

Missouri

Robert P. Menninger.

New Mexico

Davis L. Gullen.

North Carolina

Arthur S. Hill.

Texas

Alfred M. Wilson.

Texas

Joseph B. McCartney.

Washington

Timothy J. Hall.

George V. Jmaeff.

DIED OF WOUNDS—ARMY

Maryland

James R. Taylor.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS

Massachusetts

John L. Pratt.

New York

Allan R. Gyore.

Virginia

Robert A. McGill.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

Minnesota

Timothy J. Kapoun.

New York

Richard W. Kulpa.

Henry Pullum, Jr.

Ohio

Walter B. Tully, Jr.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION,
MARCH 10, 1969

ARMY

California

Peter L. Gorvad.

Ronald L. Warnett.

James E. Kinnard.

Daniel W. Lawson.

Richard W. Ford.

Stanley B. Ziegler.

Connecticut

Richard W. Keithline.

Leon R. Goodale, Jr.

Florida

Frederic N. Ash.

Charles R. Outlaw, Jr.

Georgia

William R. Black.

Louisiana

Michael A. Clause.

Maryland

Peter L. Tripp.

Clayton E. Fraley.

Massachusetts

William J. McNamara.

Glenn R. Gordon.

Michigan

David P. Jacobs.

John A. Nowakowski.

Michael A. Dunneback.

Lavern M. Lamey.

Joseph J. Strucel.

Minnesota

Phillip E. Taylor.

Clayton A. Songle.

Mississippi

Victor Johnson, Jr.

Missouri

William F. Goodwin.

Nebraska

Terry L. Sayer.

New Jersey

George A. Callan.

North Carolina

Johnny L. Palmer.

Carl S. Douglas.

Steve E. Lowery.

North Dakota

Dale G. Helgeson.

Ohio

Walter B. Hoxworth.

Glenn R. Stair.

Oklahoma

Jerry C. Robbins.

Clinton L. Wheeler.

Pennsylvania

Richard L. Deimler.

South Carolina

Linnell Butler.

Joseph A. Goodson.

ARMY—continued

South Dakota

Daniel M. Noeldner.

Tennessee

Larry Murdock.

Texas

William W. Abshear.

Sanderfield A. Jones.

Joe B. Stuart, Jr.

Utah

Michael R. Forck.

Virginia

David D. Layne.

Roy D. Wimmer.

West Virginia

Billy D. Thomas.

Wisconsin

Bruce J. Guex.

Larry G. Lacaeyse.

Wyoming

John W. Kobelin II.

NAVY

Alabama

Edgar A. Dees.

Massachusetts

John A. Sorrenti.

MARINE CORPS

Alabama

Ira M. Franklin, Jr.

William C. Northington.

Gerald B. Lane.

Arkansas

Harold E. Crower.

Jerry D. Harsson.

Carl W. Hill.

California

Anthony B. Curci.

Michael E. Angel.

Philip M. Hunt.

Connecticut

Stephen F. Kostanski.

Robert E. Goding.

Florida

Robert H. Jenkins, Jr.

Paul E. Strouse.

Illinois

William L. Gough.

Indiana

James L. Vroom.

Dandel D. Bruce.

Iowa

Ronald D. Duntz.

Louisiana

David A. Floyd.

Maine

James L. Avery.

Massachusetts

Phillip J. Taylor.

Michigan

Clarence A. Heckman.

Peter F. Dewilde, Jr.

Richard F. Dusseau.

John L. Heister.

Ronald J. Shier.

Minnesota

Thomas K. Schaefer.

Missouri

Gerald L. James.

Nevada

John I. Aleck.

New York

Nelson Bey.

Richard W. Riale.

Ohio

David C. Ferguson.

David A. Johnson.

Lawrence W. Porter.

MARINE CORPS—continued

Ohio—Continued

Frank Shartz, Jr.
Ray T. Shaum, Jr.
Oklahoma
Roy E. Lynn.
Oregon
Austin C. Lane.
Pennsylvania
Richard D. Coyle.
Leo J. Mangold.
South Carolina
Joseph L. Freeman, Jr.
Tennessee
Boyd L. Brake.
Eric T. Duffer.
Gene O. Merriweather.
Texas
Joe G. Rodrigues, Jr.
Arturo A. Cauble.
George Colunga.
Virginia
Philip N. Malone.
Wisconsin
Michael P. Malueg.
DIED OF WOUNDS—ARMY
Florida
Robert L. Harter.
DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS
California
Larry W. Liss.
New York
Richard J. Leahy.
MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY
Arizona
Edward R. Hickey.
California
Ricardo J. Ortegon.
Peter A. Duperry.
Duane C. Paepke, Jr.
Connecticut
Donald J. Krajewski.
Georgia
Jerry Johnson.
Oliver K. Webb.
Illinois
Dennis E. Wisniewski
Indiana
John A. Grabbe.
Iowa
David G. Lovitt.
Louisiana
Carl D. Cain.
Jimmie L. Gordon.
Michigan
Ronald J. Vanden Berg.
New York
Lester R. Stone, Jr.
Ohio
John A. Petric.
Lowell R. Groves.
Oklahoma
Arlin W. Koehn.
Pennsylvania
Thomas A. Becker.
Harry B. Seedes III.
Tennessee
William T. Harris.
Victor R. Scheeler.
William E. L. Hart.
Johnny R. Lynn.
Texas
Raul Alvarado, Jr.
Washington
Lynn D. Anderson.
Wisconsin
Ronald C. Thlex.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY—continued

Puerto Rico

Jose R. Overman Rodriguez.
MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—NAVY
Alabama
Theodore S. Hamner III.
Melvin L. Sellers.
California
Donald E. Erwin.
Bert E. Burton.
Cecil F. Bush.
Florida
Earl T. Moore.
Illinois
Daniel L. Overright.
Kansas
Thomas E. Adams
Massachusetts
Milton Shapiro.
New York
Ronald J. Gebbie.
Craig E. Swagler.
Ohio
Marvin D. Avery.
Pennsylvania
David W. Hawryshko.
Joseph F. Burinda, Jr.
Texas
Earnest J. Buckelew.
Washington
Donald J. Fisher.
Lyle D. Zacher.
KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION,
MARCH 11, 1969
ARMY
California
Richard L. Adcock.
Craig E. Williams.
Colorado
Edward L. Garcia.
Connecticut
David H. De Forge.
Illinois
John R. Hornsby.
George R. Lovellette.
Kentucky
Jewell C. Blankenship.
Paul D. Haydon.
Michigan
William T. Craig Jr.
James E. Ramsby.
Kenneth E. Miller.
Thomas J. Roach Jr.
Charles D. Snyder.
Missouri
Ralph D. Veale.
Montana
Truman J. Walsh.
Nebraska
Milo D. Clements.
Ohio
Nelson L. Smith.
Larry E. Evans.
Pennsylvania
Lee D. Thomas.
Utah
Jesse B. Stevenson.
Washington
Gary F. Rolfe.
West Virginia
Edward Duty.
Wisconsin
Glen O. Venet.
Guam
Vincent F. Guerrero.
NAVY
Michigan
Donald L. Rudd.

MARINE CORPS

California

Robert V. Jay.
Florida
Leslie Thompson.
Wilbur J. Miller, Jr.
Indiana
Charles W. Thomas.
Michigan
Dennis G. Merryman.
Oklahoma
Charles L. Smith.
Texas
Douglas R. Sledge.
DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS
Virginia
Drew J. Barrett III.
MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY
Illinois
Robert Jackson, Jr.
Oklahoma
Jimmie D. Cook.
Wisconsin
Jack P. Delange.
MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—NAVY
Pennsylvania
Donald M. Horton.
MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—MARINE CORPS
Indiana
Thomas M. Hiday.
Illinois
David E. Thaxton.
KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION,
MARCH 12, 1969
ARMY
Alabama
Charles F. Sturma.
John L. Motley, Jr.
Arkansas
Randall L. Harvey.
Robert E. Grant.
California
Allen D. Mortensen.
Robert L. Sloan.
Colorado
Douglas R. Pollock.
Connecticut
Thomas J. Bowe.
Florida
Calvin Norman, Jr.
Willie L. Brown, Jr.
Illinois
James E. Janka.
Willie L. Wallace.
Indiana
David R. Morgan.
Kentucky
Leon Beard.
Maryland
Joseph E. Nohe, Jr.
Massachusetts
Steven C. Erbenbraut.
Minnesota
James M. Norman.
New Jersey
Lester Danchetz.
New York
Joseph C. Russo.
Michael P. O'Connor.
North Carolina
James H. Wall.
Kenneth M. Lee.
North Dakota
Danny L. Hanson.
Ohio
Terrance L. Weant.

ARMY—continued	MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY—CON.	MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY
<i>Pennsylvania</i>	<i>Puerto Rico</i>	<i>California</i>
Jay B. Gilpin.	Lionel Maldonado-Torres.	Layne M. Santos.
William J. Kolenc.	MARINE CORPS	<i>Georgia</i>
<i>South Carolina</i>	<i>New York</i>	Michael England.
Leon Tisdale.	AIR FORCE	<i>Maryland</i>
<i>Tennessee</i>	<i>Iowa</i>	Benjamin J. Rawlings.
Cecil W. Tillman.	—	William E. Price.
<i>Texas</i>	KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION,	William J. Schaaf.
Roger W. Smelser.	MARCH 13, 1969	<i>Michigan</i>
<i>Virginia</i>	ARMY	Paul J. Buczolic.
Kenneth G. Clarke, Jr.	<i>Arkansas</i>	<i>New Jersey</i>
<i>Washington</i>	Johnny P. Grisson.	Roger J. Spence.
Richard T. Forester.	<i>California</i>	Dennis J. Coll.
<i>Wisconsin</i>	Robert N. Sauls.	<i>New York</i>
Robert J. Benedict.	<i>Colorado</i>	Rodger D. Force.
NAVY	Raymond J. Bechard.	<i>Oregon</i>
<i>North Carolina</i>	<i>Florida</i>	Melvin L. Applebury.
William L. McCormick.	Tommy L. Robinson.	<i>Pennsylvania</i>
<i>Virginia</i>	<i>Georgia</i>	Earl W. Himes.
William C. Ninow.	William C. Stinson, Jr.	Richard L. Fry.
MARINE CORPS	Larry D. Carroll.	<i>Tennessee</i>
<i>California</i>	Charles D. Macken.	David A. Selber.
Michael A. Marshall.	<i>Hawaii</i>	<i>Virginia</i>
Ronald F. Christianson.	John S. Otake.	Wille J. Hudson.
<i>Kentucky</i>	<i>Illinois</i>	Fred D. Burton.
Buford Hardy.	Robert S. Gregg.	William T. Rector, Jr.
<i>Massachusetts</i>	<i>Indiana</i>	<i>Puerto Rico</i>
Robert J. Costa.	Wayne G. Bernoska.	Juan Ayala-Mercado.
<i>New Jersey</i>	Joseph W. Wysong.	MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—NAVY
Joseph Grassia, Jr.	William T. Spearman.	<i>Oklahoma</i>
<i>South Carolina</i>	<i>Kentucky</i>	Jackie R. Morgan.
Harrison Wine, Jr.	Alfred E. Alvey, Jr.	—
<i>Texas</i>	<i>Louisiana</i>	KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION,
Nyman W. Stelter.	Roger E. Denny.	MARCH 14, 1969
<i>Virginia</i>	Leonard C. Miller.	ARMY
Douglas O. Looney.	Huey Williams.	<i>Alabama</i>
<i>West Virginia</i>	<i>Massachusetts</i>	Howard R. Thomas, Jr.
Michael S. Garrett.	Richard J. Bols.	<i>Arizona</i>
AIR FORCE	Richard A. Lameiras.	Matthew E. Morton, Jr.
<i>New Jersey</i>	Walter J. Lemieux.	<i>California</i>
Calvin E. Alexander.	John J. Petrie.	Clarence P. Burleson.
MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY	<i>Nevada</i>	David B. Christianson.
<i>California</i>	Larry D. Brown.	<i>District of Columbia</i>
Robert J. Campbell.	<i>New York</i>	Samuel J. Izzard.
<i>Florida</i>	Roger J. Mazal.	<i>Florida</i>
Carlton J. Johnson.	Francis S. Oberson.	Clarence Nofford.
<i>Illinois</i>	David J. Hordern.	Julius A. Mitchell.
George R. Aygerinos.	<i>Oregon</i>	<i>Georgia</i>
<i>Indiana</i>	Clifton F. Wagner.	James L. Yarbrough.
William D. McAllister.	<i>South Carolina</i>	<i>Idaho</i>
<i>Iowa</i>	Clarence E. Nunnery, Jr.	Douglas N. Rowe.
Phillip L. Baker.	<i>South Dakota</i>	<i>Indiana</i>
<i>Kentucky</i>	Michael J. Gruenwald.	Stephen Harder.
John P. Emrath.	<i>Wisconsin</i>	Larry L. Rauscher.
<i>Louisiana</i>	William J. Stedl.	<i>Kansas</i>
Paul D. Cooke.	MARINE CORPS	Blaine L. Honeycutt.
<i>Michigan</i>	<i>Georgia</i>	<i>Kentucky</i>
Kenneth Martin.	Elijah Herring, Jr.	Kyle Waldrop.
<i>Michigan</i>	<i>Illinois</i>	John R. Jackson.
Martin T. Scott II.	Freddie C. Pote, Jr.	John W. Hill, Jr.
<i>Missouri</i>	<i>Michigan</i>	<i>Louisiana</i>
Joseph Schmich Jr.	Larry M. Rodgers.	Donald C. Gillett.
<i>New York</i>	<i>Missouri</i>	Larry A. Jackson.
Alfred Lallave.	William T. Prose.	<i>Maryland</i>
Eugene Elder.	<i>Ohio</i>	Joseph K. Carroll.
<i>Oregon</i>	Earl E. Taylor	<i>Michigan</i>
Robert E. Leamen.	Glenn S. Wingenbach, Jr.	Richard H. Haag, Jr.
<i>South Carolina</i>	DIED OF WOUNDS—ARMY	<i>Mississippi</i>
Dennis R. P. Isom.	<i>North Carolina</i>	Bennie J. Graham.
<i>Texas</i>	Jimmy V. Smith.	<i>Missouri</i>
Robert E. Griffith.	DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS	Timothy L. Hurley.
<i>Virginia</i>	<i>Maryland</i>	<i>Nevada</i>
George L. Brown.	Calvin J. Childress.	Ronald E. Dedman.

ARMY—continued

New York

Joseph H. Mears.
Thomas Poldino.
John A. Rivera.
Joseph E. Neske.

North Dakota

Lawrence R. Esser.

Oklahoma

Bobby J. Rollins.

Pennsylvania

Robin B. Miller.
Antonio Garcia.

South Carolina

Jackie L. Crosby.

Tennessee

Jesse H. Archer.
Donald L. Shirley.

Texas

Buddy E. Channon.
Aaron L. Smith.

Puerto Rico

Juan E. Garcia-Diaz.
Daniel Irizarry-Acevedo.

NAVY

Iowa

Lewis C. Harris.

MARINE CORPS

California

Kenneth E. Gayer.
Lewis L. McDonald.

Illinois

Ronald D. Jewell.
David B. Arnold.

New Mexico

Freddie P. Chavez.

New York

Ramon J. Arroyo.

Ohio

Clarence E. Fetty.

Texas

Dale E. Greenwood.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS

Illinois

Lemond Richardson.

Michigan

Rick Yamashita.

Utah

Michael H. Yeates.

Wisconsin

Richard E. Matyas.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

Alabama

Fulton B. Moore III.
John B. Gibson Jr.

Michigan

Earl T. Hoag.
Louis A. George.

New York

George R. Robinson.

Ohio

Kenton E. Henninger.
David E. Theobald.

Utah

Michael G. Brown.

Washington

Barry D. Horton.

Puerto Rico

Efrain Figueroa-Melendez.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION,
MARCH 17, 1969

ARMY

Alabama

William H. Barksdale.
Bobby D. Clark.
James A. Franklin.

ARMY—continued

Alaska

Patrick M. McInerney.

Arizona

Archie H. Iyua Jr.
Randy R. Boykins.

Arkansas

Jean D. Martin.

California

Franklin A. Johnson.
Theophilus Bowles.
Perry L. Bozeman.
John F. Morris.
John A. Ramirez.

Connecticut

Whitney T. Ferguson III.

Delaware

James L. Ripanti.
Jeffrey T. Cassidy.

Florida

Morgan Thompson.
Alton L. Ellis.
Paul E. Irvin.

Georgia

Elbert J. Sauls.

Illinois

Milfred H. Dingman.
John P. Guttman Jr.
Melvin Guyton.

Indiana

Dean R. Orn.
Kenneth M. Frain.

Iowa

Joel L. Miller.

Kansas

Michael G. Allendorf.

Kentucky

Gary L. Moore.

Louisiana

Aaron C. Smith.

Maine

Gordon C. Murray.

Maryland

George A. Demby.

Massachusetts

Robert E. Spires.

Michigan

James E. Fowler.
Thomas R. Gregson.
Fred E. Richards.

Minnesota

Daniel W. Lloyd.
Thomas J. Koob.

Missouri

Donald L. Fowler.
Robin W. Richardson.

Montana

Larry M. Smith.

New York

Lawrence Desmore.
Clarence A. Earley.
Richard M. Schmidt.
George J. Smith, Jr.

North Carolina

Charles D. Rogers.
Charles J. Revis.

Ohio

Cornell R. R. Clark.
James H. Horton.
Phillip R. Bally.

Oklahoma

Clarence L. Rouse.
Samuel L. Holder.

Pennsylvania

William L. McFarland.

Rhode Island

Charles V. Dupre.

ARMY—continued

South Carolina

Terrell T. Ham.

Tennessee

Jerry G. Ervin.

Texas

Henry Chamberlain.
Fidel J. Aguirre.
Walter L. Moore.

Utah

Robert A. Conley.

Virginia

Vanderbilt Elliott, Jr.

West Virginia

William T. Wheeler.

Wisconsin

Franklin J. Runge.

Guam

Gregorio L. Pangelinan.

NAVY

Ohio

William R. Lucas.

MARINE CORPS

Arizona

Richard L. Thompson, Jr.

Arkansas

William H. Brown.

California

James R. Harrison.

Colorado

Kenneth A. Pederson.

District of Columbia

Jean R. Clemencia, Jr.

Louisiana

Julio C. Weld.

Maryland

Michael Digenno.

Massachusetts

John E. Shiraka.

Michigan

Donald J. Spatafore.

Minnesota

Edward J. Haugen.

Mississippi

Henry C. Sanders.

Ohio

David C. Teutsch.

Oregon

Alvin L. Lowery.

Pennsylvania

Jeffrey C. Barthol.

Texas

Doyce G. Miller.

DIED OF WOUNDS—ARMY

New York

Robert T. Orr.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS

Alabama

Johnny G. Stamps.

California

Sydney C. Howard.

Florida

Donald E. Sizemore.

Georgia

Isieah Releford.

Illinois

James L. Smith.

Iowa

Randal L. Shackelford.

Maryland

Thomas C. D. Moffitt.

Michigan

Vern E. Root.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS—CONTINUED

Minnesota
William R. Mackey, Jr.
Nevada
Ronald C. Katz.
Oregon
Daryl C. Bauer.
Pennsylvania
Cyril T. Yeckley.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY
Arizona

Steven W. Dundas.
Charlie Fields.
California
Robert B. Protto, Jr.
Steven H. Johnson.
Colorado
Roy G. Zufelt.
Connecticut
William A. Beard.
Oregon
Ted Q. Reed, Jr.
Pennsylvania
Gary R. George.
Edward J. Millison, III.
Texas
Jerry C. McDonald.
Darrell W. Donaldson.
Utah
Leonard R. Caton, Sr.
West Virginia
Paul W. Shrewsbury.
Wisconsin
Wayne A. Bratz.
Puerto Rico
David Gomez-Badillo.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION,
MARCH 18, 1969
ARMY
Alabama
Robert E. Spiegel.
Albert T. Glanton.
Arkansas
Tommy J. Dixon.
California
James P. Fullerton.
Vincent G. Lew.
Jack E. Williams.
Hawaii
Herman B. Hose, Jr.
Illinois
Thomas A. Zimmerman.
Gerald L. Tharp.
Indiana
Raymond E. Baumgarner.
Donnie J. Martin.
Michigan
Richard M. Pearsall.
New York
Berton Decker.
Ohio
Donnie W. Caudill.
Pennsylvania
Tyrone G. Thoman.
Texas
Hadley Foster.
Thomas E. Hacker.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION,
MARCH 18, 1969

NAVY
Mississippi
Terry E. Tharp.
MARINE CORPS
Georgia
Jeff Whitehead.
Massachusetts
Leonard P. Deinlein.
David J. Pugh.

MARINE CORPS—CONTINUED

Missouri
Henry R. Longston.
New York
Michael E. Brady.
Anthony J. Morina.
Ohio
James T. Anderson.

DIED OF WOUNDS—ARMY—CONTINUED
Ohio

Don R. Brewer.
Pennsylvania
Andrew J. Kukuruda.
MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY
California
Timothy M. Carroll.
Michigan
Larry Strahan.
Douglas W. Bice.
Earl S. Snyder.
New York
Joseph M. Urbanczyk.
Michael W. Doyle.

North Carolina
Franklin M. Lanier.
Ohio
Jerry O. Young.
Texas
Harlan M. Craft.
Puerto Rico
Arthur George-Pizarro.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION,
MARCH 19, 1969
ARMY
Alabama
Edgar G. McAdams.
Paul J. Peoples.
California
Thomas L. Vendelin.
Connecticut
Bernard A. Zambrano.
Georgia
John W. Camp.
Carl W. Hughes.
Illinois
Bruno Baran.
James A. Gazze.
James R. Pollard, Jr.
Kansas
Thomas Bright, Jr.
Kentucky
Fred E. Brown.
Dewey J. Ray.

Missouri
Dennis R. Hunsley.
Kenneth L. Watson.
Louis M. Beckmann.
Nebraska
Larry A. Stark.
New Jersey
John W. Price.
Paul Bonapart.
William Jackson.
New Mexico
Richard L. Duran.
New York
William J. Hillard, II.
North Carolina
Furnace Freeman, Jr.
Ohio
Ronald L. Pearl.
David A. Mitchell.
Pennsylvania
Francis E. Sievers, Jr.
Joseph A. Petrarca.
Rhode Island
Jay H. Manchester.

Ohio
James T. Anderson.

Ohio
Don R. Brewer.

Ohio
Don R. Brewer.

ARMY—CONTINUED
South Carolina

James Dollard.
Benjamin A. Smalls.
Texas
Harold P. Degner.
Utah
Kenneth J. Robinson.
Washington
Richard A. Brown.

MARINE CORPS
Georgia
William L. Tanner.
Ronald H. Howard.

Hawaii
Dalmacio P. Pascua, Jr.
Indiana
Steven D. Churchward.
Dale W. Coldiron.
New York
John McManus.
Washington
Adolf J. Kroisenbacher.
West Virginia
John E. Roberts, Jr.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS
Pennsylvania
Cyril T. Yeckley.
MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY
California
Joseph A. Lewis.
Georgia
Billy G. Creech.
Illinois
Louis W. Frericks.
Iowa
Edward T. Cooper.
Mississippi
Carlos L. Tartt.

New York
Ralph E. Mayers III.
North Carolina
Vernon E. Lall, Jr.
Pennsylvania
Paul H. Jackson, Jr.
Vermont
Dean H. Johnson.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—AIR FORCE
New Jersey
David T. Dinan III.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION,
MARCH 20, 1969
ARMY
Alabama
Milford Looney, Jr.
California
John R. Thielen.
Michael J. Caputo.
John E. Lortz III.
Michael L. Paddock.
Connecticut
Barry Jackson.
Kentucky
Delmar V. Ashbrook.
Maryland
Robert L. Baldwin.
Massachusetts
Robert E. Green.
Michigan
Earl C. Rider, Jr.
Wesley Beaver.
Minnesota
Marlon W. Troxel.
North Carolina
Robert G. Daniel.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—AIR FORCE
New Jersey
David T. Dinan III.

ARMY—continued
Ohio
Firman A. Titus.
Oklahoma
Robert W. Patterson.
Tennessee
Earl T. Quillen.
Texas
Willie E. Malone, Jr.
Wisconsin
Lyle C. Hansbrough.
John L. Rueth.
MARINE CORPS
California
Dickie D. Koell, Jr.
Phillip H. Marks.
Idaho
Danny J. Maggard.
Maryland
Joseph C. Thorne, Jr.
Michigan
John L. Gawel.
New Jersey
Herbert M. Beaumont.
New York
Richard M. Rocco.
North Carolina
David W. Bazzle.
Ohio
Samuel Hope, Jr.
Pennsylvania
Joseph T. Chatburn.
Richard C. Chubb.
Dennis L. Moyer.
Terry L. Taylor.
Virginia
Ernest R. Franks.
Wisconsin
Vernon D. Jacobs.
MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY
California
Howard G. Webster.
Illinois
Walter A. Koehler.
Roger H. Howes.
Kansas
John E. Walters.
Kentucky
Donald R. Bledsoe.
Minnesota
Craig S. Mettling.
Missouri
Willie J. Kirksey.
New York
Raymond L. Bethea.
Brian F. McCarthy.
Tennessee
Larry L. Hodges.
Texas
Edward R. Beasley.
KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION,
MARCH 21, 1969
ARMY
California
Robert A. McIntosh.
Timothy C. Proudfoot.
Frank J. J. Mattera.
Kentucky
Dennis M. Groves.
Maryland
Edward C. Cofield.
David A. Russell.
Michigan
John C. Davenport.
Robert J. Regenhart.
New Jersey
George T. Farawell.

ARMY—continued
New York
Julio Hernandez Jr.
Pennsylvania
Louis G. Wheeler.
Tennessee
Don Smith.
Texas
James C. Gilbert.
Margarito Fernandez Jr.
Manuel B. Alonzo.
Rolando G. Villarreal.
Puerto Rico
Raimundo Marquez-Quinones.
NAVY
New Jersey
Louis V. Romanelli.
MARINE CORPS
California
John A. Lestelle II.
Alan W. Thornton.
Iowa
James M. Lee.
Michigan
Earl L. Wilson.
Minnesota
Richard W. Smith.
South Carolina
Charles E. Davis Jr.
James A. Carpenter.
Texas
James M. Aston.
Washington
Henry A. Dye, Jr.
DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS
Rhode Island
Paul A. Cabral.
MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY
California
Michael L. Woodside.
Jeffrey L. Whyngaught.
Charles W. Warrington, Jr.
Maryland
Willis F. House.
New York
Sigmond M. Sikorski.
North Carolina
William Reynolds.
Texas
Lyle J. Thompson.
MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—NAVY
Alaska
William J. Hutton.
KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION,
MARCH 24, 1969
ARMY
Alabama
Louis H. Jones.
Arkansas
Harvey C. Avery.
California
Isaac E. Heath.
Michael Lynch.
Jesus C. Oleta, Jr.
Harold B. Johnson.
Billy D. Murphy.
Dennis A. Smith.
Colorado
Jackie L. Davison.
Florida
Tony L. Buholtz.
James D. Wright, Jr.
Georgia
John A. Swords.
Idaho
James J. Lister.

ARMY—continued
Idaho—Continued
Dean L. Moon.
Larry D. Greenhalgh.
Illinois
Robert C. Rogers.
Albert E. Smith, Jr.
Edward L. Shappell.
Indiana
Mervin R. Richter.
Larry M. Whitis.
Iowa
Eugene J. G. Kock.
Kansas
Richard L. Fiffe.
Maryland
Thomas M. Deitz.
Rodger L. Garlick.
Massachusetts
Simeon J. A. Bergeron.
Michigan
Iddie R. Kelley.
Missouri
Terry R. Monia.
William W. Sherman.
Minnesota
Donald L. Olive.
Mississippi
Joseph W. Hudson.
Montana
Richard D. Satterthwaite.
Nebraska
William W. Utts.
New Jersey
John B. Peterson, Jr.
New Mexico
Donald R. Alexander.
Filemon Serrano.
New York
Vaughn D. Connell.
David S. Pellew.
Larry R. Swisher.
Leonard Dodson.
Ricardo Lopez.
North Carolina
Mickey W. Hill.
Loren C. Jones.
Pennsylvania
Edward C. De Bow.
Dale L. Elsaman.
South Carolina
Adger E. Moody.
Tennessee
John W. Parham.
Clarence E. Smith.
Clifford M. Taylor.
Jackie J. Webb.
Texas
Victor D. Kahla, Jr.
William D. Overstreet.
Vermont
Kenneth D. Bailey.
West Virginia
Lawrence L. Smith.
Jack L. Rexrode.
Robert A. Tate, Jr.
Guam
Joseph M. Eustaquilo.
NAVY
California
Thomas L. Hamman.
MARINE CORPS
Alabama
James L. Phillips.
California
Dennis F. Ellis.

MARINE CORPS—continued

California—Continued

Robert R. Highfill.
Emmett T. Pringle.

Florida

Ronald K. Battle.

Georgia

Floyd M. Keefe.
Dennis R. Lawrence.
Clyde E. Saxon.

Indiana

Donald R. Bartley.
Earl F. Falconbury.

Iowa

David L. Davis.

Kentucky

John F. Allen.

Maine

Loring W. Watson.

Massachusetts

John M. Burke.

Michigan

Barry L. Kopp.
Jerry E. Samson.
William R. Stolley, Jr.
Thomas J. Yolkiewicz.

Mississippi

James E. Smith.

Missouri

Charles E. Wheeler.
Larry W. Knox.

Montana

Gordon G. White.

New Jersey

Michael J. Hayes, Jr.

Ohio

Ernest F. Elders.
Charles E. Grooms, Jr.
Jeffrey S. Forry.
Lynn R. Krotzer.
James M. Pintola.
Antonio E. Rulz.

Pennsylvania

Ward E. Homer.
Richard Gilliam.
Ronnie L. Eckenroad.
James M. Gonano.

Tennessee

George R. Ward, Jr.

Texas

Jose Torrerros.

Virginia

John G. Osterhous.

Washington

David J. Sandvig.
Daniel G. Wessler.

West Virginia

Gene W. Somers, Jr.
Clifford M. Cork.
Joseph R. Vandehel.

COAST GUARD

Rhode Island

Morris S. Beeson.

DIED OF WOUNDS—ARMY

Illinois

Robert L. Mitchell.

Minnesota

Eddie L. Evenson.

Washington

Joseph M. Buchanan.
Richard H. Mehegan.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS

Maryland

Ronald B. Cassell.

New York

David B. Arnott.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS—continued

North Carolina

Mitchel T. Morton.

Pennsylvania

Frederick C. Miller III.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

California

Stephen W. Lucia.
John R. Welr.

Florida

Thomas L. Robinson.
Brad D. Chriss.

Illinois

Herbert C. Spencer.

Michigan

Gary L. Hosko.

Ohio

Walter L. Moses, Jr.

Pennsylvania

Waymon L. Jones, Jr.

Tennessee

Ray R. Jowers.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—NAVY

Georgia

Richard C. Thum.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—AIR FORCE

California

William E. Cordero.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION,
MARCH 25, 1969

ARMY

Arkansas

Barry W. Graf.

California

Frank Spiers.
John J. Valero.
Johnny L. Edwards.
Stephen L. Weigt.
Chris A. Souza.

Colorado

Robert L. Riggins.

Florida

Thomas J. Grindstaff.
Charles F. White.
James A. Walker, Jr.

Georgia

Larry D. Smith.

Illinois

Mose C. Hundley.
Alan F. Marschall.

Iowa

James G. Johnson.

Kentucky

Robert A. Osborne.

New York

Frank A. Krieger.

Ohio

Roger L. Phillips.

Tennessee

Danny E. Hubbs.

Texas

Tim L. Walters.
Patrick L. Blair.
Joe E. Demerson.

Virginia

Herman E. Lassiter.

Washington

Richard W. Anderson.

West Virginia

Billy W. Rapp.

Wisconsin

Karl J. Taschek, Jr.

NAVY

New Jersey

Edward W. Pawlowski.

NAVY—continued

New Mexico

Howard M. Meute.

Tennessee

David R. Ray.

MARINE CORPS

Arkansas

James H. Jeffries.

California

Charles D. Hendricks.
James C. Reed.

Indiana

Robert F. Whitten.

New York

Anthony A. Giretti.

South Carolina

George T. Sargent, Jr.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

Connecticut

Johnnie R. Hanson.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—AIR FORCE

North Carolina

Charles K. Lovelace.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION,
MARCH 26, 1969

ARMY

Alabama

Armin L. Blake.

Arizona

Albert M. Mendoza.

California

Bill A. Moschetti.

Connecticut

David D. Ouellette.
Donald S. Repaci.

Georgia

Larry Scott.

Illinois

Michael A. Gehl.
Alley O. Stephens.

Louisiana

Louis B. Waner II.

Massachusetts

Thomas W. Whitten.

Michigan

Jerry L. Ewing.

Minnesota

John R. Brandborg.

New York

Carl L. Di Nunzio Jr.

North Carolina

Richard F. Salazar.

Ohio

Thomas M. Struchen.

South Carolina

Clyde S. Sweatt.

Texas

Willis Cormier.

Wisconsin

Gregory E. Newman.
Michael E. Hermesen.

Puerto Rico

Hector M. Sanchez-Rohena

NAVY

Oklahoma

Gilbert E. McDaniel.

MARINE CORPS

California

Paul Wilson.

Connecticut

Leon Sears.

Maryland

George M. Gorrera, Jr.

Ohio

John M. Goodwin.

MARINE CORPS—continued
Pennsylvania

Barry L. Eichelberger.

DIED OF WOUNDS—ARMY
Ohio

Carl H. Peters, Jr.

DIED OF WOUNDS—MARINE CORPS
Ohio

Darrel G. Napier.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY
California

Larry K. Davis.

Colorado

Frank D. Saracino, Jr.

Georgia

Donald R. Johnston.

Richard B. Phillips.

Kentucky

Leonard L. Preston, Jr.

Maine

Thomas J. McMahon.

Missouri

Douglas G. Edwards.

Nebraska

Nigel F. Poese.

South Dakota

Richard R. Maynard.

Tennessee

Kelly P. Vaughn.

Texas

Jimmy F. Burchfield.

KILLED AS A RESULT OF HOSTILE ACTION,
MARCH 28, 1969

ARMY

Arizona

Antonio R. Morales.

Arkansas

William R. Wilson.

California

Robert P. Ilsley.

David J. Huffman.

Florida

Lewis E. Sampler.

Kentucky

James R. Gentile.

Massachusetts

Arthur J. McIntyre.

Michigan

Walter E. Brown, Jr.

Minnesota

Robert A. Holan, Jr.

Nebraska

Monty G. Lackas.

New York

Westley S. Kerr.

Robert T. Manning.

Benjamin R. Turlano.

Ohio

David S. Harris.

Gary L. Weekley.

Tennessee

James H. Watson.

Texas

Joe E. Holleman.

Johnny Young.

Puerto Rico

Jesus B. Encarnacion.

Angel Reyes.

NAVY

Pennsylvania

Nicholas Cancilla.

Donald R. Robertson.

MARINE CORPS

California

John M. Foster.

Indiana

Stanley M. Clingler.

Kentucky

Steve R. Whitaker.

Maryland

Walter Green, Jr.

Michigan

Robert M. Walkley.

New York

John Barca, Jr.

Texas

Bobby D. Jennings.

West Virginia

Gary R. Moss.

DIED OF WOUNDS

Ohio

Thomas L. Loan.

MISSING TO DEAD—HOSTILE—ARMY

California

Robert L. Barrett, Jr.

Louisiana

James H. Moore.

Massachusetts

Earl M. Matthews.

Michigan

Mark F. Daniels.

Alan R. Hosnedle.

Missouri

Larry T. Moulder.

New York

Alan M. Bernstein.

North Carolina

Ronnie R. White.

Rhode Island

Robert E. O'Brien.

Texas

Joe S. Huston.

HUE AND KATYN—A TRAGIC
SIMILARITY

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the discovery of mass graves showing Communist atrocities against South Vietnamese citizens near Hue, South Vietnam, earlier this week is a tragic reminder that the same form of mass murder was committed by the Communists against our allies in the Katyn Forest, near Smolensk, Russia, at the beginning of World War II.

I was the chief investigator of the special congressional committee which in 1952 investigated the Katyn Forest massacre, and I was struck by the tragic similarity between the methods used by the Communists in the Katyn Forest in 1940, and the methods and techniques used by the Communists again earlier this week against the South Vietnamese in Hue.

There is no question in my mind that the entire free world should be shocked by this bizarre discovery of mass graves near Hue earlier this week.

The discovery was made by two South Vietnamese Army noncoms who were captured by the Vietcong during the Tet

offensive of 1968. These two men were able to free themselves and found many of the graves by digging.

To date, the mass graves have produced a total of 350 bodies.

Digging is still going on, and the two military men who were witnesses to some of these killings are now trying to identify more of the areas.

These two noncoms are Sergeant Chau and Corporal Doi of the South Vietnamese Armed Forces. They actually witnessed some of the atrocities and mass murders inflicted upon their countrymen.

These men say that some of the victims were pushed down into the grave while still alive, and this has been confirmed by doctors who have examined the corpses.

The victims were killed with a single shot in the back of their head while their hands were tied behind their backs. They were pushed into mass graves. This is precisely the method used by Communist soldiers when they massacred 15,000 Polish Army officers in the Katyn Forest in 1940.

Among the 350 victims found, 25 have been identified. Many are women. The identified bodies have been returned to their families for funeral and the rest have been taken care of by the Government of Vietnam for burial.

The location of the grave is the village of Phu Thu, about a distance of 15 kilometers from Hue.

According to Corporal Doi there are still many other graves dug by the Vietcong along the seashore and the local authorities are now proceeding to investigate them.

Mr. Speaker, it occurs to me that the free world cannot overlook nor ignore the bizarre similarity between what happened in the Katyn Forest almost 30 years ago and what is now happening in South Vietnam.

I know that all of our hearts cry out for peace in Vietnam and we pray for the day when our troops can be brought home.

I know every resource of our own Government and every effort by the South Vietnamese Government is being made to find some way to resolve this conflict and to bring it to a victorious conclusion. The United States has offered to withdraw its troops from South Vietnam if North Vietnam would agree to a similar withdrawal.

But, certainly, Mr. Speaker, as we look at the discovery of the mass graves and at the brutal techniques being used in Hue in South Vietnam today against the innocent citizens of that country, and compare them to the techniques used against the 15,000 Polish Army officers who were brutally massacred by the Communists in the Katyn Forest 30 years ago, we see that nothing has really changed in the Communist design of mass execution for those who would stand in the way of their pattern for conquest.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, the world has really not given enough attention to the discovery of these mass graves in South Vietnam last week. This discovery of mass graves in South Vietnam, in my judgment, is a prelude to what awaits millions of South Vietnamese if they

should falter in their struggle against the Communist Vietcong. I am sure that mass graves and mass executions and the whole business of Katynism, so thoroughly developed by the Communists 30 years ago, will be the order of the day in South Vietnam if the Communists were to emerge victorious.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that those who would today urge peace at any price in South Vietnam would think about these tragic consequences.

We want peace and I am confident we shall find peace only if we do not waver in our determination. The South Vietnamese Government has offered to seek a reconciliation with the Vietcong and such moves should be encouraged. But at this critical juncture, when victory is within reach, we must not waver in our defense of freedom in South Vietnam.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the very distinguished gentleman from Indiana who was chairman of the Select Committee To Investigate the Katyn Forest Massacre here in this Congress in 1952.

I have had the highest admiration for the gentlemen since the days when he headed that committee because the Katyn Forest Massacre Committee demonstrated to the world the techniques used by the Communists in mass executions of those who would stand in the way of their aggression.

The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MADDEN) has rendered a noble service in bringing before Congress the first indictments against the Soviet Union for those mass atrocities against the Polish Army officers who were murdered in Katyn.

Mr. Speaker, I deem it a privilege to yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. I thank my colleague for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois for calling the attention of Congress and reminding us of the barbarous atrocities against their victims, the Communist leaders committed during and at the beginning of World War II.

The gentleman from Illinois was one of the real leaders in the work that was done by this committee. We held hearings not only in this country but in England, Germany, and other places in Europe.

The attention of the world was drawn during those hearings to the uncivilized brutality that is embedded in the Communist leaders' attitude toward humanity, generally. Their leaders crave for power. They have no respect for human life. I remember distinctly when we held our hearings in Frankfurt, Germany, back during the days of the 82d Congress when the television and newspaper reporters and radio communications media packed our committee hearing room.

They sent word all over the globe, revealing that Stalin's barbarity is embedded in the minds of all Communist leaders. That barbarity calls for the extinction of human life, if, in the form of individuals or masses, interferes with their program to enslave the world.

I think the gentleman from Illinois was

present along with former Congressman Machrowicz, who is now a Federal judge in Michigan, and myself at the opening of the annual convention, in Berlin Germany, of Eastern and Western European journalists. The gentleman from Illinois, now speaking, Congressman Machrowicz, and myself spoke to the convention of about 200 journalists. There was a lot of opposition from the Communists in adjacent countries to the meeting there being held in Berlin.

At a luncheon at which the gentleman was present along with myself and Congressman Machrowicz, one journalist delegate revealed that the Communist propaganda machine daily published smears that the Katyn Committee was nothing but a tool of capitalism. Notwithstanding the fact that we had invited Stalin and all other Communist leaders to come to Frankfurt and testify—but we had received no answer from them—they proceeded to malign and blaspheme our committee.

These journalists, in speaking to those attending the luncheon, said that in the work of the Katyn Forest Massacre Committee, for the first time in the history of communism placed their propaganda machine on the defensive. They had no answer whatsoever to the avalanche of testimony convicting the Stalin soldiers of the mass murders of Polish leaders in the Katyn Forest.

The hard facts showed their method of human extermination, as the gentleman just stated: They shot almost 4,000 Polish patriot leaders of Poland in the Katyn Forest and two other slave camps. They followed the same pattern which they are using in Vietnam, they tied the victims hands behind their backs and shot them in the back of the head. We remind the people of America not to forget that the Communist technique has not changed one iota since those days at the beginning of World War II, when they massacred and killed millions of people through that method and also through mass starvation in the Ukraine. The people of the world should not become too forgetful of what will happen, God forbid, if ever the Communists succeed in their designs for world domination and to enslave humanity throughout the globe.

I want to thank the gentleman for his statement here today.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from Indiana for his contribution. Certainly we cannot permit the world to overlook this frightening, striking similarity in techniques. I remember the discovery of the Polish Army officers' bodies in mass graves in the Katyn Forest. Their hands were tied behind their backs. There was a single bullet through the nape of the neck. Then these men were dumped, literally dumped, one on top of the other, in the mass graves. Today, 30 years later, we are discovering the identical technique. And who are the victims? Innocent people of South Vietnam, whose only wish, whose only desire is to be free. Those men and women were dumped into graves without the benefit of a trial, without the benefit of any charges, without the benefit of any defense, picked out by the Communists

for only one crime: they are the leaders of the resistance.

And this is important, because here the similarity becomes truly striking. The 15,000 Army Reserve officers who were massacred in the Katyn Forest were the lawyers, the educators, the doctors, the ministers, and the businessmen of Poland. These were, for the most part, the intelligentsia of Poland. These were the people who would have led the resistance to Communist aggression. As early as 1939 the Soviet Union, which professed to be our ally, already was plotting the take-over of all of those countries of Europe. In 1939 and 1940, Communist troops methodically picked the intellectual leaders of Poland from within the Army Officers Reserve Corps whom they imprisoned when Russia invaded Poland on September 17, 1939, so they would not be around when the Communists overwhelmed Poland and destroyed her institutions of freedom.

This is the lesson we see now again in South Vietnam, where people are again being pulled out, picked out. These are the leaders of resistance to the Vietcong. These are the leaders, and these are the people who are holding together the spirit of freedom in South Vietnam.

I tell you this: The discovery of mass graves at Hue proves more than anything else that the Communists have on their drawing boards the blueprint for another Communist "cordon sanitaire" of captive nations in Southeast Asia, identical to the "cordon sanitaire" of captive nations that now remain in Soviet bondage in East Central Europe.

We have the right to ask: Where are the great liberal voices in this country, the great defenders of human dignity? Where are their voices in denouncing the kind of genocide—brutal mass atrocities being committed against the innocent people of Southeast Vietnam?

The American liberal has been in the forefront in denouncing genocide and urging a world treaty against mass murder of people. Where are their voices of protest against this genocide of South Vietnamese discovered in Hue last weekend?

There was the same kind of conspiracy of silence in 1940, when the Polish government in exile tried to sound the alarm about Katyn. The investigation of the Katyn massacre by the congressional committee clearly showed there were forces within our own country that did not want to talk about Katyn and the discovery of those mass graves because the Soviet Union was our "gallant ally," and any discussion of the Katyn massacre in the war years would have supposedly driven a wedge between the Allies.

I submit that had the free world been told of the infamy and the brutality of the Communists discovered in Katyn, perhaps the whole course of history could have been changed.

On Pennsylvania Avenue, in front of the National Archives Building are two monuments. One says:

What is past is prologue.

And the other one says:

Study the past.

I suggest to those who today seek peace at any price and who would let the Communists take over in Southeast Asia, ought study that wise admonition.

Look at Katyn, look at what happened after Katyn, and look at the way the Communists were able to take over 180 million people in Eastern and Central Europe, and then look at what we found in Hue.

We should ask ourselves how long America can remain free, how long can institutions of human dignity prevail in our country if the Communists' juggernaut continues to close in and in and in, as it is doing around the entire world?

The mass grave discoveries in Hue are of monumental importance. I am amazed the mass media and instruments of information have treated these discoveries with such meager attention.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I might say further that so many of the younger generation do not remember or have not had called to their attention in the schools of America the Katyn massacre and the facts regarding many other mass exterminations of humanity that the Communists inflicted upon central Europe during the dark days before World War II.

I might explain why Congress investigated the Katyn massacre. The congressional investigation of the Katyn massacre was brought about because for the first time in world history the guilt of an international crime was not established to the satisfaction of many people throughout the world. The Soviet Union, through its false mass propaganda, had millions convinced that Hitler had committed those massacres in the Katyn Forest. They were committed in the winter of 1939-40, when both armies were closing in on Warsaw.

When these massacres were committed, the bodies in the Katyn Forest were not found until 2 years later.

Immediately Stalin said that Hitler massacred the Polish leaders at Katyn. Hitler, of course, denied it and said that Stalin massacred them. That is why this Congress, through the pleading of the Polish American Congress throughout the United States, insisted that to settle the question for future history an investigation should be made. That is how the Congress became interested in investigating an international crime when one nation had accused another of committing it.

So we settled for all time that it was the Communists who committed that crime, although Hitler had a different method of exterminating people than Stalin had. There is no question, Hitler was the most brutal tyrant of our time. Nevertheless, the Katyn Forest Massacre Congressional Committee settled once and for all that it was the Communists who killed the Poles in the Katyn Forest.

Let me say something further. This is for so many of these agitators in our country today who are so enthusiastic about letting the younger folks know what a great millennium they would have

if communism takes over. I might say it was revealed in our testimony that among some of the mass murders that were committed by the Communists were massacres and murders of some of their own Communist disciples who were taken in with the network that brought in these people from the satellite nations, and they did not have any regard whatsoever for the agitators who were preaching communism, or for their own Communist fellow travelers. Some of them, according to the testimony before our committee, were massacred along with the free victims who were massacred by Stalin and his Communist cohorts.

So I might state to some of the younger folks in this country who are becoming enamored with this organized Communist propaganda in colleges and other places, if the Communists ever took over they also might be among those massacred. They care not what is the thought of the people they massacre or exterminate. That was proved by the evidence submitted in our committee, that some of the so-called super-Communist propagandists who happened to be wedged in the mass onslaught lost their lives the same as the other unfortunate prisoners in the Communist prisons and slave labor camps.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The gentleman would agree that the Katyn investigation, exhaustively conducted by the Congress of the United States, would be a hollow exercise if we failed to learn the lesson that investigation taught us.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PUCINSKI. The lesson is this: Today, while the Communist leaders are stalling in Paris and refusing to address themselves to the real issues and refusing to talk about peace and refusing to make any forward movement, they are methodically engaging in mass executions of those people in South Vietnam who would constitute resistance to communism if and when some rapprochement is reached. It is quite obvious to us that just as at Katyn, where they methodically destroyed potential opposition, we are witnessing in Hue and the other mass graves all over South Vietnam an identical pattern. They are stalling in Paris because they want first to methodically destroy through these mass executions those elements of resistance which might try to protect the institutions of freedom and dignity in South Vietnam when peace finally comes.

I think that is the lesson that Hue ought to teach us. Those who fail to see that lesson, I believe, have just not read the transcript of Katyn. More importantly, they are looking at the world through rose-colored glasses.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PUCINSKI. I yield to my colleague from Illinois (Mr. FINDLEY).

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Illinois for yielding to me.

I want to express my appreciation to him for this timely reminder of the barbaric massacres at Katyn Forest. My colleague, like I, had a part in World War II. I am sure both of us were proud to have had that part and do look back

with pride upon what small contributions, at least on my part, were made in that effort against the Nazi tyranny. My colleague and I do disagree on what ought to be done in Vietnam. I am sure this is not the place to go into the bases for a disagreement. However, I would like to enter this one thought here. I have always felt our Government has undertaken a very serious obligation to the people of Vietnam who have fought at our side. Should the day come when we do disengage and withdraw our forces from there, as I hope we will soon, I feel we must measure up to that obligation to those people and invite other nations to join with us in every possible resettlement of these people that can be undertaken.

After the Cuban episode our country opened its doors to refugees from Cuba. I think that was the right thing to do. Now because we have been involved in Vietnam we have a similar obligation there. I do not suggest that this would eliminate or perhaps even materially reduce the possibility of atrocities that might follow such a disengagement. Even so, we should do our best to provide safety and a future for the people who choose to leave their homes in the event that we should extricate ourselves from this position.

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel with the gentleman's suggestion that we start a methodical withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam. I would join him in that plea but I would also insist that the free world must insist that the North Vietnamese have a similar withdrawal of North Vietnamese troops from South Vietnam. Premier Thieu has said South Vietnam could carry on with its own army of 700,000 but it would need our continued Air Force support. I am hopeful we can withdraw American troops from South Vietnam but I believe our offer to withdraw our troops if North Vietnam similarly withdraws its troops today offers the best hope for disengagement.

More importantly, Mr. Speaker, it would be my hope that the discovery of these mass atrocities against the innocent citizens of South Vietnam would now finally, at last, shock the sensitivities of those of our allies who have meekly sat back and let the United States and the handful of our allies fighting in Vietnam, including the South Vietnamese, carry the full brunt of the conflict.

The issues in southeast Asia and the issues in South Vietnam affect the whole free world. It is incredible to me that those free world rulers who espouse the doctrine of freedom cannot recognize what we are witnessing in South Vietnam today is a repeat performance of what we saw in World War II vis-a-vis the captive nations of Europe. If we learn nothing else from the discovery of the mass graves in Hue, it would be my fervent prayer that our allies would finally be shocked into a realization that nothing has really changed in the Communist world. Mass atrocities, mass murders, and mass assassinations continue to be their main stock in trade to be used against anyone or any nation which dares to interfere with or interrupt their plans for ultimate conquest.

I would suggest that those here in this country—sincere, honest, patriotic Americans who on many occasions have tended to falter in the fight in Vietnam—take a look at these mass atrocities. These were all innocent people. These were citizens. These were people who had no greater desire than to live and let live, and be free. These are people who are being massacred in mass numbers in a most brutal manner, with their hands tied behind their backs, shot through the head with a single bullet, dumped into mass graves.

This is the true picture of communism.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that my fellow Americans who have a tendency to waiver will look at this discovery and then ask themselves: "What can we do as Americans, as united Americans, to bring this war to a successful conclusion?"

Mr. Speaker, I say that the course of history is being written in South Vietnam just as it was in the Katyn Forest. There is no question in my mind but that if the American people had known the full facts of the Katyn Forest massacre the whole course of history would have been altered.

Mr. Speaker, I was not here at that time. Like many others, I was in the armed services, fighting the war. We were helpless to say anything at that time. But now I say this: That so long as the good Lord gives me the strength I shall remain in the well of this House and try to point out the true and full, ugly consequences of compromise with communism, if we falter.

Mr. Speaker, I pray for the day when peace will return to Vietnam. I know what it is like to deliver a flag that has flown over this Nation's Capitol to a mother in my district who lost her son in Vietnam. I know the hardships our American boys are suffering in Vietnam.

I say that the tragedy of our time is that the free world wants the United States to carry this burden all by itself. This in itself is an indictment against the naivete of the leaders of the world. We saw those leaders here earlier this week. These are the men who have within their power the ability to call a halt to hostilities in Vietnam. But this they have not chosen to do; they have chosen to stand aside and watch this huge conflict develop.

It would be my fervent prayer, Mr. Speaker, that the discovery of these mass graves somehow or other will reach the conscience of the rest of the world, and that we can stand together united, and bring peace to Vietnam.

We can bring peace very quickly. Right now there are ships going into Hanoi. Many of our allies are continuing to do business with the Communists because the almighty dollar is more important to them than a principle. I am not surprised that the American people are asking more and more questions. I myself question the values of these fair-weather allies.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DADDARIO). The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

(On request of Mr. McCORMACK, and by unanimous consent, Mr. PUCINSKI was

allowed to proceed for 10 additional minutes.)

Mr. PUCINSKI. I thank our distinguished Speaker for this extension of time.

So it is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that out of this discovery the conscience of the entire world can be sufficiently aroused so that peace can come.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the words on the National Archives Building are very important. They state that—

The past is prologue, study the past.

We cannot close our eyes to reality for the sake of expediency.

My colleague from Illinois who spoke a moment ago says that he wants to pull our troops out of Vietnam. Of course we want to pull our troops out. I want to pull the American troops out. I want to get our boys back home just as quickly as possible, but it would be a tragic mistake if, for the second time in recent history we, as a free people, overlooked and failed to understand the full design of the Communists. They are not quitting. There is not an iota of proof that they are in any way quitting. They are today holding fast in Paris. Why, Mr. Speaker, this war could be brought to a conclusion in 24 hours. What does the United States want in Vietnam? Nothing. Do we seek territorial gains? Of course we do not. Do we seek domination over any other nation or group of people? Of course we do not. All we want is for the South Vietnamese to have a chance to be masters of their own destiny as free people. Is this so difficult? Is this so impossible? Is our demand so outrageous?

I think if we could pull together the resources and the determination of the whole world to make it clear that we are not going to surrender South Vietnam to Communist infamy, this war could be brought to a conclusion very quickly. I do not think the Communists are made of such strength that they do not feel the impact of this war. I think the Communists are having just as much of a problem in Hanoi and in North Vietnam and that there is as much resistance to the continuation of this war over there among the people of North Vietnam as there is among the American people here.

So it seems to me that those who falter and those who would want us to waiver and those who would suggest that somehow or other we walk away before the job is finished, are really prolonging this war and inadvertently they are contributing to false hopes among the Communist rulers.

I hope that the President will look at these mass graves, marshal the forces of the free world in indignation against this form of genocide, and then use whatever means he deems necessary to bring this war to an end in Vietnam.

Yes, Mr. Speaker, Hue and Katyn—they constitute a tragic similarity.

VIETNAM PERSPECTIVE: A GREATER LEGACY

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DADDARIO). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EDWARDS) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, the death of Dwight D. Eisenhower serves to remind all America of the immense capacity this man had for bringing people together.

The theme which consistently runs through the many excellent eulogies of the past few days is that Eisenhower as Army general and as U.S. President, had a great gift for uniting people, for creating unity out of disunity in the work for major national objectives.

Today, in 1969, the need for unity in our Nation perhaps has never been greater. The need exists in several areas of public policy, but one issue is paramount, and that issue is the war in Vietnam.

In our consideration of this conflict we will most certainly profit from keeping in mind the unifying nature of Mr. Eisenhower's leadership and the significance of that unity.

We might even go so far as to conjecture that if Mr. Eisenhower's death at this time in history gives us the impetus for a greater degree of national unity on the Vietnam question then this could prove to be still another of his great services to his country and the world.

It would be difficult to imagine a greater legacy from any man.

What are the ingredients of unity in our considerations of Vietnam today?

The first is to recognize that the President of the United States wants at least as much as any American to bring the war to a satisfactory conclusion. Secretary of State Rogers on March 28 said the United States was prepared to negotiate a simultaneous withdrawal of troops "over a very short period of time." Can anyone believe this is not a sincere and valid position of the Nixon administration?

The second ingredient is to recognize that in the search to define what kinds of conclusions can be considered as "satisfactory" the President and his top policy people are looking very carefully at all the alternatives open to them.

The third ingredient is to recognize that private negotiations have far more potential for success than do public talks. This can be shown from many examples of recent history, particularly in cases of this kind in which the adversary clearly relies on influencing public opinion as a major strategy in the negotiating process.

The fourth ingredient is to gain and hold a reasonable perspective on the total Vietnam situation. This is not an easy thing to accomplish. Each and every one of us has been bothered by the lack of clarity in assessing the history of our Vietnam involvement and of the existing situation.

But I want to make some brief comments on this matter of a proper perspective.

FREE FROM COERCION

For 22 years, ever since World War II, our foreign policy has been guided in general by the concept which President Harry Truman set forth when he told a joint session of Congress, March 12, 1947:

One of the primary objectives of the foreign policy of the United States is the creation of conditions in which we and other

nations will be able to work out a way of life free from coercion.

Perhaps there are different interpretations which might be attributed to President Truman's statement. Perhaps we can say that conditions have changed so that no President could make a statement like that today with such high public acceptance as in 1947.

However, there can be no doubt that a large majority of the people and of the Congress were in accord with President Truman's statement in 1947 and, to a large extent, still are.

There may be variations in application of the principle, but most of us feel that the position of the United States in world affairs is such that when organized attempts at mass coercion develop, our attention is required, partly because our national security may be involved, and partly because a degree of responsibility falls to us however much we may prefer otherwise.

It is this feeling, right or wrong, which was a major reason for our involvement in Korea, in the Berlin disputes, in the Greek conflict, and in other situations of strife.

And after all the other verbiage is stripped away it is the reason why we became involved in Vietnam. Our effort in Vietnam was and still is motivated in accord with what President Truman said was our policy to create conditions in which we and other nations would be able to work out a way of life free of coercion.

My point, Mr. Speaker, is to emphasize that the basic reasons for our being in Vietnam were always valid, given the acknowledged morality of and the national concurrence in this overall concept.

The reason I believe it is so important to make this point now is that U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam is being advocated on the grounds that our involvement was wrongful in the first place.

Withdrawal is certainly one of the alternative courses of action our Government must consider along with others. However, to argue the case on the grounds that our rationale for being in Vietnam in the first place is wrongful is an unnecessary and unfruitful exercise.

It is unnecessary because if withdrawal is the wisest course of action today the best reasons will have to be based not on yesterday's events but rather on what the future holds. And it is unfruitful because if the case for withdrawal must rest on the validity of arguments designed to show U.S. policy in Southeast Asia as basically aggressive and Communist policy to be passive, then the case is very weak.

A few days ago a long statement appeared in the *RECORD* calling for withdrawal—without including a word on what kind of withdrawal, or when, or how, or from where besides South Vietnam—based wholly on an effort to destroy the basic rationale for our effort.

It alleges that in Vietnam from the start our policy sought to rely on power alone and not on law and reason, that South Vietnam more than Hanoi presented obstacles to the effective function of the International Control Com-

mission, that the Vietcong had to be excused in its behavior because its "only future was in subversion," that Saigon under Diem was not interested in land reform while Ho Chi Minh championed land reform, and that Ho's reliance on Communist China and Russia was due to U.S. policies.

These and other allegations are highly questionable, at best. But the main point is that they are not relevant to the question at hand and merely serve to further embolden those who, through misrepresentation, seek to turn public opinion of the world against this country.

It is clearly on record that the U.S. involvement in Vietnam has always, since the beginning in 1954, sought to emphasize law and reason over military considerations, that Saigon in 1958 and 1959 was making very great efforts at land reform, and that Ho's ties with Communist elements in China, Russia and France predate by many years the first U.S. stirrings of interest in Southeast Asia.

Yes, the basic rationale for U.S. involvement in Vietnam is very much in accord with principles of U.S. foreign policy which have been accepted as valid for 22 years and more.

The real question, however, that U.S. policy planners must consider today is how to reconcile the military realities in Vietnam with the changing conditions of affairs in Asia and the world.

We have assigned to the military the task of waging a war in South Vietnam under real limitations. In the Korean war we talked of a sanctuary for the enemy. Today in Vietnam the adversary has not one sanctuary but three.

The war has brought tragedy to far too many Americans. Our Government must make a fresh assessment and determine without commitment to policies which have gone before, what course of action toward peace is now most likely to succeed.

As the President seeks these answers to difficult questions I believe it is incumbent on all of us to give him the unity, the time, and the encouragement he deserves.

TRADE: BEST HARDWARE IN THE ARSENAL OF OUR DEMOCRACY

(Mr. VANIK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the *RECORD* and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I have long deplored the failure of our country to fully utilize the nonmilitary tools which can lead to peace. Trade is the best hardware in the arsenal of our Democracy.

One of the most effective ways in which trade can further the cause of peace and stability is to encourage trade relations with the countries of Eastern Europe, whose economic independence is a source of strength which helps to stabilize these countries.

For these reasons, I am today introducing a bill which is cosponsored by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. REUSS) to provide for trade with Czechoslovakia on a

limited number of items to be negotiated between our two nations.

The countries of Eastern Europe look toward the West from the shadows of the East. It is my firm belief that trade initiatives would go far toward opening windows to the West which would otherwise remain sealed.

In this hour of crisis in Czechoslovakia, I feel that it is imperative for the Government of the United States to take some definite step to recognize the plea of the people of this beleaguered country for some sign of interest by America and the rest of the free world.

In a small way this bill will start our two nations upon the very long road toward a better and more fruitful relationship. The great traditions of independence and justice of the Czech and Slovak peoples require our support and friendship under every circumstance and especially at this time.

In January of this year President Johnson released a report—Future U.S. Foreign Trade Policy. This thoughtful analysis and set of guidelines for the future had been prepared by Ambassador William Roth, the President's Special Representative for Trade. It was the product of over a year's intensive efforts by the man who was in the center of U.S. trade and tariff work for over 5 years, but it was not just his own views and crystal gazing. It took into consideration extensive discussions and comments from a blue-ribbon panel of advisers from industry, commerce, banking, agriculture, and labor—people such as Fred Borch, David Rockefeller, Charles Shuman, and George Meany. It also reflected extensive public hearings by the administration and before committees of both Houses of the Congress.

The report contains a series of balanced and well-conceived recommendations, two of which are most important to my way of thinking. The first concerns our trade relations with the countries of Eastern Europe, the second concerns the steps which must be taken to assist our domestic firms, industries, and workers to adjust to increased worldwide competition.

In the field of relations with Eastern Europe, the report considers how to insure that U.S. companies and workers get a fair share of the growing markets of Eastern Europe, the conditions under which we can consider establishing trade channels, and how to balance all of this with our national security and international policy objectives. The adjustment proposals in Roth's report deal with how to make our adjustment assistance program for firms and groups of workers a true operating program and also contain a set of proposals for selective measures to deal quickly and effectively with import problems affecting entire industries or major portions of industries. Roth's report clearly recognizes that we have a responsibility both to cushion the adverse effect of sharp increases in imports and to find new ways to upgrade our economy and improve our skills and output.

The bill which I have today introduced deals with the first of these issues—the Czechoslovakian Trade Relations Act of 1969. The purposes of this bill are:

First. To use peaceful trade and related contacts with Czechoslovakia as a means of advancing the long-range interest of the United States in peace and freedom;

Second. To promote constructive relations with Czechoslovakia, to contribute to international stability, and to provide a framework helpful to private U.S. firms conducting business relations with state trading agencies in Czechoslovakia by instituting regular government-to-government negotiations concerning commercial and other matters of mutual interest; and

Third. To increase peaceful trade and related contacts between the United States and Czechoslovakia, and to expand markets for products of the United States in that country.

I recognize that a simple exchange of trade concessions between the United States and Czechoslovakia is nonsense. The organized state economy of Czechoslovakia makes meaningless our concepts of price and tariffs. With this in mind my bill proposes to give the President authority to work out constructive "deals" with Czechoslovakia in exchange for appropriate tariff concessions on our part. I do not propose that he give Czechoslovakia full most-favored-nation treatment on all products but rather MFN on individual products in exchange for meaningful concessions which will offer U.S. firms the chance to sell American goods in that country. These special deals can and have been worked out with other countries in the past. For example, when Poland joined the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade—GATT—a year or so ago, she gave very specific guarantees with regard to the volume of imported goods she would purchase every year.

I am convinced that the more contacts we have with this country the more opportunities we will have to influence its citizens in our favor. We will also, by freeing some of the trade pipelines, show that we side with them in their bitter fight to maintain their self respect and be free of outside domination.

My bill will not weaken in any way the existing precautions against exporting advanced U.S. technology or strategic items. It contains a specific provision that it in no way may be deemed to modify either the Export Control Act or the Battle Act. I also provide that any agreement that the President may enter into shall in no event be for more than 3 years, at which time it must be fully reviewed before it can be extended. I also provide that the President shall report annually to the Congress on all aspects of any commercial agreements program he may enter into.

RACE HATE

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GONZALEZ) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, there is no greater poison of mind and spirit than race hate. There is no greater evil among men than the irrational antipathy that is based in race and race alone. There is no greater injustice than to be labeled

"inferior" or "undeserving" or "sub-human" or "second class" solely on account of race or descent; and there is no greater evildoer than the spreader of race hate. My colleagues know well the number of times I have spoken out against those who would discover some nonexistent plot among minority groups, or those who automatically assume that Negroes, or Jews, or Indians, or Mexicans are somehow sinister influences. My colleagues know all too well the sorrows visited on this House and this Nation because of the messages of hate. It is because I oppose this irrational, this pervasive, this debasing hate that I have joined my colleagues against it, and for human decency.

All my political life I have asked only that I be judged for my qualifications, for my policies, for my proposals, not on what I am, or what my name may be. I ask for every man that he be given that same privilege. Throughout my career I have been attacked repeatedly by right-wing extremists because I stand for equality for all men before God, before man, and before the law. I have been called a Communist, my life has been threatened, I have been castigated as a "nigger lover," and I am certain, denounced as a "dirty meskin." I have been branded a Fabian Socialist, denounced as a hater, and denigrated as a wrecker of stability and destroyer of harmony. Yet, I do not regret it; the people of San Antonio and Bexar County have repeatedly demonstrated that they do not care what I am or what I am called, as long as I make an honest effort to be an honest Representative. My faith has been affirmed time and again in the basic decency and integrity of the vast and overwhelming majority of the people of this land. I have seen it proved all over the country that there is far more decency than indecency, far more tolerance than intolerance, and far more honor than dishonor. That has made it worthwhile; that has removed the sting from the barbs of haters both professional and amateur alike; and that has enabled me to say truthfully that the haters are a small and contemptible minority.

Ironically, I now find myself assaulted from the left as well as from the right. Yet I do not hesitate to say now, as before, that evil is evil, that it is just as wrong for a member of an ethnic minority to succumb to hate and fear as it is for any one else to do so. A racist is no good either to himself or to his fellow man, be he black, white, brown, red, or yellow. I believe in decency, and I denounce indecency; and I serve public notice that my policy will not change.

Mr. Speaker, I have watched with alarm as new Mexican-American militant groups have formed, not because they have formed, but because some of them no matter how worthy their ideals may be, have fallen into the spell and trap of reverse racism. These few are themselves becoming the purveyors of the hate they denounce; they are themselves the personification of the unspeakable evils they declaim against; and they are themselves the ultimate tragedy of racism. If there can be no moral justification for racial antipathy on one side,

neither can there be on the other; yet tragically these new racists seem utterly convinced of their moral rectitude.

I have heard and read and been shocked by violent denunciations of the so-called establishment and now of gringos and even of yankee imperialists. Whatever the title may be, the result is the same argument: the majority, the Anglo-Saxon American, is joined in a fantastic plot to subjugate and hold in poverty the Mexican-American citizen of this land. This new dogma is just as fantastic as the old cries about "Wall Street imperialists" of years back, and as xenophobic as the know-nothings of a century gone by. It is as evil as the deadly hatred of the Nazis, and as terrible in its implications as the rantings of demagogues warning against "mongrelization of the races" by white supremacists. I do not know, and defy anyone to find, any one race, any one ethnic group that is the personification and embodiment of evil; neither do I know of any that is the incarnation of good. Neither racism nor reverse racism is defensible.

I cannot stand silently by if an organization like the Mexican-American Youth Organization, or MAYO, as it is known, publishes hate sheets containing statements like:

The gringo took your grandfather's land, he took your father's job, and now he's sucking out your soul. There is no such thing as "mala suerte" (bad luck); there is only malos gringos (bad gringos).

MAYO styles itself the embodiment of good and the Anglo-American as the incarnation of evil. That is not merely ridiculous; it is drawing fire from the deepest wellsprings of hate. The San Antonio leader of MAYO, Jose Angel Gutierrez, may think himself something of a hero, but he is, in fact, only a benighted soul if he believes that in the espousal of hatred he will find love. He is simply deluded if he believes that the wearing of fatigues and a beard makes his followers revolutionaries, or that the genius of revolution is in slogans.

As for the so-called older radicals who lend their assent and even support of the orators of race and hate, they need not wonder why their integrity is questioned. They cannot claim the support of all men, or the right to just consideration, if they denounce some men irrationally; one cannot espouse evil and not expect the favor to be returned. One cannot fan the flames of emotion, or turn on the streams of bigotry one moment and expect them to disappear the next.

I cannot accept the argument that this is an evil country or that our system does not work, or that it is foolish to expect redress of a just grievance. It may be wrong to expect miracles, but it is also wrong to expect no progress at all. I have seen too much proof that there is a residue of good will in this country, that there is a determination for progress, and I have seen, taken part in, and been the beneficiary of too much progress to deny its existence, or to say that we are incapable of it. I cannot find evidence that there is any country in the world that matches the progress of this one. For all our inequity, for all our admitted failings, for all the urgent unmet needs,

this country is the living embodiment of a revolution that the so-called militants only play at. They may proclaim the romance of heroes dead and gone, but they do not know what the realities of those men were. The wearing of a Zapata moustache today does not mean that his "pan y tierra" ever came into being; and the bitter truth is that the true revolution is here, not somewhere else.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the time to despair, and it is not the time to give over to hate; it is still the time for faith. I believe that the majority of people in this land agree with me. I take my stand here, and against the kind of nihilism I now take the liberty of reading into the RECORD:

WORDS MAKE THE HACKLES RISE

The words are rough and tough. At times, history and facts are distorted to serve a purpose. Many of the words and phrases—in English and Spanish—are blistering hot, and the art work and slogans downright inflammatory.

The flag of Mexico, the bugle symbol of "no quarter," revolutionary symbols such as Emiliano Zapata, the clenched fist, and the upraised rifle seem chilling.

Words of hate lashing out at "blue eyed whitey" and the call of the chicano to battle the gringo makes the heart pump and the hackles rise.

These words, phrases, challenges, facts and distortions, are in the so-called "underground papers" circulating here, in the Southwest and in areas of heavy Mexican-American population.

Cheap printing, crude illustrations—but they pack a wallop.

The term Rep. Henry B. Gonzalez uses for these papers is "hate sheets."

In Washington this week, he said:

"It is incumbent on me to speak up about the hate sheets and literature that MAYO in Texas is putting out both in Del Rio and in San Antonio.

"These sheets reflect the language of Castro and incorporate language that is alien to our area of the country."

MAYO means Mexican-American Youth Organization. This group uses the term "Brown Power" and members like to costume themselves in brown berets, combat boots, serapes, rolled blankets slung over shoulder and chest in campaign style, moustaches and/or beards.

There are four of these papers in Texas: El Deguello, San Antonio; Hoy, published in the Valley; El Azteca, Kingsville; and La Revolucion, Uvalde. All are MAYO publications.

An editorial box in Hoy says it is published by the South Texas MAYO, of which Pan American College (Edinburg) is a member, and is dedicated to unity of the Mexican-American and the downfall of all forces that exploit them.

The local publication, El Deguello, takes its title from an ancient bugle battle call signifying no quarter, battle to the death. Reputedly, Gen. Santa Anna ordered this bugle call sounded as the Battle of the Alamo began.

Copies of all four of these publications made the rounds at the Del Rio demonstration Palm Sunday, an event in which Mayo played a prominent role.

Other similar type publications in Texas are La Justicia Mayorista which carries a "San Felipe del Rio" dateline, presumably meaning Del Rio; El Malcriado, McAllen; El Yaqui of Houston and El Compass of Houston.

Over the West are published La Raza of Los Angeles, El Gallo, Denver; Carta Editorial, Los Angeles; El Papel, Albuquerque; El

Paisano, Tolleson, Ariz.; Inside-Eastside, Los Angeles; and Bronze, San Jose, Calif.

Outside the Southwest there are Lado, published in Chicago, and La Voz Mexicana, Wautoma, Wis.

While the objective is unity for Mexican-Americans to gain economic, education and fair treatment goals, the language of the papers is bellicose.

Polarization is seen in some of the statements, such as "Realization by all Chicanos that we cannot fit into the Gringo society and that we must not try."

As El Deguello of San Antonio declares in its February 1969 issue under the heading "Arriba Raza!":

"You may like it or hate it, but we can not remain silent any longer. There are things that must be said, problems that must be faced, a community that must be changed. There are goals, therefore, set up for this paper, and they are:

"An end to white supremacy and the City Council must be used as an example.

"An end to economic exploitation of the minority groups and unequal distribution of the economy.

"Realization by all Chicanos that we cannot fit into the Gringo society and that we must not try.

"Exposure of all those individuals who oppose La Raza.

"A lot less asking and a lot more demanding."

In a lead editorial, the paper explains it is named for the bugle call ordered by Santa Anna and declares:

"Just as that bugle rang out that quiet morning, so, too, must it ring in every Chicano's ears. As Chicanos we have given the gringo pleas, requests, and even demands. The gringo still refuses to hear our voices just like Travis did. Obviously gringos didn't learn much in 120 years.

"So El Deguello must again shout out its war cry to all Chicanos that we must rise up against the gringo again. He has had his last chance."

The term "chicano" probably originated as a regionalism on the border. It refers to a person of Mexican descent, but a citizen or resident on the northern side of the Rio Grande.

In another article "Dead End for Students," the implication is that, regardless of schooling, Mexican-Americans have no future. Then it points out "there's a movement afoot going on whether you like it or not. All over the Southwest in the United States, people like you are realizing that they can change this problem.

"I'm talking about the Gringo, I'm talking about blue-eyed whitey, with a hotter car, a better education, and a better job. I'm talking about what was taken from you and your grandfather.

"The Gringo took your grandfather's land, he took your father's job, and now he's sucking out your soul. There is no such thing as 'mala suerte' (bad luck); there is only 'malos gringos' (bad gringos). He's keeping us in slavery now through our jobs, through the lousy education you're getting at school, through everything that affects us."

Then the article hurls the challenge: "Only those Chicanos with guts will be the ones that get in the movement, and if you're not man enough to take what's yours by right, then you don't have any business even being alive.

"If you don't want the same opportunity, the same education, the same respect, then you're not for the movement. If all you think about is your small little high school world, then you're not for the movement.

"If all you want is money out of this life, then just paint yourself white and change your name—cause you're not Chicano. Go back to sleep or better yet, go crawl in a hole and die."

Tone of articles in El Deguello is parallel with statements made in public Sunday in

Del Rio by Jose Angel Gutierrez, San Antonio MAYO leader. They are similar to other utterances in public by MAYO members.

Among his declarations were "we have been oppressed for too long and we will tangle with the gringo anywhere he wants to."

It was Gonzalez' hand that helped post the "Del Rio Manifesto" on the Val Verde County Courthouse door, and it was the red and black MAYO flag that was hoisted to the top of the courthouse flagpole.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. PUCINSKI, for 30 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama (at the request of Mr. MILLER of Ohio), for 15 minutes, today; to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.

Mr. GONZALEZ, for 15 minutes, today.
Mr. CULVER, for 10 minutes, today.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks was granted to:

Mr. MADDEN.

Mr. VANIK in two instances.

Mr. MADDEN to revise and extend his remarks during Mr. PUCINSKI's special order.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MILLER of Ohio) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. RUMSFELD in two instances.

Mr. BROOMFIELD.

Mr. CLEVELAND in three instances.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio in two instances.

Mr. TALCOTT.

Mrs. REID of Illinois.

Mr. ASHBROOK in two instances.

Mr. WYMAN in three instances.

Mr. MATHIAS.

Mr. LIPSCOMB.

Mr. LANDGREBE.

Mr. NELSEN.

Mr. BUCHANAN in five instances.

Mr. HARVEY.

Mr. SCHWENDEL in two instances.

Mr. WIDNALL.

Mr. DELLENBACH in two instances.

Mr. RIEGLE.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. CAFFERY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. OTTINGER.

Mr. EDWARDS of California.

Mr. LONG of Maryland in four instances.

Mr. STEPHENS in two instances.

Mr. FARBSTAIN in two instances.

Mr. YOUNG in four instances.

Mr. EILBERG.

Mr. MARSH in two instances.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas in six instances.

Mr. FOUNTAIN in two instances.

Mr. PREYER of North Carolina in two instances.

Mr. O'HARA in two instances.

Mr. VANIK.

Mr. TIERNAN.

Mr. DIGGS in two instances.
 Mr. DELANEY.
 Mr. FUQUA in two instances.
 Mr. FRASER in four instances.
 Mr. GONZALEZ in three instances.
 Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey in two instances.
 Mr. ROSENTHAL in five instances.
 Mr. PICKLE in six instances.
 Mr. FULTON of Tennessee in two instances.
 Mr. DORN in two instances.
 Mr. BLATNIK in two instances.
 Mr. OLSEN in three instances.
 Mr. RYAN in two instances.
 Mr. MIKVA in two instances.
 Mr. PUCINSKI in six instances.
 Mr. LEGGETT.

ADJOURNMENT BY RESOLUTION TO A FUTURE DATE

Mr. CAFFERY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. In accordance with House Concurrent Resolution 191, the Chair declares the House adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on April 14 next.

Thereupon (at 1 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), pursuant to House Concurrent Resolution 191, the House adjourned until Monday, April 14, 1969, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

647. A letter from the Secretary of the Air Force, transmitting a report on Air Force military construction contracts awarded by the Department without formal advertisement, for the period July 1-December 31, 1968, pursuant to the provisions of section 804 of Public Law 90-110; to the Committee on Armed Services.

648. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize appropriations for the fiscal years 1970 and 1971 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, and to amend the definition of "motor vehicle equipment" in the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

649. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a report pursuant to the provisions of section 3 of Public Law 89-175; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

650. A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, U.S. Department of Justice, transmitting reports concerning visa petitions approved according certain beneficiaries third- and sixth-preference classification, pursuant to the provisions of section 204(d) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS:

H.R. 9911. A bill to amend the act, entitled "An Act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon the railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon", approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BATES (for himself and Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts):

H.R. 9912. A bill to provide for the orderly marketing of articles imported into the United States, to establish a flexible basis for the adjustment by the U.S. economy to expanded trade, and to afford supplying nations a fair share of the growth or change in the U.S. market; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BLATNIK:

H.R. 9913. A bill to create a Department of Youth Affairs; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BLATNIK (for himself, Mr. REUSS, and Mr. ROSENTHAL):

H.R. 9914. A bill to establish a Commission to study the organization, operation, and management of the executive branch of the Government and to recommend changes necessary or desirable in the interest of governmental efficiency and economy; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 9915. A bill to improve intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities, and the economy and efficiency of all levels of government, by providing Federal block grants for State and localities which take steps to modernize State and local government; to the Committee on Government Operations.

H.R. 9916. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROYHILL of North Carolina:

H.R. 9917. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to allow a credit against income tax for a portion of amounts paid for certain educational expenses incurred at an institution of higher learning or vocational training; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.R. 9918. A bill to temporarily suspend the recent increases in fees for grazing of livestock on public lands; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

H.R. 9919. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CORBETT:

H.R. 9920. A bill to improve the safety conditions of persons working in the coal mining industry of the United States; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

H.R. 9921. A bill to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of compensation of wage board employees; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H.R. 9922. A bill to amend section 252 of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to provide that the President shall impose reciprocal import restrictions whenever such action is necessary or appropriate to obtain the removal of foreign nonduty trade restrictions which are substantially curtailing U.S. exports; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DOWDY:

H.R. 9923. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the mailing of obscene matter to minors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ECKHARDT:

H.R. 9924. A bill to extend Federal group life and health insurance benefits to Federal employees in the Canal Zone who are not citizens of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. EDWARDS of Alabama:

H.R. 9925. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the sale of mailing

lists used to disseminate through the mails materials harmful to persons under the age of 19 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.R. 9926. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, section 753(e), to eliminate the maximum and minimum limitations upon the annual salary of reporters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9927. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FINDLEY:

H.R. 9928. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 9929. A bill to amend the act, entitled "An Act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service of employees thereon", approved March 4, 1907; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 9930. A bill to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, relating to enrollment charges for Federal employees' health benefits; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9931. A bill to provide for improved employee-management relations in the postal service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9932. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide an established workweek, a new system of overtime compensation for postal field service employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FRASER (for himself, Mr. LONG of Maryland, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. KARTH, Mr. REES, Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. EVANS of Colorado, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. NEDZI, and Mr. LOWENSTEIN):

H.R. 9933. A bill to provide equitable treatment to purchasers of U.S. savings bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 9934. A bill to amend the Federal Hazardous Substances Act to protect children from toys or other articles intended for use by children which present any electrical, mechanical, or thermal hazard; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FUQUA:

H.R. 9935. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1966 to clarify the exemption accorded mechanics in certain non-manufacturing establishments; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GALIFIANAKIS:

H.R. 9936. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the percentage standard deduction from 10 to 15 percent, and to increase the ceiling on such deduction to \$3,000; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 9937. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit the payment of benefits to a married couple on their combined earnings record where that method of computation produces a higher combined benefit; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HALEY:

H.R. 9938. A bill to amend section 521 of title 38, United States Code, to exclude from consideration as income, for the purpose of determining eligibility for pension, all payments of any kind or from any source, including salary, retirement, or annuity payments, endowments or similar income, which a veteran receives or is entitled to receive

after attaining age 72; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.R. 9939. A bill to amend title 39, United States Code, to provide additional free letter mail and air transportation mailing privileges for certain members of the U.S. Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Services.

H.R. 9940. A bill to amend section 320 of title 23 of the United States Code to increase the authorization for that section, and to earmark such increase for a bridge across Markland Dam on the Ohio River; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOGAN (for himself, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. MONTGOMERY, Mr. O'KONSKI, Mr. PRICE of Texas, and Mr. WIGGINS):

H.R. 9941. A bill to designate the stadium constructed in the District of Columbia under authority of the District of Columbia Stadium Act of 1957 as the "Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Stadium"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 9942. A bill to provide for the enforcement of support orders in certain State and Federal courts, and to make it a crime to move or travel in interstate and foreign commerce to avoid compliance with such orders; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JONES of North Carolina:

H.R. 9943. A bill to authorize funds to carry out the purposes of title V of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. LOWENSTEIN:

H.R. 9944. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make additional immigrant visas available for immigrants from certain foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCLURE:

H.R. 9945. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 to increase the lowest induction age to age 21; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. McMILLAN:

H.R. 9946. A bill to authorize and direct the Secretary of Agriculture to quitclaim retained rights in certain tracts of land to the Board of Education of Lee County, S.C.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MARSH:

H.R. 9947. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to limit the categories of questions required to be answered under penalty of law in the decennial censuses of population, unemployment, and housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MATHIAS:

H.R. 9948. A bill to enable honey producers to finance a nationally coordinated research and promotion program to improve their competitive position and expand their markets for honey; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H.R. 9949. A bill to establish the Inter-agency Committee on Mexican-American Affairs and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. MAY:

H.R. 9950. A bill to strengthen voluntary agricultural organizations, to provide for the orderly marketing of agricultural products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MILLS (for himself and Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin):

H.R. 9951. A bill to provide for the collection of the Federal unemployment tax in quarterly installments during each taxable year, to make status of employer depend on employment during preceding as well as current taxable year, to exclude from the computation of the excess the balance in the em-

ployment security administration account as of the close of fiscal years 1970 through 1972, to raise the limitation on the amount authorized to be made available for expenditure out of the employment security administration account by the amounts so excluded, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 9952. A bill to amend the public assistance provisions of the Social Security Act to require the establishment of nationally uniform minimum standards and eligibility requirements for aid or assistance thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NELSEN:

H.R. 9953. A bill relating to the tariff treatment of poultry laying cages; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HARA (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. BRADEMAS, Mr. HAWKINS, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. BURTON of California, Mr. GAYDOS, Mr. STOKES, Mr. CLAY, Mr. POWELL, Mr. REID of New York, Mr. PELLY, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. WHALEN, Mr. MOSS, Mr. ASHLEY, Mr. DIGGS, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. FARRSTEIN, Mr. COHELAN, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DULSKI, and Mr. HALPERN):

H.R. 9954. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, to amend the definition of "employee" to include certain agricultural employees, and to permit certain provisions in agreements between agricultural employers and employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'HARA (for himself, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. KARTH, Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. GILBERT, Mr. JOELSON, Mr. NEDZI, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. FRASER, Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania, Mr. LEGGETT, Mr. ROYBAL, Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HOWARD, Mr. JACOBS, Mr. MCCARTHY, Mr. REES, Mr. WOLFF, and Mr. ECKHARDT):

H.R. 9955. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, to amend the definition of "employee" to include certain agricultural employees, and to permit certain provisions in agreements between agricultural employers and employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'HARA (for himself, Mr. RYAN, Mr. ANDERSON of California, Mr. BIAGGI, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. KOCH, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and Mr. PODELL):

H.R. 9956. A bill to amend the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, to amend the definition of "employee" to include certain agricultural employees, and to permit certain provisions in agreements between agricultural employers and employees; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9957. A bill to incorporate College Benefit System of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts:

H.R. 9958. A bill to amend section 702 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. PEPPER:

H.R. 9959. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to permit a taxpayer who rents his home or apartment to deduct all or part of his rent payments; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PODELL:

H.R. 9960. A bill to provide for the compensation of persons injured by certain criminal acts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. POLLOCK:

H.R. 9961. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act so as to liberalize the conditions governing eligibility of blind persons to receive disability insurance benefits thereunder; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 9962. A bill to amend section 214(b) of the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that certain aliens who apply for a visa to visit the United States temporarily for pleasure or temporarily for business shall not be denied nonimmigrant visitor status by any consular officer or immigration officer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9963. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit the sale of mailing lists used to disseminate through the mails materials harmful to persons under the age of 19 years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9964. A bill, Veterans' Fair Treatment Amendments of 1969; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RONAN:

H.R. 9965. A bill to provide for the redistribution of unused quota numbers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9966. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUPPE:

H.R. 9967. A bill to amend chapter 83, title 5, United States Code, to eliminate the reduction in the annuities of employees or Members who elected reduced annuities in order to provide a survivor annuity if predeceased by the person named as survivor and permit a retired employee or Member to designate a new spouse as survivor if predeceased by the person named as survivor at the time of retirement; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. SISK:

H.R. 9968. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to include a definition of food supplements, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. OLSEN:

H.R. 9969. A bill to reclassify certain positions in the postal field service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H.R. 9970. A bill to amend the Flood Control Act of 1950 relating to the Libby Dam, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.R. 9971. A bill to adjust agricultural production, to provide a transitional program for farmers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STRATTON:

H.R. 9972. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to establish Federal standards on thermal pollution of water which will apply to all federally licensed activities; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. TAFT (for himself, Mr. CONABLE, Mr. HALPERN, and Mr. LUJAN):

H.R. 9973. A bill to provide appropriations for sharing of Federal revenues with States and certain cities and urban counties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIERNAN:

H.R. 9974. A bill to amend part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to include drugs prescribed for diabetes, or for chronic cardiovascular, respiratory, or kidney disease, among the medical expenses with respect to which payment may be made under the program of supplementary medical insurance benefits for the aged; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANIK (for himself, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. BINGHAM, Mr. DADDARIO, Mr.

HAWKINS, Mr. MACDONALD of Massachusetts, Mr. MIKVA, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. MURPHY of Illinois, Mr. O'HARA, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. ROBISON, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ST. ONGE, and Mr. YATRON):

H.R. 9975. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that percentage depletion shall not be allowed in the case of mines, wells, and other natural deposits located in foreign territory; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANIK (for himself and Mr. REUSS):

H.R. 9976. A bill to promote the foreign policy and security of the United States by providing authority to negotiate a commercial agreement with Czechoslovakia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATRON:

H.R. 9977. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that a portion of the retirement benefits of a public employee shall not be subject to the income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 9978. A bill making an appropriation to the Office of Education to carry out the Bilingual Education Act for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1970; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BINGHAM:

H.J. Res. 629. Joint resolution to establish the Commission on the Future Political Status of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (Micronesia); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BURTON of Utah:

H.J. Res. 630. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EDWARDS of California:

H.J. Res. 631. Joint resolution in honor of Joseph B. Ridder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Pennsylvania:

H.J. Res. 632. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDADE:

H.J. Res. 633. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RHODES:

H.J. Res. 634. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAFFORD:

H.J. Res. 635. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YATRON:

H.J. Res. 636. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ADAMS:

H. Con. Res. 197. Concurrent resolution, it is the sense of Congress that the United States should begin to reduce its military involvement in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Tennessee:

H. Con. Res. 198. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the United States should begin to reduce its military involvement in Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 359. Resolution relative to the hijacking of U.S. aircraft; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

101. By Mr. OLSEN: Joint resolution of the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Montana, asking that Congress enact legislation permitting 25 percent of the gross sales of national forest products to be deposited in the funds of the county where the products are grown to replace the tax loss to the counties wherein these public lands are located; to the Committee on Agriculture.

102. By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, relative to Federal funding of public welfare expenditures; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

103. Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, relative to changing the name of the Glen Canyon Dam to the Dwight D. Eisenhower Dam; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALEXANDER:

H.R. 9979. A bill for the relief of Choi Sung Joo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BELL of California:

H.R. 9980. A bill for the relief of Mario Pineda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE of Florida:

H.R. 9981. A bill for the relief of Dr. Antonio Racca Pizarro; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin:

H.R. 9982. A bill for the relief of Doo Ok Kwang and Nam Soon Suh; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAREY:

H.R. 9983. A bill for the relief of Rabbi, Haim Moshe Groman and his wife, Berayne Groman, and their children, Nachman David Groman, Israel Groman, Abraham Groman, and Nechama Groman; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9984. A bill for the relief of Domenico Marrone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HANNA:

H.R. 9985. A bill for the relief of Kim Dang Heng; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELSTOSKI:

H.R. 9986. A bill for the relief of Orlando I. Agnir; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9987. A bill for the relief of Girolamo Biondo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9988. A bill for the relief of Francisco Cacciola; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9989. A bill for the relief of Pietro DeSantis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9990. A bill for the relief of Antonio Inzillo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9991. A bill for the relief of Michala Liotta; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9992. A bill for the relief of Romolo Marsiglia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 9993. A bill for the relief of Antonio Vitale; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LOWENSTEIN:

H.R. 9994. A bill for the relief of Josephine Palazzolo and Michele Palazzolo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROSENTHAL:

H.R. 9995. A bill for the relief of Philip Antoun Morcos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE—Thursday, April 3, 1969

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, wilt Thou hallow the memories of this holy week. Make us mindful of our fallen leaders, of their service and sacrifice. But especially keep us mindful of the One who went by way of the cross, who taught us that "without the shedding of blood there is no remission of sins," and that "whoever would be greatest among you, must be the servant of all."

O Thou who on a night long ago didst wash the feet of Thy disciples, wash from us the stains of our sin, that we may not fall Thee in the hour of danger, but follow Thee in true faith unto life eternal.

In all the worship and praise of the coming days make us to know where

salvation is to be found for all men and nations. Give journeying mercies to all who travel, and return Thy servants to this place renewed in soul and mind, the better to serve Thee and this Republic. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, April 1, 1969, be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 1437. An act for the relief of Cosmina Ruggiero;

H.R. 1708. An act for the relief of Ai Bok Chun;

H.R. 1721. An act for the relief of William J. Hurley;

H.R. 1939. An act for the relief of Mrs. Marjorie J. Hottenroth;

H.R. 1960. An act for the relief of Mario Santos Gomes;

H.R. 2275. An act for the relief of John Thomas Cosby, Jr.;

H.R. 2315. An act for the relief of Josefina Policar Abutan Fullar;

H.R. 2335. An act for the relief of Enrico DeMonte;

H.R. 2876. An act for the relief of Beasley Engineering Co., Inc.;

H.R. 2948. An act for the relief of Maria Prescilla Caramanzana;

H.R. 3144. An act for the relief of Sung Nan Lee;

H.R. 3212. An act for the relief of Lee Ok Ja.;

H.R. 3379. An act for the relief of Sgt. 1c. Patrick Marratto, U.S. Army, retired;

H.R. 3464. An act for the relief of Maria Balluardo Frasca;