United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 91st CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE—*Monday, August 10, 1970*

The Senate met at 10:30 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, a Senator from the State of Florida.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, in whom we live and move and have our being, turn our minds inward that we may be aware of the mysterious resources with which Thou hast endowed us. Turn our minds outward that we may behold the world's need. Turn our minds upward to behold Thy majesty, glory, and power which is sufficient for all mankind.

May we be captive this day to the Master of life—

"In hope that sends a shining ray
Far down the future's broadening way;
In peace that only Thou canst give,
With Thee, O Master, let me live."

In His name we pray. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore of the Senate (Mr. RUSSELL).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., August 10, 1970.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, a Senator from the State of Florida, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

Mr. HOLLAND thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, August 7, 1970, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG) there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, with a time limitation of 3 minutes on statements made therein.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAIVER OF CALL OF CALENDAR UNDER RULE VIII

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to waive the call of the calendar for unobjected-to bills under rule VIII.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider executive business.

OFFICE OF EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the first nomination on the Executive Calendar.

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Darrell M. Trent, of Kansas, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination will be considered; and, without objection, it is confirmed.

U.S. AIR FORCE

The assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Brig. Gen. Roy M. Terry—colonel, Regular Air Force, chaplain—U.S. Air Force, to be a major general.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

U.S. ARMY

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Army.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations be considered en bloc.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. NAVY

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Navy.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I make the same request for those nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

U.S. MARINE CORPS

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the U.S. Marine Corps.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I make the same request for those nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations are considered and confirmed en bloc.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to legislative session.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, with the concurrence of the distinguished Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES), I would like to call up Calendar No. 1077, S. 3835, but before that, with his approval, I would like to make a brief statement.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my statement Calendar No. 1077, S. 3835, be laid before the Senate as the pending business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

NONAGGRESSION PACT BETWEEN THE SOVIET UNION AND WEST GERMANY

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, last week, the Soviet Union and West Germany initiated a nonaggression pact. The agreement still awaits formal signature and ratification by both nations.

Nevertheless, the initialing of the pact is in itself an event of great importance. That such is the case is indicated by the comments of both the West German Foreign Minister Walter Scheel and his Soviet counterpart, Andrei Gromyko, when, after 12 days of negotiations, they concluded the agreement.

According to press reports, the pact encompasses the usual provisions for renunciation of force in settling disputes. It goes beyond, however, to include a mutual pledge to accept Europe's current national borders and to work for an improvement in East-West European relations. The pact leaves open the door to eventual German reunification. Finally, it offers assurance that the rights of the Western Allies of World War II in the Berlin situation will not be impaired.

This agreement seems to me to operate in concert with two decades of Presidential pronouncements regarding this Nation's policies. It is a landmark in the detente which has been in progress for many years in Europe, between East and West. It appears to be a link in the evolution of European relations toward an all-European approach to a stable peace. These relations have emerged from the fear and hostility of the immediate post-World-War-II years via the routes of commerce, travel, and cultural interchange between East and West. Now, the initiating of this agreement may well point toward a full European diplomatic reconciliation.

In that sense, the German-Soviet pact underscores what so many in the Senate have been urging for so long. It is urgent that this Nation readjust its policies to the changing realities in Europe, and notably as they involve a massive and costly U.S. troop deployment in Western Europe. In great measure this expenditure has been more than a needless drain on our dwindling resources. In the rigidity with which it has been maintained, the deployment has acted to reduce the relevance of U.S. policy to the flow of events in Europe.

The $14 billion annual drain on U.S. resources is made even more anachronistic by the latest development in West Germany-Soviet relations. It would be my hope that the executive branch will now be moved to act promptly to begin an orderly and a planned reduction of the over 500,000 U.S. forces and dependents in Western Europe, to the end that this excessive and wasteful expenditure of resources may be made to serve more useful purposes, defense and nondefense.

I cannot stress too much the Senate's interest in this matter. It is not unrelated to the military authorizations and appropriations which are now moving through the Congress. May I say that if the President takes an Executive initiative which would act to redirect the usage of some of this needlessly excessive expenditure in Europe, he can count on the full cooperation of the Senate in bringing about the adjustment.

I thank the distinguished Senator for yielding.

COMPREHENSIVE ALCOHOL ABUSE AND ALCOHOLISM PREVENTION, TREATMENT, AND REHABILITATION ACT OF 1970

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, S. 3835 will be stated by title and will become the pending business.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows: Calendar No. 1077 (S. 3835) a bill to provide a comprehensive Federal program for the prevention and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SHORT TITLE

This Act may be cited as the "Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970".

TITLE I—FINDINGS AND DECLARATION OF PURPOSES

SEC. 101. The Congress hereby finds that—

(a) Alcohol abuse and alcoholism are increasing throughout the country. Alcohol abuse can seriously impair health and can lead to alcoholism. Alcoholism is an illness or disease that requires treatment through health rehabilitation services.

(b) Alcoholism treatment and control programs should, whenever possible, be community based; provide a comprehensive range of services, including emergency treatment, under proper medical auspices on a coordinated basis; and be integrated with and involve the active participation of a wide range of public and nongovernmental agencies.

(c) Existing laws and their implementation have not been adequate to prevent alcohol abuse or to provide sufficient education, treatment, and rehabilitation of alcoholics. Increasing education, treatment, and rehabilitation services, and closer coordination of efforts, offer the best possibility of reducing alcohol abuse and alcoholism. A major commitment of health and social resources and Government funds is required to institute an adequate and effective Federal program for the prevention and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism.

(d) Present Federal programs for alcohol abuse and alcoholism are relegated to a low level of priority and remain uncoordinated within the Government. Therefore, existing Federal research, social, health, and rehabilitation laws have not adequately been used to attack alcohol abuse and alcoholism. This has contributed to the failure of public and private State and local agencies, institutions, and organizations to recognize their responsibilities for meeting these problems.

(e) Federal officials have failed to effectively handle alcoholism among those for whom the Government has special responsibility—civilian employees, military personnel, veterans, Federal offenders, American Indians, and Alaskan Natives.

(f) The criminal law is not an appropriate device for preventing or controlling health problems. Therefore dealing with persons who are guilty of no more than public intoxication as criminals is improper, essentially unproductive, and wasteful. The recognition of this fact and the concurrent establishment of modern public health programs for the medical management of alcohol abuse and alcoholism will facilitate (1) early detection and prevention of alcoholism and effective treatment and rehabilitation of alcoholics, and (2) early diagnosis and treatment of other concurrent diseases.

(g) Handling alcohol abusers and alcoholics primarily through health and other rehabilitative programs relieves the police, courts, correctional institutions and other law enforcement agencies of a burden that interferes with their ability to protect citizens, apprehend law violators, and maintain safe and orderly streets.

SEC. 102. The Congress declares that—

(a) There shall be established and maintained in the Public Health Service, a National Institute for the Prevention and Treatment of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, through which the Secretary shall coordinate all Federal health, rehabilitation, and other social programs related to the prevention and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism and administer the programs and authorities established by this Act.

(b) Major Federal action and Federal assistance to State and local programs shall be undertaken to engage in and encourage planning, coordination, statistics, research, training and education with respect to alcohol abuse and alcoholism, and to provide equal access to humane care, effective treatment, and rehabilitation for all alcoholics regardless of their circumstances.

(c) In addition to the provisions of this Act, other Federal legislation providing for Federal or federally assisted research, prevention, treatment, or rehabilitation programs in the fields of health, education, welfare, rehabilitation, and highway safety shall be utilized to reduce alcohol abuse and alcoholism.

TITLE II—DEFINITONS

SEC. 201. For the purposes of this Act—

(a) "Alcohol abuse" means any use of any alcoholic beverage that results in intoxication which endangers persons or property.

(b) "Alcoholic" means any person whose repetitive use of alcohol causes him physical, psychological, or social harm.

(c) "Alcoholic beverage" includes alcoholic spirits, liquors, wines, beer, and every liquid or fluid, patented or not, containing alcoholic spirits, wine or beer which is capable of being consumed by human beings and produces intoxication in any form or in any degree.

(d) "Alcoholism" means any condition characterized by the repetitive use of alcohol to an extent that causes the drinker physical, psychological, or social harm.

(e) "Courts" includes all Federal courts, including any United States magistrate.

(f) "Department" means the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(g) "Emergency medical services" includes all appropriate short-term services for the acute effects of alcohol intoxication which (1) are available twenty-four hours a day, (2) are community based and located so as to be quickly and easily accessible to patients, (3) are affiliated with, and constitute an integral (but not necessarily physical) part of, the general medical services of a general hospital, and (4) provide detoxification and other appropriate medical care and treatment, professional examination, evaluation, diagnosis and classification with respect to possible alcoholism, and referral for other treatment and rehabilitation.

(h) "Inpatient services" includes all treatment and rehabilitation services for alcohol abuse and alcoholism provided for a resident patient while he spends full time in a treatment institution, which is, preferably, community based and located so as to be quickly and easily accessible to patients.

(i) "Institute" means the National Institute for the Prevention and Treatment of

Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism in the Public Health Service.

(j) "Intermediate care services" includes all treatment and rehabilitation services for alcohol abuse and alcoholism for a resident patient while he spends part time in a treatment institution (including but not limited to a halfway house, hostel, or foster home) which is community based and located so as to be quickly and easily accessible to patients.

(k) "Outpatient services" includes all treatment and rehabilitation services (including but not limited to clinics, social centers, vocational rehabilitation services, welfare services, and job referral services) for alcohol abuse and alcoholism provided while the patient is not a resident of a treatment institution, which are community based and located so as to be quickly and easily accessible to patients.

(l) "Prevention and treatment" includes all appropriate forms of educational programs and services (including but not limited to radio, television, films, books, pamphlets, lectures, seminars, workshops, conferences, adult education, and school courses); planning, coordinating, statistical, research, training, evaluation, reporting, classification, and other administrative, scientific, or technical programs or services; and screening, diagnosis, treatment (emergency medical services, inpatient services, intermediate care services, and outpatient services), vocational rehabilitation, job training and referral, and other rehabilitation programs or services.

(m) "Secretary" means the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

(n) "State" includes the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, in addition to the fifty States.

TITLE III—NATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR THE PREVENTION AND TREATMENT OF ALCOHOL ABUSE AND ALCOHOLISM

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE INSTITUTE

SEC. 301. (a) There is hereby established in the Public Health Service, a National Institute for the Prevention and Treatment of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism to administer the programs and authorities assigned to the Secretary by this Act. The Secretary, acting through the Institute, shall develop and conduct a comprehensive health, education, research, and rehabilitation program for the prevention and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism.

(b) The Institute shall be under the direction of a Director who shall be appointed by the Secretary.

(c) The Institute and its programs and services shall be staffed with an adequate number of personnel, who shall possess appropriate qualifications and competence, and some of whom may be recovered alcoholics. Prior alcohol related criminal arrests or convictions shall not be a bar to such employment.

ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS OF THE SECRETARY

SEC. 302. It shall be the duty of the Secretary, acting through the Institute, with respect to his administrative functions to—

(a) assist Federal departments and agencies in the development and maintenance of appropriate prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation programs and services in accordance with section 304(a) of this Act;

(b) review and provide in writing an evaluation of the adequacy and appropriateness of any provisions relating to the prevention and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism of all comprehensive State health, welfare, and rehabilitation plans submitted to the Federal Government pursuant to Federal law, including but not limited to those submitted pursuant to section 5(a) of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, section 501 of this Act, section 604 of the Public Health Service Act, Section 1902(a) of title XIX of the Social Security Act, and section 204 of part A of the Community Mental Health Centers Act;

(c) administer the grants and contracts authorized under title V of this Act; and

(d) provide assistance to any other service or program, or take any other action, consistent with the intent and objectives of this Act.

PLANNING FUNCTIONS OF THE SECRETARY

SEC. 303. It shall be the duty of the Secretary, acting through the Institute, with respect to his planning function to—

(a) develop a detailed and comprehensive Federal alcohol abuse and alcoholism prevention and treatment plan to implement the objectives and policies of this Act. The plan shall be submitted to Congress as soon as practicable, but not later than one year after the enactment date of this Act. Other responsibilities of the Secretary, as set out in this Act, shall not be interrupted or delayed pending the initial development of such a plan. The plan shall be reviewed annually and submitted to Congress with any appropriate revisions as part of the Secretary's annual report. The Secretary shall, in developing the comprehensive Federal plan, consult and collaborate with all appropriate public and private departments, agencies, institutions, organizations, and individuals. The plan shall specify how all available health, welfare, educational, and rehabilitation resources, and how funds, programs, services, and facilities authorized under existing Federal legislation, should be utilized;

(b) carry out a complete evaluation of existing and ongoing alcohol education materials and programs, and alcohol abuse and alcoholism prevention compaigns;

(c) develop models of alcoholism prevention and treatment legislation for State and local governments, which utilize the concepts incorporated in this Act;

(d) develop model alcohol abuse and alcoholism prevention and treatment plans for State and local governments, utilizing the concepts incorporated in the comprehensive Federal plan. The model plans shall be reviewed on a periodic basis and revised to keep them current. They shall specify how all types of community resources and existing Federal legislation may be utilized;

(e) provide assistance and consultation to State and local governments and private organizations, agencies, institutions, and individuals with respect to the prevention and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism; and

(f) encourage and promote, throughout the country, public health procedures for the treatment of alcoholics as alternatives to present criminal procedures.

COORDINATION FUNCTIONS OF THE SECRETARY

SEC. 304. It shall be the duty of the Secretary, acting through the Institute, with respect to his coordinating functions to—

(a) upon request, assist the Civil Service Commission, the Department of Defense, the Veterans' Administration, and other Federal departments and agencies in the development and maintenance of appropriate prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation programs and services for alcohol abuse and alcoholism pursuant to title IV of this Act;

(b) serve in a consulting capacity to all Federal courts, departments, and agencies, and be responsible for assisting in the development and coordination of a full range of programs, facilities, and services available to them for education, diagnosis, planning, counseling, treatment, and rehabilitation with respect to the alcohol abuse and alcoholism problems they encounter;

(c) coordinate all Federal social, health, rehabilitation, and other efforts to deal with alcohol abuse and alcoholism;

(d) encourage and assist State and local government programs and services, and programs and services of public and private agencies, institutions, and organizations for the prevention and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism;

(e) stimulate more effective use of existing resources and available services for the prevention and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism;

(f) cooperate with the National Advisory Council on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism the Civil Service Commission, and other appropriate Federal departments and agencies to develop a policy consistent with this Act with regard to Federal civilian employees who are alcohol abusers or alcoholics, involving appropriate programs and services for the prevention and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism among such employees; and

(g) assist State and local governments in coordinating programs among themselves for the prevention and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism.

STATISTICAL FUNCTIONS OF THE SECRETARY

SEC. 305. It shall be the duty of the Secretary, acting through the Institute with respect to his statistical functions to—

(a) gather and publish statistics pertaining to alcohol abuse and alcoholism;

(b) promulgate regulations specifying uniform statistics to be obtained, records to be maintained, and reports to be submitted on a voluntary basis by public and private departments, agencies, organizations, practitioners, and other persons with respect to alcohol abuse and alcoholism. Such statistics and reports shall not reveal the identity of any patient or alcoholic or other confidential information.

RESEARCH FUNCTIONS OF THE SECRETARY

SEC. 306. It shall be the duty of the Secretary, acting through the Institute with respect to his research functions to—

(a) conduct and encourage all forms of research, investigations, experiments, and studies relating to the cause, epidemiology, sociological aspects, prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism;

(b) conduct, and encourage and assist others to conduct, all forms of research, investigation, experiments, and studies relating to the toxicology, pharmacology, chemistry, and effects on the health, of alcohol abuse and alcoholism;

(c) coordinate such research with research conducted by other Federal and State and local agencies, public and private agencies, institutions, organizations, and individuals. To facilitate this activity the Secretary shall establish and maintain a complete and current register of all practitioners and other qualified investigators engaged in any form of research on alcohol abuse and alcoholism;

(d) make available research facilities and resources of the Secretary to appropriate authorities, health officials, and individuals engaged in special studies related to the purposes of this Act;

(e) make grants to public and private nonprofit agencies, organizations, and institutions, and contracts with public or private agencies, institutions, organizations, and individuals, for such research;

(f) establish an information center on such research, which will gather and contain, and disseminate where appropriate, all available published and unpublished data and information. All Federal departments and agencies shall send to the Secretary any unpublished data and information pertinent to the cause, prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism and the toxicology, pharmacology, epidemiology, and incidence of alcohol abuse and alcoholism, and studies, reports and other

research on other alcohol problems such as those pertaining to traffic safety, and the Secretary shall make such data and information widely available;

(g) establish and maintain research fellowships in the administration and elsewhere, and provide for such fellowship through grants to public and private nonprofit agencies, institutions, and organizations:

(h) investigate methods for determining more rapidly and precisely the extent of alcohol consumption by an individual in a given time period and the degree of intoxication which individuals are likely to experience from such alcohol consumption, and publish on a current basis information concerning uniform methodology and technology for making such determinations;

(i) any information obtained through investigation or research conducted pursuant to this Act shall be used in ways so that no name or identifying characteristics of any person shall be divulged without the approval of the Secretary and the consent of the person concerned. Persons engaged in research pursuant to this section shall protect the privacy of individuals who are the subject of such research by withholding from all persons not connected with the conduct of such research the names or other identifying characteristics of such individuals. Persons engaged in such research shall protect the privacy of such individuals and may not be compelled in any Federal, State, civil, criminal, administrative, legislative, or other proceeding to identify such individuals; and

(j) evaluate existing and proposed new programs and services for the prevention and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism.

TRAINING FUNCTIONS OF THE SECRETARY

SEC. 307. It shall be the duty of the Secretary, acting through the Institute, with respect to his training functions to—

(a) establish training programs, including interdisciplinary and bilingual training programs for professional and paraprofessional personnel with respect to alcohol abuse and alcoholism;

(b) encourage the establishment of training courses, including interdisciplinary and bilingual training programs, for professional and paraprofessional personnel by State and local governments with respect to alcohol abuse and alcoholism; and

(c) establish and maintain training fellowships in the Administration and elsewhere, and provide for such fellowships through grants to public and private institutions.

EDUCATIONAL FUNCTIONS OF THE SECRETARY

SEC. 308. It shall be duty of the Secretary, acting through the Institute, with respect to his educational functions to—

(a) develop model curricula including bilingual curricula which reflect social, geographic, and economic variables of the alcohol abuse and alcoholism problem, and which include relevant data and other information, for utilization by elementary and secondary schools for instructing children about alcohol abuse and alcoholism:

(b) develop model curricula, including bilingual curricula, which reflect social, geographic and economic variables of the alcohol abuse and alcoholism problem, and which include relevant data and other information, for utilization by parent-teacher associations, adult education centers, private citizen groups, or other State or local sources, for instructing parents and other adults about alcohol abuse and alcoholism;

(c) prepare a broad variety of educational materials including bilingual materials, which reflect social, geographic, and economic variables of the alcohol abuse and alcoholism problem, for use in all media and to reach all segments of the population, that can be utilized by public and private agencies in educational programs with respect to alcohol abuse and alcoholism;

(d) establish educational courses and guidelines, including relevant data and other information, on the causes and effects of, and treatment for, alcohol abuse and alcoholism, for Federal law enforcement officials (including prosecuting attorneys, court personnel, the judiciary, probation and parole officers, correctional officers, and other law enforcement personnel), Federal welfare, vocational rehabilitation, military, veterans, civil service, transportation, economic opportunity, housing personnel, and other Federal officials who come in contact with alcohol abuse and alcoholism problems;

(e) develop educational courses and guidelines, reflecting the social, geographic, and economic variables of the alcohol abuse and alcoholism problem, and including the provision of relevant data and other information, on the causes and effects of, and treatment for, alcohol abuse and alcoholism for use by appropriate States and local government and private agencies, institutions, and organizations, for State and local law enforcement officials (including prosecuting attorneys, court personnel, the judiciary, probation and parole officers, correctional officials, and other law enforcement personnel), State and local welfare, vocational rehabilitation, veterans, civil service, transportation, economic opportunity, and housing personnel, and other State and local officials and community leaders;

(f) serve as a clearinghouse for the collection, preparation and dissemination of all information relating to alcohol abuse and alcoholism, including State and local alcohol abuse and alcoholism treatment plans, availability of treatment resources, training and educational programs, statistics, research, and other pertinent data and information;

(g) recruit, train, organize and employ professional and other persons, including recovered alcoholics, to organize and participate in programs of public education in relation to alcohol abuse and alcoholism;

(h) coordinate activities carried on by all departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the Federal Government with respect to health education aspects of alcohol abuse and alcoholism;

(i) promote the implementation of bilingual educational programs in carrying out the provisions of this section; and

(j) undertake such other activities as the Secretary may consider important to a national program of education relating to alcohol abuse and alcoholism.

REPORTING FUNCTIONS OF THE SECRETARY

SEC. 309. It shall be the duty of the Secretary, acting through the Institute, with respect to his reporting functions to—

(a) submit an annual report to Congress, which shall specify the actions taken and services provided and funds expended under each provision of this Act and an evaluation of their effectiveness, and which shall contain the current Federal alcohol abuse and alcoholism prevention and treatment plan;

(b) submit to Congress on or before June 30, 1971, a report (1) containing current information on the health consequences of using alcohol, and (2) containing such recommendations for legislation and administrative action as he may deem appropriate;

(c) submit such additional reports as may be requested by the President of the United States or by Congress; and

(d) submit to the President of the United States and to Congress such recommendations as will further the prevention, treatment, and control of alcohol abuse and alcoholism.

TITLE IV—PREVENTION AND TREATMENT OF ALCOHOL ABUSE AND ALCOHOLISM FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

ALCOHOL ABUSE AND ALCOHOLISM AMONG FEDERAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

SEC. 401. (a) The Civil Service Commission shall be responsible for developing and maintaining, in cooperation with the Secretary and with other Federal agencies and departments, appropriate policies and services for the prevention and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism among Federal civilian employees, consistent with the purposes and intent of this Act. Such policies and services shall make optimal use of existing governmental facilities, services, and skills. Federal civilian employees who are alcohol abusers or who are alcoholics shall retain the same employment and other benefits as other persons afflicted with health problems and illnesses, and shall not lose, solely because they are alcohol abusers or alcoholics, pension, retirement, medical, or other rights. A good faith attempt shall be made to find appropriate nonsensitive work within the Government during the employee's rehabilitative treatment, rather than placing him on sick leave.

(b) The Secretary, acting through the Institute, shall be responsible for fostering similar alcohol abuse and alcoholism prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation services in State and local governments and in private industry.

(c) No person may be denied or deprived of Federal civilian employment or a Federal professional or other license or right solely on the ground of prior alcohol abuse or alcoholism, except with regard to extremely sensitive positions specified in regulations promulgated by the department or agency in which he is employed.

(d) Nothing herein shall prohibit the dismissal from employment of a Federal civilian employee who, as a result of alcohol abuse or alcoholism and failure to accept appropriate treatment, cannot properly function in his employment.

HEALTH AND DISABILITY INSURANCE PLANS FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

SEC. 402. All health and disability insurance policies and plans for Federal civilian employees hereafter contracted or renegotiated shall cover alcoholism in the same way as other health problems, illnesses, and diseases that are not self-inflicted.

CONFIDENTIALITY OF RECORDS

SEC. 403. (a) All patient records prepared or obtained pursuant to this Act, and all information contained therein, shall remain confidential and may be disclosed, with the patient's consent only to medical personnel and only for purposes of diagnosis and treatment of the patient, or to Government or other officials for the purpose of obtaining benefits due the patient as a result of his alcoholism or, for research purposes, to public or private research organizations, agencies, institutions, or individuals whose competence and research programs have been approved by the Secretary. Disclosure may be made for purposes unrelated to such treatment, benefits, or research upon an order of a court after application showing good cause therefor. In determining whether there is good cause for disclosure, the court shall weigh the need for the information sought to be disclosed against the possible harm of disclosure to the person to whom such information pertains, to the physician-patient relationship, and to the treatment service, and may condition disclosure of the information upon any appropriate safeguards. No such records or information may be used to initiate criminal charges against a patient under any circumstances.

(b) All patient records and all informa-

tion contained therein relating to alcohol abuse or alcoholism prepared or obtained by a private practitioner shall remain confidential, and may be disclosed only with the patient's consent and only to medical personnel for purposes of diagnosis and treatment of the patient or to Government or other officials for the purpose of obtaining benefits due the patient as a result of his alcoholism.

TITLE V—FEDERAL ASSISTANCE FOR STATE AND LOCAL PROGRAMS

PART A—COMPREHENSIVE STATE PLANS

COMPREHENSIVE STATE PLANS

SEC. 501. Section 314(a)(2) of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding at the end thereof:

"(L) provide for services for the prevention and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism, commensurate with the extent of the problem, such plan to (i) estimate the number of alcohol abusers and alcoholics within the various areas within the State and the extent of the health problem caused, (ii) establish priorities for the improvement of the capabilities of State and local governments and public and private agencies, institutions, and organizations with respect to prevention and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism, and (iii) specify how all available community health, welfare, educational, and rehabilitation resources, and how funds, programs, services, and facilities authorized under existing Federal and State legislation, are to be used for these purposes."

PART B—FORMULA GRANTS

AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 511. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, the sum of $20,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, the sum of $25,000,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, the sum of $30,000,000 for grants to States to assist them in planning, establishing, maintaining, coordinating, and evaluating projects for the development of more effective prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation programs to deal with alcohol abuse and alcoholism.

STATE ALLOTMENT

SEC. 512. (a) For each fiscal year the Secretary shall, in accordance with regulations, allot the sums appropriated for such year pursuant to section 511 among the States on the basis of the relative population, financial need, and need for more effective prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation of alcohol abuse and alcoholism; except that no such allotment to any State (other than the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands) for any fiscal year shall be less than $200,000.

(b) Any amount so allotted to a State (other than the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, and the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands) and remaining unobligated at the end of such year shall remain available to such State, for the purposes for which made, for the next fiscal years (and for such years only), and any such amount shall be in addition to the amounts allotted to such State for such purpose for such next fiscal year; except that any such amount, remaining unobligated at the end of the sixth month following the end of such year for which it was allotted, which the Secretary determines will remain unobligated by the close of such next fiscal year may be realloted by the Secretary, to be available for the purposes for which made until the close of such next fiscal year, to other States which have need therefor, on such basis as the Secretary deems equitable and consistent with the purposes of this title, and any amount so reallotted to a State shall be in addition to the amounts allotted and available to the States for the same period. Any amount allotted under subsection (a) to the Virgin Islands, American Samoa, Guam, or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands for a fiscal year and remaining unobligated at the end of such year shall remain available to it, for the purposes for which made, for the next two fiscal years (and for such years only), and any such amount shall be in addition to the amounts allotted to it for such purpose for each of such next two fiscal years; except that any such amount, remaining unobligated at the end of the first of such two additional years, which the Secretary determines will remain unobligated at the close of the second of such additional years may be reallotted by the Secretary, to be available for the purposes for which made until the close of the second of such additional years, to any other of such four States which have need therefor, on such basis as the Secretary deems equitable and consistent with the purposes of this title, and any amount so reallotted to a State shall be in addition to the amounts allotted and available to the State for the same period.

(c) At the request of any State, a portion of any allotment or allotments of such State under this part shall be available to pay that portion of the expenditures found necessary by the Secretary for the proper and efficient administration during such year of the State plan approved under this part, except that not more than 10 per centum of the total of the allotments of such State for a year, or $50,000, whichever is greater, shall be available for such purpose for such year.

STATE PLANS

SEC. 513. (a) Any State desiring to participate in this part shall submit a State plan for carrying out its purposes. Such plan must—

(1) designate a single State agency as the sole agency for the administration of the plan, or designate such agency as the sole agency for supervising the administration of the plan;

(2) contain satisfactory evidence that the State agency designated in accordance with paragraph (1) will have authority to carry out such plan in conformity with this part;

(3) provide for the designation of a State advisory council which shall include representatives of nongovernmental organizations or groups, and of public agencies concerned with the prevention and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism, to consult with the State agency in carrying out the plan;

(4) set forth, in accordance with criteria established by the Secretary, a survey of need for the prevention and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism, including a survey of the health facilities needed to provide services for alcohol abuse and alcoholism and a plan for the development and distribution of such facilities and programs throughout the State;

(5) provide such methods of administration of the State plan, including methods relating to the establishment and maintenance of personnel standards on a merit basis (except that the Secretary shall exercise no authority with respect to the selection, tenure of office, or compensation of any individual employed in accordance with such methods), as are found by the Secretary to be necessary for the proper and efficient operation of the plan;

(6) provide that the State agency will make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may from time to time reasonably require, and will keep such records and afford such access thereto as the Secretary may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports;

(7) provide that the Comptroller General of the United States or his duly authorized represenaives shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to the records specified in paragraph (6);

(8) provide that the State agency will from time to time, but not less often than annually, review its State plan and submit to the Secretary any modifications thereof which it considers necessary;

(9) provide reasonable assurance that Federal funds made available under this part for any period will be so used as to supplement and increase, to the extent feasible and practical, the level of State, local, and other non-Federal funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for the programs described in this part, and will in no event supplant such State, local, and other non-Federal funds; and

(10) contain such additional information and assurance as the Secretary may find necessary to carry out the provisions and purposes of this part.

(b) The Secretary shall approve any State plan and any modification thereof which complies with the provisions of subsection (a).

APPLICATIONS AND CONDITIONS

SEC. 514. (a) For each project pursuant to a State plan approved under this part for which a grant is sought from an allotment under section 512, there shall be submitted to the Secretary, through the State agency designated in accordance with section 513, an application by the State or a political subdivision thereof or by a public or other nonprofit agency, institution or organization.

(b) The Secretary shall approve such application if (1) there remains sufficient balance in the allotment (available for the purposes of this part) determined for such State; (2) he finds that the application is in conformity with the State plan under section 513; (3) he obtains assurances that any facility or portion thereof to be constructed or modernized and any program to be carried out will be available to all persons residing in the territorial area of the applicant; and (4) he obtains assurances that the applicant will keep such records, and afford such access thereto, and make such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Secretary may reasonably require. The Secretary may to the extent he determines it would not interfere with the objectives of this title, base his findings and determinations under this subsection on certifications by the State agency.

(c) No application under this section shall be disapproved until the Secretary has afforded the State agency an opportunity for a hearing.

(d) Amendment of an approved application shall be subject to approval in the same manner as an original application.

PART C—PROJECT GRANTS

GRANTS AND CONTRACTS FOR THE PREVENTION AND TREATMENT OF ALCOHOL ABUSE AND ALCOHOLISM

SEC. 520. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated $60,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971; $100,000,000 for year ending June 30, 1972; and $160,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, to carry out the provisions of this part. Any appropriated funds shall remain available until expended.

Sec. 521. (a) The Secretary, acting through the Institute, is authorized to make grants to public and private non-profit agencies, organizations and institutions and enter into contracts with public and private agencies, organizations, institutions, and individuals for the prevention and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism to assist State and local governments and public and private organizations, agencies, institutions, or individuals to——

(1) (a) meet the costs of constructing and equipping treatment and rehabilitation facilities, including but not limited to emergency medical, inpatient, intermediate care, and outpatient facilities for alcohol abusers and alcoholics, and (b) to assist them to meet, for the temporary periods specified in subsection (c) of this section, a portion of the costs of compensation of personnel and other operating costs for the initial operation of such facilities, and of new services in existing facilities for alcohol abusers and alcoholics;

(2) conduct research, demonstration, and evaluation projects, including surveys and field trials, looking toward the development of improved, expanded, and more effective methods of prevention and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism;

(3) provide education and training for mental health personnel and for professional personnel, including medical, psychiatric, vocational rehabilitation, and social welfare personnel, in academic and professional institutions and in postgraduate courses, about the prevention and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism, and provide training for such personnel in the administration, operation, and supervision of programs and services for the prevention and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism;

(4) recruit, educate, train, organize, and employ community alcohol abuse and alcoholism prevention and treatment personnel to serve with and under the direction of mental health personnel and professional medical, psychiatric, vocational rehabilitation, and social welfare personnel in alcohol abuse and alcoholism prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation programs. Prior alcohol abuse or alcoholism and prior alcohol related criminal arrests or convictions shall not be a bar to such employment;

(5) provide services in correctional and penal institutions for the prevention and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism;

(6) provide services, in cooperation with schools, law enforcement agencies, courts, and other public and private agencies, for the prevention and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism among juveniles and young adults. These services, where feasible, shall include curriculum, including bilingual curriculums, for alcohol education in elementary and secondary schools, and among parents and other adults;

(7) provide programs and services, in cooperation with local law enforcement agencies, the courts, and other public and private agencies, for the instruction of law enforcement officers, prosecuting attorneys, court personnel, the judiciary, probation and parole officers, correctional officials and legal aid, public defender, and neighborhood legal services attorneys with respect to the causes, effects, prevention, and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism. Such programs and services shall include, where possible, a full range of services available to State and local courts for diagnosis, counseling, and treatment for alcohol abuse and alcoholism for persons coming before the courts;

(8) provide services for outpatient counseling of alcohol abusers and alcoholics to include employment, welfare, legal, education, and other assistance, in cooperation and coordination with welfare and rehabilitation personnel;

(9) develop or evaluate curricula, including bilingual curricula, on alcohol abuse and alcoholism prevention and treatment, including the preparation of new and improved curricula materials for use in elementary, secondary, higher, and adult education programs and pilot projects designed to demonstrate and test the effectiveness of such curricula (whether developed with assistance under this Act or otherwise);

(10) develop or evaluate a program of dissemination of curricular material and other significant information regarding alcohol abuse and alcoholism;

(11) provide preservice and inservice training programs on alcohol abuse and alcoholism (including courses of study, institutes, seminars, films, workshops, and conferences) for teachers, counselors, and other educational personnel;

(12) provide community education programs on alcohol abuse and alcoholism (including courses of study, institutes, seminars, films, workshops, and conferences) especially for parents and other adults in the community;

(13) enable a State government agency to assist local education agencies in the planning, development, and implementation of alcohol abuse and alcoholism education programs; and

(14) develop educational material and programs about the prevention and treatment of, and problems arising from, alcohol abuse and alcoholism, for use or distribution by any form of mass media.

(b) Projects for which grants or contracts are made under this part shall, whenever possible, be community based, provide a comprehensive range of services, and be integrated with, and involve the active participation of, a wide range of public and nongovernmental agencies, organizations, institutions, and individuals.

(c) The amount of any Federal grant made under subsection (a) of this section, except with regard to certain grants made under paragraph (1) of subsection (a), shall not exceed 100 per centum of the cost of the program or project specified in the application for such grant. The amount of any Federal grant made under paragraph (1) (a) of subsection (a) of this section to meet costs of constructing and equipping the facilities referred to in such paragraph shall not exceed 90 per centum of the cost of the program or project specified in the application for such grant. The amount of any Federal grant made under paragraph (1) (b) of subsection (a) of this section to meet the costs of compensation of personnel and other operating costs may be made only for the period beginning with the first day for which such a grant is made and ending with the close of eight years after such first day; and such grants may not exceed 90 per centum of such costs for each of the first two years after such first day, 80 per centum of such costs for the third year after such first day, 75 per centum of such costs for the fourth and fifth years after such first day, and 70 per centum of such costs for each of the next three years after such first day.

(d) An amount, not to exceed 5 per centum of the amount appropriated pursuant to the provisions of this part for any fiscal year, shall be available to the Secretary to make grants to local public or non-profit private agencies, organizations, and institutions to cover up to 100 per centum of the costs (but in no case to exceed $100,000) of projects for assessing local needs for programs of services for alcohol abusers and alcoholics, designing such programs, obtaining local financial and professional assistance and support for such programs in the community, and fostering community involvement in initiating and developing such programs in the community. In no case shall a grant under this subsection be for a period in excess of one year; nor shall any grant be made under this subsection with respect to any project if, for any preceding year, a grant under this subsection has been made with respect to such project.

APPLICATION FOR FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FROM UNITS OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE ORGANIZATIONS

SEC. 522. (a) In administering the provisions of this part, the Secretary shall require coordination of all applications for programs in a State and, in view of the local nature of alcohol abuse and alcoholism, shall not give precedence to public agencies over private agencies, or to State agencies over local agencies.

(b) Each applicant from within a State, upon filing its application with the Secretary, shall submit a copy of its application for review by the State agency designated in accordance with section 513, and if no such agency exists, by the State agency responsible for administering the State comprehensive plan for treatment and prevention of alcohol abuse and alcoholism, if such agency exists. Such State agency shall be given not more than thirty days from the date of receipt of the application to submit to the Secretary, in writing, an evaluation of the project set forth in the application. Such evaluation may include comments on the relationship of the project to other projects pending and approved and to the State comprehensive plan for treatment and prevention of alcohol abuse and alcoholism. The State shall furnish the applicant a copy of any such evaluation. A State, if it so desires, may, in writing, waive its rights under this section.

(c) Approval of any application by the Secretary, including the earmarking of financial assistance for a program or project, may be granted only if the application substantially meets a set of criteria established by the Secretary that—

(1) provide that the activities and services for which assistance under this title is sought will be substantially administered by or under the supervision of the applicant;

(2) provide for such methods of administration as are necessary for the proper and efficient operation of such programs or projects;

(3) provide for such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as may be necessary to assure proper disbursement of and accounting for Federal funds paid to the applicant; and

(4) provide reasonable assurance that Federal funds made available under this part for any period will be so used as to supplement and increase, to the extent feasible and practical, the level of State, local, and other non-Federal funds that would in the absence of such Federal funds be made available for the program described in this part, and will in no event supplant such State, local, and other non-Federal funds.

APPROVAL BY NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON ALCOHOL ABUSE AND ALCOHOLISM

SEC. 523. The Secretary, upon the recommendation of the National Advisory Council on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, is authorized to make grants under part C of this title.

PART D—GENERAL

SEC. 531. (a) Whenever the Secretary finds a failure to comply with the terms of a grant or contract made or entered into under this title, he shall, after reasonable notice and opportunity for a hearing, terminate payments until he is satisfied that there will no longer be any failure to comply.

(b) The exclusive remedy of anyone adversely affected by a final action of the Secretary under subsection (a) of this section is to appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which it is located by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such final action. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Secretary. The Secretary thereupon shall file with the court the record of the proceeding on which he based his action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28 of the United States Code. Upon the filing of such petition, the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the action of the Secretary or set it aside, in whole or in part, temporarily or permanently. Until the filing of the record, the Secretary may modify or set aside his order. The findings of the Secretary as to the facts shall be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Secretary to take further

evidence, and the Secretary may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify his previous action, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence. The judgment of the court affirming or setting aside, in whole or in part, any action of the Secretary shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari as provided in section 1254 of title 28 of the United States Code. The commencement of proceedings under this subsection shall not, unless so specifically ordered by the court, operate as a stay of the Secretary's action.

ADMISSION OF ALCOHOL ABUSERS AND ALCOHOLICS TO PRIVATE AND PUBLIC HOSPITALS

SEC. 532. (a) Alcohol abusers and alcoholics shall be admitted to and treated in private and public general hospitals on the basis of medical need and shall not be discriminated against solely because of their alcoholism. No hospital that violates this section shall receive Federal financial assistance under the provisions of this title or any other Federal law administered by the Secretary. No such action shall be taken until the Secretary has advised the appropriate person or persons of the failure to comply with this section, and provided an opportunity for correction or a hearing.

(b) Any action taken by the Secretary pursuant to this section shall be subject to such judicial review as is provided by section 531(b) of this title.

TITLE VI—THE NATIONAL ADVISORY COUNCIL ON ALCOHOL ABUSE AND ALCOHOLISM

ESTABLISHMENT OF COUNCIL

SEC. 601. (a) Section 217(a) of the Public Health Service Act is amended—

(1) in the first sentence thereof, by inserting "the National Advisory Council on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism," immediately after "the National Advisory Mental Health Council,"; and

(2) in the second sentence thereof, by inserting "the National Advisory Council on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism," immediately after "the National Advisory Mental Health Council,", and by inserting "alcohol abuse and alcoholism," immediately after "psychiatric disorders,".

(b) Section 217(b) of such Act is amended, in the second sentence thereof, by inserting "alcohol abuse and alcoholism," immediately after "mental health,".

(c) Section 217 of such Act is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) The National Advisory Council on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism shall advise, consult with, and make recommendations to the Secretary on matters relating to the activities and functions of the Service in the field of alcohol abuse and alcoholism. The Council is authorized (1) to review research projects or programs submitted to or initiated by it in the field of alcohol abuse and alcoholism and recommend to the Secretary, for prosecution under this Act, any such projects which it believes show promise of making valuable contributions to human knowledge with respect to the cause, prevention, or methods of diagnosis and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism, and (2) to collect information as to studies being carried on in the field of alcohol abuse and alcoholism and, with the approval of the Secretary, make available such information through the appropriate publications for the benefit of health and welfare agencies or organizations (public or private), physicians, or any other scientists, and for the information of the general public. The Council is also authorized to recommend to the Secretary, for acceptance pursuant to section 501 of this Act, conditional gifts for work in the field of alcohol abuse and alcoholism; and the Secretary shall recommend acceptance of any such gifts only after consultation with the Council."

APPROVAL BY COUNCIL OF CERTAIN GRANTS UNDER COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH CENTERS ACT

SEC. 602. Section 266 of part E of the Community Mental Health Centers Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "Grants" and inserting in lieu thereof

"(a) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (b), grants"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(b) Grants made under this title which are primarily intended for use in the prevention or treatment of alcohol abuse or alcoholism may be made only upon recommendation of the National Advisory Council on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism established by section 217(a) of the Public Health Service Act."

TITLE VII—INTERGOVERNMENT COORDINATING COUNCIL ON ALCOHOL ABUSE AND ALCOHOLISM

SEC. 701. (a) For the purpose of coordinating all Federal Government prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation efforts with respect to alcohol abuse and alcoholism, of coordinating such Federal efforts with State and local government efforts, and of developing an enlightened policy and appropriate programs for Federal civilian employees for the prevention and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism and the rehabilitation of alcoholics, there is hereby established an Intergovernment Coordinating Council on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism consisting of the Secretary who shall serve as Chairman, the Director of the National Institute for the Prevention and Treatment of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, the Director of the National Institute of Mental Health, four representatives of Federal departments or agencies, and four representatives of State and local government departments or agencies.

(b) The President shall designate the four representatives of Federal departments or agencies who shall serve on the Coordinating Council, and shall appoint the four representatives of State and local government departments or agencies. The State and local government representatives shall serve for terms of five years, staggered so that one vacancy occurs each year. A State or local government representative may be reappointed immediately after serving less than a full term, and may be reappointed after a five-year hiatus after serving a full term.

(c) The Coordinating Council may appoint such technical consultants as are deemed appropriate for advising the Council in carrying out its functions. The services of consultants obtained under this section may be obtained in accordance with section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, at rates for individuals not in excess of the daily equivalent paid for positions in GS–18 of the General Schedule in section 5332 of title 5, United States Code.

SEC. 702. The Coordinating Council is authorized and directed to—

(a) assist the Secretary in carrying out his function of coordinating all Federal prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation efforts to deal with alcohol abuse and alcoholism;

(b) assist the Secretary in carrying out his function of coordinating such Federal efforts with State and local governments;

(c) engage in educational programs among Federal civilian employees, and in other appropriate activities, designed to prevent alcohol abuse and alcoholism;

(d) implement programs for the rehabilitation of Federal civilian employees who are alcohol abusers or alcoholics;

(e) develop and maintain any other appropriate activities consistent with the purposes of this Act.

TITLE VIII—GENERAL

SEC. 801. If any section, provision, or term of this Act is adjudged invalid for any reason, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate any other section, provision, or term of this Act, and the remaining sections, provisions, and terms shall be and remain in full force and effect.

SEC. 802. (a) Each recipient of assistance under this Act pursuant to grants or contracts entered into under other than competitive bidding procedures shall keep such records as the Secretary shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such grant or contract, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such grant is given or used, and the amount of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

(b) The Secretary and Comptroller General of the United States, or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of such recipients that are pertinent to the grants or contracts entered into under the provisions of this Act under other than competitive bidding procedures.

SEC. 803. Payments under this title may be made in advance or by way of reimbursement and in such installments as the Secretary may determine.

SEC. 804. (a) Section 7352 of title 5 of the United States Code is hereby repealed.

(b) Section 8102(a) of title 5 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows: "§ 8102. Compensation for disability or death of employee

"(a) The United States shall pay compensation as specified by this subchapter for the disability or death of an employee resulting from personal injury sustained while in the performance of his duty, unless the injury or death is—

"(1) caused by willful misconduct of the employee;

"(2) caused by the employee's intention to bring about the injury or death of himself or of another."

(c) Paragraph 2 of section 5(d) of the Peace Corps Act is hereby amended to repeal the clause ", or unless intoxication of the injured volunteer is the proximate cause of the injury or death".

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the consideration of S. 3835 members of the staff of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare may be permitted the privilege of the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR STATEMENTS TO BE PRINTED IN THE RECORD

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the discussion on S. 3835, and at an appropriate place in the RECORD, in context, certain prepared remarks by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH) be incorporated as a part of the RECORD. He was unable to be present this morning and wanted to have those comments entered into the RECORD at the appropriate place.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I make a similar request for remarks by the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH), who is the chairman of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I am pleased to have the opportunity this morning to present this measure, with the ranking Republican member of both the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare and that committee's Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Narcotics, the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS). I am also pleased to see here this morning the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK), these two distinguished gentlemen have labored long and hard on this particular piece of legislation. They also devoted much attention to this area prior to my coming to the Senate.

S. 3835, the proposed Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970, represents a new and comprehensive approach to meeting what Dr. Roger Egeberg, the Government's highest ranking health official, termed in testimony before the Senate Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Narcotics the Nation's No. 1 health problem.

It is a realistic, practical design at the Federal level for setting in motion throughout the Nation the mechanisms to deal with a deadly, costly disease that has become epidemic in our time.

Alcoholism is in many ways a unique problem in our society, but it is also a microcosm of the many other social problems that debilitate our strength as a people. Decisive action to meet this long neglected blight may well show the way to the realistic handling of other compelling national problems. In its comprehensiveness, in its flexibility, particularly with reference to the interworking with State and local governments, and in its careful planning of expenditures, it is, I believe, a template of its kind of legislation.

Despite the scope and seriousness of the problem, it has long been neglected at all levels of government. Special credit should be given, therefore, to those who have pioneered in this field, such as the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss), who is unable to be with us this morning, and the distinguished Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK).

I must also pay tribute to the patient and dedicated work of the Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Narcotics and the expeditious handling of the bill by the parent Labor and Public Welfare Committee under the able chairmanship of the Senator from Texas (Mr. YARBOROUGH) who is also a member of the subcommittee.

I commend to you the committee report on S. 3835, which I believe faithfully and concisely summarizes the committee's findings and recommendations.

To begin with, S. 3835 establishes the administrative framework for a massive, nationwide, intergovernmental effort to control alcoholism and alcohol abuse in our country.

The controlling agency is a National Institute for the Prevention and Control of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism within the Public Health Service.

Through this Institute, the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare would coordinate all Federal Health, rehabilitation, and other social programs related to the control of alcoholism and administer the programs specifically established by the bill.

The legislation provides for extensive Federal assistance to State and local programs designed to promote effective treatment and rehabilitation of alcoholics throughout the Nation, and help for private, nonprofit agencies to use and develop the expertise and the techniques that they have for dealing with this particular problem.

It requires the utilization of all existing Federal legislation for programs related to alcoholism in such fields as health, education, welfare, and highway safety. There are many such provisions in the law, but the programs they authorize have had little activation heretofore.

Considering the scope of the legislation and the seriousness of the problem it attacks, I believe the funding has been carefully and frugally planned, with every dollar a working dollar.

Let me cite a few quick facts to picture the immensity of the problem with which we are working.

It is now estimated that there are over 9 million alcoholics in the United States, and approximately another 9 million chronic problem drinkers.

Consider the family members and others affected by the impact of alcoholism on our society and you are talking about a total of perhaps 50 million people adversely affected by overuse of alcohol.

One out of three arrests in America is for simple public intoxication—throwing an intolerable burden on our system of criminal justice.

The economic waste caused by alcohol abuse has been estimated to be as high as $7 billion annually.

Highway safety experts have estimated that as many as 50 percent of our highway fatalities are connected with problem drinking. This is about 25,000 deaths annually—substantially more than the fatalities in Vietnam. Problem drinking is involved in some 800,000 auto crashes each year, in this country.

Alcoholism is now rated our fourth major disease in terms of seriousness and numbers of people affected.

I could go on with other statistics documenting the prodigious cost in human life and economic waste of our most neglected national health problem.

And even these figures do not tell half the story of the terrible toll in wasted lives, broken homes, destruction of youth, misery, and heartache.

In the hearings of our Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Narcotics, held in such cities as Los Angeles, New York, Denver, and Des Moines, we heard the testimony of many former narcotic addicts. I was struck with the fact that in most instances, the addicts, many of them young people, had begun their careers of drug abuse with alcohol. This seems to be the starter drug of the drug cycle, if such can be named.

We tend to lose sight of the fact that alcohol is the most widely abused dangerous drug in America.

We are not suggesting prohibition—we have been through the Volstead Act, and that experiment was a failure. We are suggesting something that would be substantially less costly and infinitely more effective—sensible, realistic legislation for the control and prevention of an illness that would be recognized as having reached epidemic proportions if it were typhoid or tuberculosis, or another disease.

I would like to point out that, as with other diseases, if we simply treat the disease, we do nothing to stop the input, and the disease becomes more crippling year after year. So, prevention is an important part of the attack on the disease of alcoholism.

Medical authorities, including the American Medical Association, the American Hospital Association, and the American Psychiatric Association recognize alcoholism as a disease, not a behavioral problem.

This fact is now generally recognized by enlightened people throughout the civilized world.

What is not so generally recognized is that it is a disease from which the patient, in the vast majority of instances, can recover.

We know that alcoholic patients, with the proper help and treatment, can get well.

We know that with the proper help and treatment, they can learn to control their illness so that they can live normal and productive lives.

We know a great deal about effective programs of prevention and about the kind of research that is needed to make our other efforts more efficient.

In short, we know what to do about alcoholism in our society; what has been lacking is the commitment to do it.

As I said when I introduced this legislation, I believe S. 3835 is a vehicle by which the Congress can face its responsibility for decisive action to meet one of the Nation's most urgent health problems.

And if there has ever been legislation to strike a blow for economy, I believe this bill must be so regarded.

Every dollar soundly invested to control this costly plague will be returned to society at all levels many times over.

I believe that in order to give the administrative entity established by this legislation the stature, visibility, permanence, and prestige required to do the massive job envisioned, the committee felt it essential to give it institute status.

In this and others of its recommendations, the committee was mindful that we are contemplating a vast, nationwide, public health effort to combat a disease affecting millions of Americans. A partial effort would duplicate shortcomings of the past and would mean that funds, however modest, would be wasted.

In the past, alcoholism has had a seat far to the rear so far as funding is concerned. For fiscal year 1970, alcoholism received far less Federal funding than other diseases that have a much smaller impact on the Nation.

The solution, in the committee's judgment, is not to neglect these other diseases, by any means, but to fund alco-

holism programs at a level commensurate with the seriousness of its impact on our Nation.

In S. 3835, the committee would authorize grants totaling $75 million over the next 3 years to help States develop and administer programs dealing with alcoholism. These formula grants to States would run $20 million for fiscal 1971, $25 million for fiscal 1972 and $30 million for fiscal 1973.

Grants totaling $320 million over the next 3 years would be authorized for State and local agencies, both public and private, to help finance specific projects. For such project grants to public and private nonprofit agencies, organizations, and institutions, the amounts would be $60 million for fiscal 1971, $100 million for fiscal 1972, and $160 million for fiscal 1973.

I would call attention to certain other provisions of the bill that the committee felt essential in mounting a massive Federal attack on the growing problem of alcoholism in the Nation.

The bill requires the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to submit to Congress, by June 30, 1971, a report on the health consequences of the use of alcohol, similar to the Surgeon General's report on smoking and the forthcoming report on the use of marihuana.

It also requires Federal agencies to establish programs for dealing with alcohol abuse among Federal employees and directs the U.S. Civil Service Commission to guarantee persons afflicted with alcoholism the same employment conditions and benefits as persons who are ill from other causes.

In order to assure proper coordination and sound on-going policy for this vast public health effort, the bill would establish an independent National Advisory Council and an Intergovernmental Coordinating Council on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism.

S. 3835 is cosponsored by 52 Members of the Senate. The bill has been strongly endorsed by the American Medical Association, the North American Association of Alcoholism Programs, the National Council on Alcoholism, the National Association of State Mental Health Program Directors, the American Public Health Association, and a number of individual citizens.

The committee report contains a quotation by Mr. Justice Marshall that—

> The picture of the penniless drunk propelled aimlessly and endlessly through the law's "revolving door" of arrest, incarceration, release, and rearrest is not a pretty one.

The Justice made note of the urgent need for "some clear promise of a better world for these unfortunate people."

Mr. President, I believe that by the enactment of S. 3835, Congress would take a significant step toward providing that "better world" for the millions of Americans afflicted by this common but deadly and long-neglected disease.

At the same time, I am convinced that we can save lives on our public highways, reduce crime, relieve some of the unnecessary burden on our criminal justice system, cut down an appalling annual economic waste, and effectively contribute to a happier and healthier society by making this legislation the law of the land.

Mr. President, I would like to use a portion of the remainder of my time for my distinguished colleagues on the minority side to comment on this issue.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, first, I should like to make a personal statement about the Senator from Iowa. He is very generous in his remarks about Senator DOMINICK, Senator Moss, and myself, and I appreciate it, and I am sure my colleagues appreciate it very much. In a few minutes Senator DOMINICK, who has been very active in the work of the subcommittee, will address himself to the bill.

I have had this experience before, where a good idea lies fallow, or almost so, for a long time, until a combination of events and a particular personality bring it into focus and cause unprecedented action.

The Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss) and I collaborated upon this matter—to establish alcoholism as an acknowledged illness which needs to be treated on the basis of medical care, research, and rehabilitation rather than on the revolving door basis of a police station and jail—and introduced the first bill in 1966. In 1967, interest had grown so that S.1508 had 35 cosponsors. In 1969, interest had grown to 41 cosponsors when we introduced S. 1997, the Alcoholism Care and Control Act of 1969.

We did get some results, certain provisions of the bill were enacted into law on March 13, 1970, as Public Law 91–211, the Community Mental Health Centers Amendments of 1970. In the fiscal year 1971 budget this resulted in $6 million being devoted to alcoholism through the community mental health program. However, until the matter was put in hand, through a special subcommittee headed by Senator HUGHES, who had a unique, not only long-standing but also lifetime concern with this as a mission and as an objective, nothing major really happened. When he did take over the subcommittee, of which I have the honor to be the ranking minority member, something did happen, and this pending legislation is the fruition of that work. We are now on the threshold, should this become law—and I see no reason why it should not—of what is properly called in the report a massive Federal approach, to attack the dread illness of alcoholism in this country.

This is an historic change. I have had a previous experience with the same thing. Since 1949 and up to 1965, I carried on a campaign for a national arts foundation of some kind for the United States. I got nowhere for 16 years. That is a long time for a legislator to persist, but it shows how long it can take. It was not until there came upon the scene Senators PELL, CLARK, and HUMPHREY, and, in the House, Representatives CELLER, THOMPSON, and others of the same point of view, that the longstanding effort which had gone on for a decade and a half was brought to fruition.

Mr. President, all honor and credit are due to those who make these things happen in history, and I think Senator HUGHES is one of them. I pay great tribute and great credit to him for his persistence, his imagination, and the initiative which resulted in this special subcommittee and will, hopefully, result in this legislation being enacted into law.

I hasten to add that his work and our work is not over. A law is like a directive in Washington. It is good for 2 weeks, unless you do something with it. Notwithstanding the passage of this bill into law, there will yet be the appropriation side, no matter how conservative we may think our authorizations to be. Then we will face the sheer matter of getting States interested, as this is very heavily premised—as are other measures here—upon State action. Then we will face yet the other challenge of the imaginative implementation by the Federal Government, including the critically important aspect of education in this bill.

So I want to say to my colleague that his labor is just beginning today; it is hardly over. But we will join him in it; and I am very hopeful that we may see in our lifetimes a very measurable improvement and a new horizon opened up to these miserable people who are alcoholics, with shining examples of what can be done for themselves with proper medical aid, if the resources and facilities are available, and a tremendous reduction in the unbelievably horrific figure of 9 million—which, incidentally, I might say to my colleague, is almost double the previous classic estimate in this field. Indeed, the doctor—Morris E. Chafetz, director of Clinical Psychiatric Services, Massachusetts General Hospital—who testified to the 9 million figure made that clear. For example, he said at page 110 of the hearing record:

> Most of us for decades have used the often quoted figure of 4,500,000 to 5,000,000 alcoholic people in this country. But a recently completed scientific study shows the figure to be beyond nine million.

That is a very interesting statement, because either the figure has burgeoned because of the pressures of the times, which is what has brought us into this dread period of narcotic addiction and drug abuse, or we really have underestimated the number of alcoholic people for all these years. Whichever way it is, 9 million—and these are essentially adults; they are not children—out of an employable population of 70 million is a staggering figure. And none of this takes into consideration the effects on the families and the children of the alcoholics—the hopelessness and despair which exist in many of them—which continues day after day over a period of many years. I am sure that other countries may do worse in proportion, but that is no excuse for us.

Mr. President (Mr. SPARKMAN), this is a milestone which we are facing not so much in the declaration of alcoholism as a disease or an illness or a public health problem—because the courts have recognized that and we have recognized it in the law to which I previously referred, Public Law 91–211, which was passed in 1970—but in the size and scope of the treatment we are prepared to afford and

the resources we have prepared to make available at this time. Whether or not the issue of resources is challenged, I should like to address myself to that—that is, the authorization for appropriations—because it is only fair to our colleagues that an explanation should be of record.

Some of the best testimony on this score comes from the department itself, and I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the letter addressed to me, dated June 19, 1970, by Dr. Roger O. Egeberg, Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION, AND WELFARE,
Washington, D.C., June 19, 1970.

Hon. JACOB JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: This letter is in response to the questions you raised on May 25, 1970, on the legislative objectives of S. 3835.

In regard to the issue raised by question number two, we would defer to the opinions of the United States Civil Service Commission.

Question No. 1: "What level of Federal funding would you estimate could be effectively used to meet each of the following legislative objectives of S. 3835:

a. To stimulate research on control and prevention of alcoholism.

b. To improve treatment services for alcoholics.

c. To accelerate communication and application of research findings to research programs.

d. To develop training programs for scientific professional and non-professional.

e. To modify public attitudes through expanded programs of education."

Answer: The needs implied by the legislative objectives of S. 3835 are extremely substantial. A history of neglect by the Nation's health service system creates a need for rather enormous Federal investments to seek solutions to the problems of alcohol abuse and alcoholism. A degree of professional judgment is required to estimate the level of Federal funding which could be *effectively* used to meet the legislative objectives of S. 3835. It is recognized that the Department has not requested authorizations or appropriations with these specific objectives in mind, and the following estimates are made exclusively on the basis of professional judgment relating to the *effective* use of Federal funds.

Fiscal Year 1972

Objective:	*Millions*
(a) To stimulate research on control and prevention of alcoholism	$2
(b) To improve treatment serivces for alcoholics	18
(c) To accelerate communication and application of research findings to research programs	1
(d) To develop training programs for scientific professional(s) and non-professional(s)	5
(e) To modify public attitudes through expanded programs of education	1.5

Question No. 3: "Will the cost of Medicare and Medicaid programs be increased by declaring an alcoholic as eligible for coverage as provided for by Section 501 of the bill? If so, to what extent? If not, is this because in practice, alcoholism is already covered but defined as another form of illness?"

Answer: *Medicare:* Assuming that Section 501 applies only to alcoholics who are age 65 or over (since no provision is made to change the age requirement for eligibility under Medicare) and only to the hospital insurance plan (since essentially all persons age 65 or over are now eligible to enroll in the medical insurance plan), there would be no significant additional cost to the Medicare program. Possibly a small number who are ineligible under present law might be eligible under Section 501. Essentially, however, to the extent that alcoholics age 65 or over have need of the services covered under the hospital insurance plan and a physician certified to such need, the services are presently being provided.

Medicaid: Section D–5140 (Interpretation of Regulations) of the Handbook of the Public Assistance Administration states that "Limitations may not be set by eliminating certain groups of patients or certain diagnoses, from coverage." Thus, if an eligible Medicaid patient receives one of the basic five services or an additional service included in the State plan, coverage for his care and treatment is subject only to the usual limitations on such services. Therefore, if treatment is provided by a clinic which meets the State standards for licensing, it would be covered under Medicaid if clinic services are included in the State plan.

Section 501(b) of S. 3835 would mandate inclusion in State plans of a provision for the prevention and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism. We question the advisability of singling this category of diseases out for mandatory coverage at the potential expense of other equally important disease categories. Enactment of this section would involve an increase in costs in those States which do not currently cover additional services (particularly clinic services). Information is not available at this time whch would allow us to accurately forecast this cost increase.

Question No. 4: "Will the cost of social security disability benefits be increased by declaring an alcoholic eligible (as provided for by Secton 502 of the bill)? If so, to what extent? If not, is this because in practice, alcoholism is already covered but defined as another form of illness?"

Answer: To be eligible for social security disability benefits a worker must be disabled as defined in the law and must meet the disability insured status requirements.[1]

Section 502 of S. 3835 states that an alcoholic shall be regarded as eligible for social security disability benefits and the benefits shall not be barred on the ground that alcoholism is a self-inflicted disability. As we see it, this language would not change the effects of present law and thus would not increase the cost of the social security disability provisions. However, if the language of this section were modified or were to be interpreted to permit an alcoholic to qualify for social security disability benefits without meeting the requirements of present law it would significantly increase the cost of the disability program. Moreover, there would be serious objections on grounds that provisions giving special treatment under social security to one category of impairment would be inequitable to persons with other types of serious conditions who do not meet the definition of total disability or the insured status requirements of present law.

Question No. 5: "Will the cost of vocational rehabilitation benefits be increased by declaring alcoholism as eligible for coverage (as provided for by Section 504 of the bill)? If so, to what extent? If not, is this because in practice, alcoholism is already covered but defined as another form of illness?"

Answer: Under the Federal-State program of vocational rehabilitation, alcoholics are accepted as eligible because alcoholism is recognized as an illness in itself and services are provided on the same basis as for any other disability. As is true for any disability category, costs increase as numbers accepted increase. However, alcoholism is not one of the more expensive disabilities for the rehabilitation program. While alcoholics require a substantial amount of counseling and other specialized services, relatively little physical restoration is involved.

Question No. 6: "Would you agree that a hospital has a community responsibility to admit and treat alcoholics on the basis of medical need and if it fails to meet this community responsibility, the facility should be 'cut-off' from any further Federal financial assistance (as provided for under Section 611 of the bill)? If not, why?"

Answer: Section 611 of S. 3835 provides that "alcohol abusers and alcoholics shall be admitted to and treated in private and public hospitals on the basis of medical need and shall not be discriminated against solely because of their alcoholism." The same Section further provides that "no hospital that violates this Section shall receive Federal financial assistance under the provisions of this Act or any other Federal law administered by the Secretary."

Federal policy which prohibits discrimination on the basis of diagnosis is valid and justifiable. It is our opinion that alcoholics should be admitted to medical care facilities on an equal basis as persons who suffer other illnesses and that alcoholics should not be refused admission on the basis of their alcoholism. We fully agree that hospitals should admit and treat alcoholics on the basis of medical needs.

Sincerely yours,

ROGER O. EGEBERG, M.D.,
Assistant Secretary for Health and Scientific Affairs.

[1] The social security law defines disability generally as the inability to engage in any substantial gainful activity by reason of a medically determinable physical or mental impairment that has lasted or is expected to last at least 12 months, or to result in death. A disabled worker is insured for disability benefits if (1) he has at least as many quarters of coverage as the number of calendar years that elapsed after 1950 (or the year he reached age 21, if later) and up to the year in which he became disabled; and (2) he had substantial recent work covered under social security before he became disabled. To meet the latter requirement, a worker disabled at age 31 or later needs at least 20 quarters of coverage during the period of 40 calendar quarters ending with the quarter in which he became disabled. (Workers disabled before age 31 can be insured with quarters of coverage in half of a period shorter than 10 years.)

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, Dr. Egeberg, whom we all respect very highly and is an outstanding authority, addressed himself only to the first year and the immediate need for Federal funds. He addressed himself to fiscal 1972 and for that he gives us an estimate in round figures of about $27.5 million—the first year estimate for the Federal program—which is spending for prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation of alcohol abuse and alcoholism of $3 per alcoholic. That is essentially what Dr. Egeberg addressed himself to, which we have in our bill of $60 million; but yet, I respectfully submit, the estimate of Dr. Egeberg bears out the amount we have set up in the bill, and for this reason. While his figures on the basic stimulation of research, the communication of research findings, and the training program for scientific and nonprofessional personnel concerning alcoholism, may be accepted as authoritative, they come to only $8 million of the $27.5 million; but when

we get to the area of the other two critical items, to improve treatment services for alcoholics and to modify the public attitude through expanded programs of education, there, I think, our judgment, with all respect, has a right to be considered better than Dr. Egeberg's, at least, I would not be quite so restrained by departmental considerations, and so forth, as he might be. For his estimate on its face, is patently low.

He gives us $18 million to improve treatment services for alcoholics. That is $2 per alcoholic per year. We have just devoted $6 million to the same purpose, and it has hardly been heard of, let alone made a ripple. Thus, it seems to me that at the least, and in the most elementary sense, that figure should be doubled or tripled, and even that would only be $6 per alcoholic per year.

Then, as to the modification of the public attitude through expanded programs of education, bearing in mind the enormous scope of the problem nationwide and the great number of people involved, the fact that education should take place not only through industrial agencies—that is, agencies operating in the business world—but also in schools and colleges, Dr. Egeberg gives us $1,500,000.

With all respect, that figure again would not only fail to make a ripple, it would be literally unknown, at least at the minimum, the figure of $10 million for that purpose, in my judgment, would be an elementary starting figure.

Accordingly, Mr. President, based upon those analyses, I deeply believe that the figures we have been given by Dr. Egeberg, though they seem to reduce materially the figures in the bill, go far to sustain them rather than the other way.

The second item of appropriation deals with the State program, the State formula grants. In that respect, I should like to point out that the formulation of those grants is a very important one. That is the basis upon which they will be given. For it relates to relative population, financial need, and, very importantly, the need for more effective prevention, treatment, and rehabilitation programs in the alcoholism field.

There, I believe, is a key element in what we must try to accomplish. For we have found that the carrot and the stick approach with the States is extremely persuasive and extremely helpful. We offer each State as much as $200,000 as a basic formula grant, but if the State is to participate, and we have a right to expect that its own people will urge the State effectively to participate, then the States must really establish, under the bill, a comprehensive program for the prevention and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism, commensurate with the extent of the problem in the particular State. The specifications are very exact and constructive, which will bring the State into the scheme of effort to enforce what we are seeking to bring about in an effective way.

To indicate the amounts which are available under the $20 million, first year authorization to the States, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a table of estimated formula pared by the Department at our request but does not represent a commitment to grants to the States. This table was prethem to seek such funding appropriations.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

200,000 MINIMUM PER/STATE

State	Region	Amount
Total		20,000,000
1. Alabama	4	383,354
2. Alaska	9	200,000
3. Arizona	9	200,000
4. Arkansas	7	217,877
5. California	9	1,470,043
6. Colorado	8	200,000
7. Connecticut	1	261,062
8. Delaware	2	200,000
9. District of Columbia	3	200,000
10. Florida	4	562,564
11. Georgia	4	447,621
12. Hawaii	9	200,000
13. Idaho	8	200,000
14. Illinois	5	829,603
15. Indiana	5	423,918
16. Iowa	6	235,899
17. Kansas	6	200,000
18. Kentucky	3	323,518
19. Louisiana	7	374,264
20. Maine	1	200,000
21. Maryland	3	297,487
22. Massachusetts	1	424,692
23. Michigan	5	696,830
24. Minnesota	6	313,847
25. Mississippi	4	289,036
26. Missouri	6	401,359
27. Montana	8	200,000
28. Nebraska	6	200,000
29. Nevada	9	200,000
30. New Hampshire	1	200,000
31. New Jersey	2	542,149
32. New Mexico	7	200,000
33. New York	2	1,356,894
34. North Carolina	3	517,638
35. North Dakota	6	200,000
36. Ohio	5	878,837
37. Oklahoma	7	241,244
38. Oregon	9	200,000
39. Pennsylvania	2	981,946
40. Rhode Island	1	200,000
41. South Carolina	4	290,373
42. South Dakota	6	200,000
43. Tennessee	4	404,947
44. Texas	7	1,019,679
45. Utah	8	200,000
46. Vermont	1	200,000
47. Virginia	3	421,809
48. Washington	9	270,293
49. West Virginia	3	200,000
50. Wisconsin	5	355,764
51. Wyoming	8	200,000
52. Guam	9	12,994
53. Puerto Rico	3	337,162
54. Virgin Islands	3	6,875
55. American Samoa		4,027

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the primary sponsor of the bill, the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES), spoke of the economic cost to business alone, let alone the cost in ruined lives and families—and, incidentally, the welfare cost, which is tremendous—but the cost of judicial administration through the courts and the jails in the country—one out of three arrests being for public drunkenness—is horrendous.

Mr. President, I should like to give one estimate of these loss figures as compiled by the health department of New York City—for New York City alone, which represents 5 percent of the population of the country. The department estimates are as follows:

Welfare costs—$150 million.

Lowered job productivity—$260 million.

Yearly deaths (loss of record)—$210 million.

Traffic fatalities—$50 million.

Injuries and property damage—$210 million.

That comes to a figure of $880 million, approximately $1 billion a year, for New York City alone, attributable directly to alcoholism. Indeed, a phrase has been coined for the loss to American business at the national level of the economic waste due to alcoholism, "industry's $7 billion hangover."

As a measure of demonstrating precisely what is at stake, in his report in the letter which I have had placed in the RECORD, Dr. Egeberg states:

> The needs implied by the legislative objectives of S. 3835 are extremely substantial. A history of neglect by the Nation's health service system creates a need for rather enormous Federal investments to seek solutions to the problems of alcohol abuse and alcoholism.

That, I think, symbolizes what we have tried to accomplish in respect to the bill.

I might say that I consider it a matter of single achievement by us, and the fact that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK) who, on our committee, I think, stands preeminent in the scrupulous care he has taken in doing his homework in respect to authorizations for particular measures in which we are engaged, finally came to the conclusion, after profound consideration, that the amounts in the authorizations were appropriate.

Thus, Mr. President, I sum up as follows:

I support and urge the Senate to enact the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970 (S. 3835), a critical milestone in the commitment of the United States to declaring war on alcoholism as a disease.

It is an effective approach attributable, in my judgment, to the gifted and important leadership in consolidating and crystallizing what has gone before him by the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES), who is a new Member of the Senate. Those of us who have been here a long time get considerable satisfaction in that kind of development with our new Members, regardless of party.

If we give the Nation the necessary legislative oversight and follow through on our promises, and if we implement the appropriations with suitable legislative and executive action, the legislative action being effective oversight, this has great promise of really reversing the trend which has been going on so heavily against us, in respect of alcoholism, and in cutting down remarkably on its incidence and the gross waste both in terms of money and ruined lives which ensue from this dreadful blight with which we are trying to deal today.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. HUGHES. I thank the distinguished ranking minority member of the committee and subcommittee, the Senator from New York, for his comments and particularly for the contribution he has made this morning to an understanding of the need for an appropriate level of funding.

I would like to point out that there has been real cooperation between the majority and minority members on this

particular piece of legislation, including the area of funding, on which I imagine the Senator from Colorado will comment. I think the conclusions we have arrived at will bear up under the closest inspection.

I thank the Senator from New York for the very kind comments he has made about me personally, and also for the great contribution he has made to the legislation.

Mr. JAVITS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, along with the distinguished Senators from New York and Iowa, I think this bill is of enormous importance. I second what the Senator from New York has had to say concerning the leadership and flexibility shown by the Senator from Iowa.

This is not an easy bill to give consideration to. It is not easy because we are trying to correlate a broad range of different approaches to the problem of the prevention and treatment of alcoholic abuse.

It involves jurisdictional problems within the Federal Government. It involves the question of whether we should operate solely through the States or solely through the local communities. It involves the question of whether there should be a great degree of participation by the mental health centers in the communities.

We found in the hearings that people affected with alcohol or drug addiction problems resent in many cases being treated in mental health centers.

Early last year and this year in the consideration of the community mental health center bill, questions were raised as to whether we should do anything about funding alcoholic health treatment centers under that bill because we did have a comprehensive bill on alcoholism coming out.

The Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) and I got together and decided that in order to persuade people that we were neither going to lessen our initiative in this matter nor were we going to relinquish committee jurisdiction over alcoholism we should provide funds for mental health centers and make it plain, as we did in the report on that bill, that we were not ending our efforts in the endeavor to resolve the problems of alcoholism.

The flexibility of both the Senator from New York and the Senator from Iowa in trying to work out these problems and getting the bill cosponsored by 52 Senators, reported unanimously by the committee, is in my opinion a real tribute to both of the Senators. I put that statement in the RECORD plainly and flatly.

I am encouraged not only by the emphasis given to the problems of alcoholism by the bill, but also the fact that the working operations, the mechanics, of trying to effect some rehabilitation and cures, and hopefully some prevention, are concentrated at the local level.

Surely, we operate through the States. And certainly, we have an instiute set up in the Public Health Service and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. But the rehabilitation effort is designed to work through and with the local communities where the alcoholics live, and where they can more easily receive all necessary treatment and help.

I think the importance of the bill can be summarized by pointing out two matters in addition to the remarks by the Senator from Iowa and the Senator from New York.

The damage to our Nation shows itself in many ways. One of the most damaging areas is in auto safety. Some national estimates indicate that 30 percent of all traffic fatalities occur with alcohol related to the cause. In a recent year in Colorado, 60 percent of fatal accidents took place with drivers whose blood alcohol levels would fail to meet permissible levels, under the current relevant statute. This is not a unique statistic. The harm caused by such drivers to themselves, their families, innocent victims, and to property, is immense.

The effects of alcoholism are also seen in the great burdens placed by it on our criminal justice system, our mental institutions, and our welfare system. In our State, between 50 and 75 percent of all arrests were alcohol related in a recent year. Many of those arrested are repeaters—unfortunate people caught in an alcoholic revolving door. Clearly this results in an unproductive use of our criminal justice system.

We must, through the mental health field, do something about this problem and make a sufficient number of people aware of the dangers and the problems of alcoholism so that they will be able not only to exercise judgment as to whether they should use it, but will also be able, if they do get caught in the alcoholic trap, to find a satisfactory method of receiving treatment and care.

The need for comprehensive Federal legislation to combat the problem of alcoholism in our Nation is clear. During hearings held around the country by the Special Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Narcotics, we were presented with evidence which exposed the great damage caused by the abuse of alcohol both in terms of the human pain and anguish suffered by alcoholics and those who live and work with them, and the tremendous burden which alcoholism places on all of the institutions of our society.

Mr. President, the bill before us is a bipartisan bill ably led through and over several hurdles by the chairman of our subcommittee, Senator HUGHES and the ranking Republican, Senator JAVITS, and a bill which, although comprehensive in scope, operates primarily through local communities in an effort to provide remedies for the damage which alcohol creates.

The effects of alcoholism are also seen in the great burdens placed by it on our criminal justice system, our mental institutions, and our welfare system. In our State, between 50 and 75 percent of all arrests were alcohol related in a recent year. Many of those arrested are repeaters—unfortunate people caught in an alcoholic revolving door. Clearly this results in an unproductive use of our criminal justice system. These arrests occupy much of the time of our law enforcement judicial and penal systems which could be utilized in handling many of our other pressing criminal justice needs.

The same is true in the mental health field. Our mental institutions contain many people whose illness is alcohol related. These patients require a great commitment of resources—personnel, space, and funds. Solving the alcoholism problem of these people would permit better utilization of these mental health resources.

I believe the programs provided for in this bill will meet many of these alcohol-related problems. While the Institute estabished by this bill will have important responsibilities in terms of comprehensive planning, education, research, coordination functions, and training functions, the greatest impact of the Institute will be in its activities on the local community level. Through the funds provided by the project grant sections of this bill, the Institute will be able to help the local communities and the institutions in the local communities, both public, and private, get aid to the alcoholic. The Institute will help local communities develop physical facilities, train personnel, and provide research assistance, and knowledge. On the local level, the Institute will be charged with the responsibility of bringing together all of the resources needed to achieve comprehensive treatment and rehabilitation. These resources may include medical treatment, mental health facilities, private agencies such as Alcoholics Anonymous or halfway houses.

Another benefit of gearing this program to the local level is that the law enforcement agencies will be able to cooperate directly with treatment agencies in getting aid to the person who goes in and out of jail for drunkenness. In having treatment facilities available in the local community, the courts will have a realistic alternative to the drunk tank and the pressure on our legal system will be eased.

While this bill provides a broad legislative approach to the alcoholism problem, the success of its programs will depend primarily on the vigorous efforts of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The committee did not specify the level at which this program should be placed within the Public Health Service. However, it is the intent of the committee that the Institute and its programs be given a high priority consistent with the great magnitude of our needs in this field. I am confident that the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare will provide the leadership necessary to make the expectations of the committee a reality. If this is done, much of the human suffering and economic loss caused by the abuse of alcohol will be overcome.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I would like to point out to the Senate that the distinguished Senator from Colorado was on all the field trips that the subcommittee made and was in attendance at all sessions and regularly contributed to the research and work of this subcom-

mittee. Without his able and dedicated assistance it would have been impossible for us to reach as fine a product as the piece of legislation being considered today.

As the chairman of the subcommittee, I certainly want to express my deep appreciation to the Senator from Colorado for his interest and dedication in this particular matter and for his donation of time and expertise.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Iowa very deeply. As I said before, I accept these accolades with a degree of modesty, because he is the leader in achieving the passage of this legislation, and we know it.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUGHES. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I want to commend the very distinguished and very able Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES) for his outstanding work in the area of alcohol abuse and its prevention and treatment.

Our distinguished colleague has brought to the Senate's attention today the results of his comprehensive and diligent study into one of the most dangerous health problems confronting the Nation, and through his unique expertise and understanding of all facets of the disease of alcoholism, not only will the 9 million Americans currently suffering from the affliction of alcoholism benefit, but so will tens of millions of other Americans who are relatives, friends, or innocent bystanders.

This bill is a major legislative initiative with regard to a previously much neglected national health problem. Two of the legislation's most important findings are: First, that alcoholism is a medical-social problem, rather than a legal-criminal problem; and second, that the alcoholic should be given medical and rehabilitative treatment, instead of being treated as a criminal. In addition, S. 3835 will authorize the establishment of a National Institute for the Prevention and Control of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism within the Public Health Service through which a Federal effort will be made to promote effective treatment and rehabilitation programs for alcoholics throughout the country.

Mr. President, a national policy which would effectively reduce the incidence of alcohol abuse and alcoholism throughout the country is long overdue. I am pleased to support this legislation, and I again commend the junior Senator from Iowa for his zeal and persistence, diligence, and wisdom in bringing this bill to the Senate floor and for his masterful, forceful, and effective work in managing the bill. He has performed a great service, and I hope that the other body will act favorably and quickly so that the Nation may reap the benefits therefrom.

Mr. President, the able Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) referred to the problem of funding the authorizing legislation should it be enacted into law.

I assure the Senator that, as a member of the Appropriations Committee and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Deficiencies and Supplementals, I will do everything within my power as one Senator to aid in securing the funds for this measure when the occasion arises.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, having had a great deal of experience with the Senator from West Virginia, I know that when he makes that kind of statement, it is worth millions of dollars to the program and will help to get it off the ground very quickly.

I am very grateful to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from West Virginia not only for the statement he has just made and the very kind his deep interest over the course of the last year. Both he and the majority leader have spoken time and time again remarks about me personally, but also for on the floor of the Senate to help get funding for this subcommittee. In the beginning we were trying to work without any specific funding. In the absence of the majority leader I wish to also mention specifically his pleas on the floor of the Senate that we should pursue this subject matter and do something about it. I am very grateful to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia. I look forward to his able leadership as this measure becomes law, in helping us to obtain adequate funding.

Mr. President, I would like to suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that request?

Mr. HUGHES. I withhold my request.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have asked that the Senator withhold his request so that we might be certain that all Members who are here who desire to speak have spoken. I know that both the Senator and I agree that there should be a brief quorum call to let Senators know that there is no desire to pass this bill under cover of darkness. I would like the RECORD to show that there was an agreement entered into that this measure would be called up at 10:30 Monday morning, so Senators were apprised in advance and they had the weekend to think about the matter. When we have the quorum call I hope we will let it go for a while so that every Senator will be apprised that the bill will be reached for final passage after that.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, anent the statement of the distinguished Senator from New York with respect to notification of Senators, on Friday it was expressly stated on the floor of the Senate that we would come in this morning at 10:30 a.m. for the purpose of considering this bill. Therefore, all Senators were clearly put on notice; and I, as the acting assistant majority leader, on Friday discussed with attachés on the minority side the fact that this bill was to be considered. And it was then agreed that the bill would be brought up today. So I think all Senators have had ample opportunity to be prepared.

I hope the quorum will not extend overly long because the distinguished Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), under a previous order, is to be recognized today circa 11 a.m. I hope the quorum call will be brief.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I would like to join the Senator from New York in the request, with the agreement and understanding that certainly this matter has been fully called to the attention of all Members of the Senate.

Prior to the request for the quorum I think it would be proper to have the committee amendment presented.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, could we have third reading?

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I would not want to cut off amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair advises the Senator from New York that amendments are already cut off.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, alcoholism is a complex and tragic illness. It was long misunderstood and made the subject of punishment rather than treatment. Alcoholism is indiscriminate, afflicting young and old, rich and poor, of every race.

That such a widespread and serious public health problem has gone without a comprehensive Federal program to combat it is a serious blight on our Nation's health care record.

S. 3835 is a major step toward erasing this mark. By establishing a comprehensive approach to alcoholism it offers real hope of relief to the individuals who suffer from the disease and a realistic basis for reducing its impact in our country. Its threeefold approach, through prevention, treatment and rehabilitation, shows a modern and enlightened appreciation of the problems we are facing.

By providing extensive assistance to State and local programs, the bill assures maximum impact at the points and in the forms which can be most beneficial and effective. The national advisory council on alcohol abuse and alcoholism, which the bill establishes, will provide the first coordinating services in this field on a nationwide basis.

A full and productive life for every citizen is one of the most precious goals of a free society. Alcoholism has robbed countless individuals and their families of any hope of achieving that goal. It has inflicted economic ruin and often death on its victims. The costs to our country have been incalculable in terms of wasted lives and lost contributions to personal, family and community welfare.

By providing a coordinated and broadly based approach to alcoholism, S. 3835 will lay the foundation for significant progress in our efforts to control this disease.

I urge approval of this urgently needed legislation.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, the passage of this bill is of the utmost importance. Alcohol abuse and alcoholism are rapidly increasing throughout the country. Alcoholism is now rated the fourth ma-

jor killing illness in America. It takes an incalculable toll in ruined lives, lost profits, broken homes, and destruction of youth. One of its more important effects, and one I should like to emphasize today, is the effect of alcohol and alcoholism on automobile accidents.

According to Dr. William Haddon, Jr., former director of the National Highway Safety Bureau, problem drinking is "the No. 1 problem on our highways." Approximately 50 percent of all highway fatalities can be attributed to problem drinking.

A report by the U.S. Department of Transportation to the Congress in 1968, entitled "Alcohol and Highway Safety," stated:

The use of alcohol by drivers and pedestrians leads to some 25,000 deaths and a total of at least 800,000 crashes in the United States each year. Especially tragic is the fact that much of the loss in life, limb, and property damage involves completely innocent parties.

Mr. President, several particularly good articles for the St. Louis Globe-Democrat, on the problem of alcohol and driving have come to my attention. In my opinion, they further indicate the strong need for the bill which we are considering today and which I have cosponsored. I ask unanimous consent that the material be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Louis Globe-Democrat]

ALCOHOL AND HIGHWAY HOMICIDE: AN ESTIMATED 56,900 PEOPLE WILL DIE IN AUTO CRASHES IN THE UNITED STATES IN 1969 AND DRUNKEN DRIVERS WILL CAUSE MORE THAN HALF—35,000—OF THESE TRAFFIC FATALITIES

(By Sue Ann Wood)

If a mysterious epidemic were to sweep across the nation killing more than 1,000 men, women and children a week, the public would rise in arms and demand that a cure be found.

If jet airplanes started falling out of the sky at a rate of 10 a week, more than one every day, the national outcry would spur Congress and officials at every level to immediate action.

And yet . . .

More than 1,000 men, women and children in the United States are dying violent, agonizing deaths each week from an epidemic of auto crashes sweeping the nation's streets and highways.

The same disease is causing injury and disfigurement to 10,000 people every day.

It would require 500 jet airliner crashes a year, 10 every week, to equal the number of persons killed in auto crashes in this country.

Yet there is no public demand for action.

The casualty toll from auto accidents each week is nearly five times the number of Americans killed weekly in Vietnam.

Almost 10 times as many persons are injured every week in highway crashes in the United States as are hurt in all crimes of violence, including homicide, armed robbery and assaults.

Yet when most Americans are asked what are the greatest national concerns at the moment, they are likely to say either the war in Vietnam or "crime in the streets." They demand solutions to both of these national problems.

"We have a tradition," Dr. William Haddon Jr., until recently national director of highway safety, acknowledged sadly, "of saying we cannot do anything about highway crashes."

"Too many people have been prepared to believe," Alan S. Boyd, former U.S. Secretary of Transportation, said recently, "that these losses of human life and national wealth are just the price you have to pay for mobility."

He pointed out that Americans seem almost to be "conducting some sort of military campaign against ourselves, for the pain, the human tragedy and the destruction are warlike in their dimensions.

"In money terms alone, crashes cost us over $13 billion per year in medical bills, lost wages, property damage, claims processing, police service and operations of traffic courts."

Direct economic losses from crashes total nearly $1 billion a month, safety experts estimate. In 1967, auto collisions cost U.S. citizens more than $34 million every day, nearly half the daily cost of the Vietnam war.

"In money terms alone, crashes cost us over $13 billion per year in medical bills, lost wages, property damage, claims processing, police service and operation of traffic courts."

Still the public attitude is one of apathy. What can be done? We're a mobile society; people must drive and accidents are a necessary evil—so the argument goes.

Or are they?

A growing body of evidence is pointing to a single cause of more than 50 per cent of all highway fatalities in the United States. If that one factor could be successfully eliminated, more than 25,000 lives could be saved annually.

That one cause is alcohol.

This year, it is estimated that 56,900 will die in auto crashes.

And intoxicated drivers will cause more than half—35,000—of these traffic fatalities, statistics from every part of the nation reveal. That term "intoxicated" doesn't mean a person who has had "one or two drinks" but a driver who is really blind, staggering drunk.

For years, safety officials pointed to speed or the vague term "driver error" as chief culprits in the highway death toll. Then, as more and more areas began taking breath and blood tests to determine whether persons in auto crashes had been drinking, overwhelming proof began to build up pointing out alcohol—large quantities of it—as the real cause in many fatal crashes.

Contrary to popular belief, the average "social drinker" is not the one primarily at fault in these cases, although anyone who has had even a few drinks is a more dangerous driver than someone who is sober.

A Department of Transportation report to Congress last year on alcohol and traffic safety revealed this startling fact:

"Research shows that more than half of adults use the highways at least occasionally after drinking (but) . . . the problem is primarily one of persons, predominantly men, who have been drinking heavily, to an extent rare among drivers not involved in crashes.

"Alcoholics and other problem drinkers . . . account for a very large part of the overall problem . . . Fatal and other crashes of teenagers and young adults also frequently involved hazardous amounts of alcohol . . ."

Former St. Louis County Coroner Raymond I. Harris, now chief legal investigator for the new county medical examiner's office, has made a careful study of factors involved in traffic fatalities.

"Definitely over 50 per cent of the fatalities in St. Louis County involve alcohol," Harris declares. "Last year, we had 147 fatalities and in 75 per cent of the crashes, alcohol was a factor."

He bases his figures on tests showing alcohol content in the blood, which is accepted by legal and scientific authorities as proof of the degree of intoxication.

Especially tragic in most alcohol-involved crashes, as Harris and other officials note, is the fact that much of the loss in life, limb and property damage involves completely innocent people.

Quite often the drunken driver survives a bloody crash that he caused, killing innocent children and adults. However, the drunk also is a frequent victim, particularly in single-car crashes with fixed objects at roadside.

Dr. Haddon says: "If we can find acceptable ways to identify the drunken driver and remove him from the highways until cured, we could save more than 25,000 lives each year"—including the lives of many of those same drunken drivers.

ALCOHOL AND HIGHWAY HOMICIDE: BREATH TEST IS EFFECTIVE TOOL IN PULLING DRUNK DRIVER OFF ROAD

"But officer, I'm not drunk. I've only had a couple of beers."

This is the common claim that police officers hear when they make an arrest for driving while intoxicated. It often is spoken in a slurred, tongue-thick tone that belies the claim.

For many years, police had only their powers of observation on which to base a charge of drunken driving, after having a suspect walk a straight line or take another familiar test.

When a case went to court, the defendant—sober and clear-voiced—would repeat his claim of having had only "a couple of beers" and not being intoxicated. It was the police officer's word against his. Judges and juries, more often than not, chose to give the defendant the benefit of the doubt and freed him—to drink and drive again.

Now, law enforcement officials have an effective tool to provide proof of intoxication—the chemical breath test.

These tests, used in almost every state including Missouri, are simple to give and to take, involving a few deep breaths blown into a tube connected to a small machine, either a breathalyzer or a slightly more complex intoximeter.

A sample of the exhaled air goes into a tube containing a chemical that changes color when exposed to alcohol. By measuring how much of the chemical changes color, operators of the machine can calculate accurately how much alcohol is in the blood of the person taking the test.

In Missouri, drunken drivers who take the breath test still get the benefit of the doubt, because a very high reading—.15 per cent—is required before the law considers it clear evidence of intoxication. A lower reading of .10 per cent can be considered, but only along with other evidence, the law states.

Scientific research has shown, beyond a shadow of a doubt, that the brain is affected by a blood alcohol level of only .04 per cent.

"After your blood alcohol level has reached .04 per cent, you are a highway hazard," a recent article in a leading medical magazine reported, "and your chances of an accident rise sharply after that if you continue drinking."

A special study done for the U.S. Department of Transportation showed that a driver's likelihood of causing a highway accident "begins to increase noticeably at about .04 per cent; at .06 per cent, it is twice as great as at .04 per cent; at .08 per cent, it is about four times as great; at .10 per cent, more than six times as great, and at .15 per cent, about 25 times as great."

The national highway safety standards call for all state laws to set .10 per cent as evidence of intoxication, instead of the higher .15 per cent that Missouri and several other states now have.

Anybody who has been drinking enough to show a blood-alcohol content of .10 per cent is a deadly menace behind a car's wheel, safety experts say.

Slowed reflexes and an impaired "sense of the car," which are basic to driving skill, are the main effects of alcohol in a driver's blood. Tests on professional racing drivers, who volunteered to drive over a test course after drinking various amounts, showed a definite drop in their driving ability at blood alcohol levels between .04 and .08 percent.

Some European countries, most recently Great Britain, have set .08 per cent and even lower levels as evidence of intoxication. Persons arrested after tests showing these blood-alcohol contents are subject to severe penalties.

In Missouri, the minimum penalty for driving while intoxicated is a $100 fine and automatic revocation of driving license for one year. Anyone who refuses to take a breath test after arrest on this charge also is subject to license revocation for a year. A person whose license is revoked can appeal to the court to have it reinstated if its loss is a "hardship," and the court usually grants the request.

Most persons convicted on a charge of drunken driving in Missouri have registered .15 per cent, or well above that level, in a breath test.

How much do you have to drink before your blood-alcohol content reaches that legally hazardous point of .15 per cent? It depends, mainly, on three factors: How much you weigh; how fast you drink and whether you drink after a full meal or on an empty stomach.

Alcohol goes directly into the blood stream after reaching the stomach and is absorbed by the body at a steady rate. Normally, about one ounce of whisky or one bottle of beer can be absorbed by a person of average weight in about an hour.

To reach a blood-alcohol content of .15 per cent, a 120-pound person has to have four drinks within an hour; a 150-pounder requires six drinks an hour and a 200-pounder, seven drinks. That's a lot more than the average "social drinker" drinks safety experts note.

Col. E. I. Hockaday, superintendent of the Missouri State Highway Patrol, reports that of more than 5,000 persons taking breathalyzer tests given by the patrol last year, 3,464 had blood-alcohol levels of .15 or over; 854 were between .10 and .15 per cent; 223 were under .10 and 55 were under .05 per cent.

A similarly high percentage of persons who are given the intoximeter test in St. Louis register above the .15 per cent mark, department records show.

"The simple fact is," Dr. William Haddon, former national director of highway safety, point out, "that the bulk of the problem is coming from people who have been drinking far more than what you would normally think of . . ."

In other words, a lot more than "a couple of beers."

ALCOHOL AND HIGHWAY HOMICIDE: FLAW IN LAW FREES DRUNKEN DRIVERS

Because of a flaw in the Missouri law, some persons charged with drunken driving are getting off scot-free even though breath tests showed they were very intoxicated at the time of their arrest.

This seems to be happening most often in St. Louis County, where last year an estimated 75 per cent of the traffic fatalities were caused by drunken driving.

In St. Louis and other parts of the state the flaw in the law is proving less of a problem in prosecuting cases of driving while intoxicated (DWI).

The loophole through which some persons charged with DWI are crawling to acquittal is a phrase in the statute requiring that the results of breath tests in DWI cases must be expressed in terms of "milligrams of alcohol per 100 milligrams of blood."

However, Missouri Division of Health regulations, under which operators of breath tests are licensed, state that alcoholic content of blood is based on "milligrams of alcohol per 100 milliliters of blood."

In other words, the statute requires a breath test reading based on weight of blood, while the actual tests produce results stated in terms of blood volume.

The difference, chemists and other experts agree, is minimal.

But it can loom large in legal procedure, as County Prosecuting Attorney Gene McNary and his assistants have learned.

"When defense lawyers started raising this defect in the intoxication test," McNary said, "we had to revert back to evidence based on overt signs of intoxication noted by the arresting officer.

"The test is no longer viable; we need a change in the law to make it read 'milliliters' instead of 'milligrams.' That would make it all right."

A simple change, but one that failed to pass when introduced in the last regular session of the State Legislature. McNary is hoping it will be introduced again and pass. Meanwhile, he is seriously hampered in prosecution of DWI cases.

Assistant Prosecuting Attorney Donald J. Weyerich said only about 20 per cent of the DWI cases now are going to trial. Of the rest, he said, about 25 per cent are convicted on pleas of guilty and the rest are being prosecuted on reduced charges—mainly because the prosecutor can no longer use breath tests results as reliable evidence in court.

McNary and Weyrich are hoping that television films made during questioning of drunken driving suspects can be a useful prosecution tool, if accepted as evidence, to support testimony by an arresting officer.

In a recent memorandum to all police chiefs in the county, McNary urged officers to "make detailed notes of subjects' actions" after DWI arrests. He also urged them to take suspects to a hospital to have a sample of blood drawn for alcohol-content testing in any cases involving a traffic fatality.

"Though our job of getting the drunken driver off the street is complicated by some inept legislation," McNary declared, "we must not let this deter us from stringent law enforcement and vigorous prosecution of the drunken driver."

Col. E. I. Hockaday, head of the Missouri State Highway Patrol, agrees that the state law needs a change to clarify wording in regard to breath tests. The difference between milligrams and milliliters is "so small you can dismiss it," he says, but the discrepancy can be used as a means of getting DWI cases dismissed or a drunk driving charge reduced.

The City of St. Louis has a good record of convictions in spite of the flaw in the law, Thomas W. Shannon, city prosecuting attorney, reports. He noted that many persons charged after a high reading on a breath test plead guilty. Last year his office handled 268 DWI cases and won 244 convictions, many on guilty pleas.

The county prosecutor's office has handled 526 DWI cases so far this year; of these 194 pleaded guilty and 71 went to trial. Reduced charges were filed for 261, because the prosecutor felt unable to present a good case without breath test results. Of those tried, 42 were convicted and 30 were acquitted.

Gerald L. Birnbaum, assistant prosecuting attorney, attributes much of the city's success in DWI cases to the type of intoxication test given by the St. Louis Police Department. He feels it is superior to the breathalyzer used in the county.

Also, Birnbaum said, a police chemist is available for testimony as an expert witness in DWI court hearings. The chemist simply transposes the intoximeter test results into milligrams through use of a mathematical formula, meeting requirements of the state law, he explained.

McNary said his office tried to use the county's one police chemist as an expert witness in a DWI case that was appealed from conviction in a magistrate court to a county circuit court. The higher court judge accepted the defense argument that the breathalyzer test was invalid under wording of the state law and ordered the jury to disregard the chemist's testimony.

The defendant, whose blood alcohol reading had been .24 per cent—well above the intoxication level—was acquitted.

ALCOHOL AND HIGHWAY HOMICIDE: STIFF FINES, JAIL TERMS REDUCE DRUNKEN DRIVING

The scene is a highway in Central Missouri. A car is weaving along from one traffic lane to the other, over the center line into the path of oncoming traffic. A highway patrolman spots the car before the almost inevitable crash occurs and orders the driver to the side of the road.

When the patrolman tells the driver, whose breath reeks of alcohol, that he is under arrest for driving while intoxicated, the driver looks at him anxiously and asks:

"My God, am I in Callaway County?"

The reason for the question is obvious to anyone knowing Magistrate Hugh P. Williamson, of Fulton, Mo., who hears most cases involving a charge of driving while intoxicated (DWI) in Callaway County.

During the last eight years, Judge Williamson has gained a reputation as a "tough" judge in drunken driving cases. It is a reputation he gladly acknowledges.

He believes that "drastic punishment does reduce drunken driving, which is a great menace . . . one of the most frequent causes of injury and death."

Under state law, the minimum punishment for DWI conviction is a fine of $100 and automatic revocation of a driver's license for a year. Williamson usually gives that minimum to persons charged with DWI who have taken a breathalyzer test registering .08 to .10 per cent alcohol content in the blood.

The law specifies that .15 per cent shall be considered clearcut evidence of intoxication. Amounts down to .05 per cent may be considered along with other evidence.

Williamson usually gives a stiff fine—$250 to $300—and a six-month jail term to persons with a blood-alcohol level of .15 per cent or above at time of arrest.

"I make them serve a portion of this term," Williamson said. "We have a system permitting them to come into jail at noon Saturday and stay until 5 p.m. Sunday, so they can hold a job and still serve time.

"Unless there are unusual circumstances, they serve four to six weekends. Then I usually suspend the rest of the sentence, but we still have a hold on them for all six months."

While Williamson believes his strict sentencing policy has reduced drunken driving in Callaway County, the lower number of DWI cases in his court in recent years may be caused, in part, by a practice that infuriates the magistrate. Some lawyers, he said, are being hired by DWI defendants to get a change of venue from Williamson's court to circuit court, by filing "a false affidavit" that the magistrate is prejudiced against their clients.

In the circuit court, Williamson said, DWI offenders rarely are given more than the minimum penalty and some cases "never come up for trial."

This lenient attitude toward drunken drivers has been more common in Missouri than the strict attitude of Magistrate Williamson, safety experts observe ruefully. DWI suspects whose cases are heard before juries also have a traditionally easier time getting an acquittal.

The reason for this lenient approach to drunken driving, most experts believe, is the mistaken impression most people have that drunken drivers are, like themselves, persons who just drink a little, socially.

The usual jury attitude, encouraged by astute defense lawyers, is, "There but for the grace of God go I," as they recall times they also drove a car after a few drinks.

What they fail to realize, safety experts point out, is that anybody with a blood-alcohol content of 10 per cent or more is drunk far beyond the limits of normal social drinking and is a serious hazard on the highway.

A flaw in the Missouri law that causes confusion about blood-alcohol tests is another factor defense lawyers use to get acquittal particularly from lenient judges and juries, in DWI cases.

These difficulties in getting conviction on DWI charges discourage police and prosecutors, observers point out. Much as they would like to take drunken drivers off the streets—seeing too many bloody crashes they have caused—police officers are undermined by the knowledge that a suspect might get off easily in court.

However, some magistrates believe that the automatic year's revocation of driver's license for a DWI conviction is too drastic a punishment in some drunken driving cases. This is why they sometimes will acquit a man when they know loss of a driver's license will cause loss of a job or other hardship.

St. Louis County Magistrate Harry J. Stussie, regarded as "tough" on drunken drivers, is one who believes the law should be changed to give judges more discretion in punishment.

It isn't fair, Stussie believes, for the same punishment to be given "to a guy who injures six people and a man who wiggles over a road line."

On the other hand, most law and safety officials believe that license revocation is the most effective means of keeping drunken drivers off the highways and that strict law enforcement reduces accidents.

A person who "wiggles over a line" because he is too drunk to drive properly might well have gone on to injure six persons—or kill that many—had he not been arrested, for DWI, they point out.

In Sweden, a person convicted of drunken driving gets a prisoner or "Work" sentence; even a prosperous businessman can be seen on a jail work crew if he has been caught for DWI. As a result, Swedes take their drunken driving laws so seriously, they arrange for a cab—or a car driven by a sober friend—to take them home if they have been drinking at a party or tavern.

Sweden's traffic fatality rate is half that of the United States.

In Great Britain, a recently passed law sets a blood-alcohol level of .08 per cent as proof of intoxication and forbids driving a car with that amount of alcohol or more in the blood. British police officers carry portable breath testing devices, which they use to screen possible violators of this law at the scene of the arrest.

In the first year the law was in effect, 1967, British traffic deaths fell 10 per cent—meaning 1,152 fewer persons were killed than in the previous year.

ALCOHOL AND HIGHWAY HOMICIDE: IT'S ALL TOO EASY FOR REPEATERS

A man arrested recently in St. Louis after his car went through a red traffic light, struck another car and killed its driver was found to have a record of 70 previous traffic arrests.

He had been convicted once of manslaughter, in a car crash that killed his own son, and had been convicted three times before for driving while intoxicated.

His license was under suspension at the time of his latest fatal crash and he was driving with an apparently fraudulent receipt for a chauffeur's license.

The public, appalled that a man with such a record still would be able to drive—and kill—again and again, asks how such a thing can happen.

The answer: All too easily.

In fact, safety experts and researchers have found that drivers with long histories of arrests and serious accidents related to heavy drinking cause a very large number of the auto fatalities in this country.

The 1968 Alcohol and Highway Safety Report, made to Congress by the Department of Transportation, reviewed existing research and made this statement:

"Alcoholics and other problem drinkers, who constitute but a small minority of the general population (about 4 per cent), account for a very large part of the overall problem. . . .

"There are at present virtually no programs in the country in which alcoholism specialists and medical and behavioral scientists participate in the evaluation of people coming to attention because of alcohol-related highway problems, to determine the types of drinkers involved, and to reduce repetition in the future. . . ."

Ordinary forms of traffic law enforcement and punishment on conviction prove to have little effect on the habitual heavy drinker, the report also notes. Perhaps, it suggests, corrective measures such as referral to alcoholism treatment centers may have greater success.

Dr. Norvin C. Kiefer, chief medical director of the Equitable Life Assurance Society, agrees with this suggestion, saying:

"A drunken driver may be fined or imprisoned. He or his friends pay the fine or he serves his prison term, but he still is an alcoholic. His license to drive may be revoked; frequently he continues to drive without it. The fundamental need is to control his basic disease: alcoholism."

And Dr. William Haddon Jr., who was the first director of the National Highway Safety Bureau, gives these views on the subject:

"Alcoholics, that is, sick drinkers, account for at least 60 per cent of the alcohol-involved serious crashes. . . . Experts on alcoholism, physicians and psychologists should be working with police groups, licensing agencies and the court in trying to identify kinds of drinkers. . . . It doesn't make sense to risk an alcoholic to control himself. He needs treatment."

(Dr. Haddon left the national bureau post this year to become president of the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety. As yet, President Nixon has appointed nobody to replace him.)

St. Louis has an internationally recognized treatment center for alcoholics at the bottom rung of society's ladder, the Skid Row variety. It is called the St. Louis Detoxification Center, located on the grounds of St. Louis State Hospital.

Dr. Joseph B. Kendis, medical director of the detoxification center, said in a recent interview he sees no reason why alcoholics involved in serious highway crashes could not be treated effectively in a program designed for that purpose.

The detoxification center, set up to treat persons picked up for public drunkenness, would not be the appropriate place for an alcoholic driver program, Dr. Kendis said.

But he added that the state has excellent alcoholism treatment centers at each of its state hospitals that probably could provide this service.

Acknowledging that little research has been done by alcoholism experts on the problem of drunken driving, Dr. Kendis said it is possible that alcoholics feel a compulsion to drive just as they do to drink. After all, he noted, "an alcoholic is a person running away from reality," and an auto represents a means of flight.

"It would be an excellent idea to evaluate persons involved in alcohol-related accidents to find out if they are hard-core drinkers," the physician said. "This can be done by talks with family, working associates, the person himself. . . ."

Raymond I. Harris, a former St. Louis County magistrate and now chief investigator for the medical examiner's office, would like to see reinstated a program he started in 1954, of substituting a driver-education course for a fine or jail sentence in traffic cases.

Incorporated in such an adult driving course could be discussion of the problem of drunken driving, perhaps with a psychiatrist or psychologist, he said.

The Insurance Institute for Highway Safety, identifying the alcoholic or problem drinker as a "major factor in fatal crashes," suggests that state and local programs could be developed to cope with this serious problem.

Such a program, the institute says, could be "aimed at identifying, isolating and treating alcoholics and pre-alcoholics discovered on the highway, possibly substituting therapy for fines, jail sentences or revocation of licenses. . . ."

Also suggested is an enforcement or probational program "designed to keep unlicensed drivers off the road while they are under suspension of revocation, including the possibility of suspending the registration plates of the offender's vehicle."

What is important, all the experts agree, is to keep the alcoholic from driving until he can be cured of alcoholism.

DRUNK DRIVING—THE SURE ROAD TO SORROW

Anybody who doubts that alcohol plays a dominant role in the causes of fatal highway crashes should go to the City Morgue and read over a few inquest reports.

Time after time he will see a pencilled notation that a blood-alcohol test was made on a driver killed in a crash that probably killed others too.

Such tests are not always made, morgue officials say, because crash victims sometimes die several days after the accident, or else they are too young to have been drinking.

However, in nearly 20 per cent of the tests made on persons who have died in St. Louis this year from highway collisions, the blood-alcohol content was .10 per cent or above—evidence of heavy drinking.

St. Louis Police Department records for last year show that of the 115 persons fatally injured in city accidents, blood-alcohol analysis was procured from 61 persons; of these, 33—or 54.1 per cent—had a blood-alcohol content of .06 to .33 per cent.

The St. Louis County medical examiner's office records show that as of Sept. 1 this year, 35 of the 101 traffic fatalities in the county "definitely involved alcohol."

All the records show that the largest number of traffic fatalities occur in the late-night, early-morning hours, on weekends and holidays—all times when the most people are drinking.

Former County Coroner Raymond I. Harris feel that almost all serious crashes involving young drivers are alcohol-related.

"Drinks affect teen-agers differently from adults," Harris points out.

It takes less alcohol to intoxicate a teenager, for one thing, he noted, and youngsters rarely are alone in a car; they usually have several friends or a date, and especially after drinking, want to "show off" by speeding and taking unnecessary risks.

Even at a low level of intoxication, alcohol slows the reflexes of an adult or youngster, Harris pointed out; for example, it takes an intoxicated driver longer to get his foot off the accelerator and onto the brake.

"Anyone with enough alcohol in his system to register .15 per cent on a breath test," Harris said, "has reflexes that are slowed three times what they would be when he's sober. At 60 miles per hour, it normally takes about one second to put on the brakes. It takes a drunk driver three seconds.

"Since a car going 60 mph travels 90 feet a second, this means that the car goes 270 feet before the driver has reacted properly to a situation."

That situation could be a child darting into the street, a sharp curve in the road or a slower moving vehicle just ahead.

The problem is a nationwide one. At least half of all U.S. traffic fatalities each year are related to drinking.

About 44 per cent of the drivers killed in crashes are innocent victims of drunken drivers, according to national surveys of traffic fatalities.

The problem is—How to get drunk drivers off the roads?

This series has posed that question to a wide variety of experts in the field of traffic safety and law enforcement. Their answers vary but all agree that solutions to this problem must be found.

Here are some of the necessary steps they say must be taken in Missouri:

One. A change in the state law to clear up confusion over breath tests given in driving-while-intoxicated cases; if one word, "milligrams," were changed to "milliliters," a flaw in this law now hampering prosecution of DWI cases would be corrected.

Two. Lowering of the legal definition of positive intoxication from the present .15 per cent reading in a breath test to .10 per cent, which is only reached after a person has had much more to drink than the normal social drinker and his driving ability is badly impaired.

Three. Strict law enforcement, vigorous prosecution and uniformly severe sentencing on conviction of drunken driving.

Four. Simpler procedures for giving breath tests, possibly with portable equipment for police officers like that being used for screening drunk driving suspects in Britain.

Five. A program of treatment for alcoholics and problem drinkers arrested for traffic violations, to keep them off the highways until they are cured of the disease of alcoholism.

Six. Increased awareness by everyone who drives after drinking, even occasionally, that his chances of causing a serious accident are far greater than when he is sober.

Anyone who feels he must drive after drinking should at least wait an hour, without having anything to drink or sipping some non-alcoholic beverage like coffee, before he takes the wheel. Good hosts and hostesses should make their guests' "last one for the road" coffee.

What is needed most of all, safety experts stress, is an end to public apathy about the nation's traffic death toll.

Officials of Allstate Insurance Co., which is conducting a vigorous promotion campaign against drunken driving, estimate that 56,900 Americans will die in traffic crashes this year and 35,0000 of those crashes will involve drunk drivers.

No wonder they feel, as does everyone who studies the reasons behind the rising rate of highway homicide, that the drunk is the No. 1 menace on the roads today.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I support S. 3835, the proposed "Federal Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970," which I am privileged to cosponsor. The energy which Senator HUGHES has displayed in assembling this broad program to combat the destructive effects of alcohol on 9 million Americans is characteristic of the courage, imagination, and leadership with which he is serving the needs of the American people.

Alcohol abuse, the fourth most serious illness in America in terms of fatalities, is a complex social and medical problem costing an unbearable toll in human suffering, wasted resources, and wasted lives. S. 3835, with its far-reaching provisions for research, treatment, and prevention of alcoholism, can significantly reduce this toll on American society.

The cost to the American economy through the drain of Federal, State, and local resources attributed to the misuse of alcohol is enormous. In Los Angeles County alone, in excess of $73 million was spent on alcohol-related government services, including court and legal expenses, law enforcement functions, and hospital services during 1968–69.

In San Diego County, the burden of alcoholism and alcohol-related problems has increased significantly in recent years. Over the past 5 years, the county's alcoholic detoxification case load has doubled. It has been estimated that 80,000 of the county's 1.4 million residents are alcoholics. This year the county plans to expand and improve its detoxification program in order to increase its ability to provide medical care for those apprehended as a result of drunkeness, to reduce the number of alcoholics receiving criminal records, and provide a more positive environment in which to motivate patients to help themselves. The funds authorized in S. 3835 are most important to the success of this and similar efforts on the local and State levels.

Similarly, in San Francisco there are an estimated 48,000 alcoholics and 100,000 problem drinkers. According to the San Francisco branch of the National Council on Alcoholism, the programs and approaches contained in S. 3835 are vital to any effort to deal effectively with this grave social problem.

Alcohol also presents a serious problem to industry, resulting in an estimated $7 billion annual loss through alcohol-associated absenteeism, accidents, and reduction in worker efficiency.

While this cost in economic resources is vast, the cost in human suffering is far more disastrous. In the past 9 years, 437,000 Americans have died on the Nation's highways—more than 10 times the toll of the war in Vietnam. More than 30 percent of all traffic fatalities are caused by drunken drivers.

The millions of Americans in mourning for family members killed in automobile accidents are joined by millions whose lives, along with the lives of those close to them, have been more subtly destroyed by alcohol abuse. Alcohol abuse, destroying family relations, often rendering an individual unfit for employment, takes a terrible toll in wasted lives, from the skid-row derelict to the white-collar commuter who escapes through alcohol.

Consumption of alcohol is so pervasive at all levels of our society—and unlike the problems of drug abuse is not commonly associated with crime—that Americans have tended not to regard alcoholism as appropriate for urgent national attention and action. In recent years, however, alcoholism has begun to be approached as a medical problem, and progress has been made in developing psychiatric and medical treatments for alcohol abuse and alcoholism.

S. 3835 will authorize appropriation of funds necessary for giving rehabilitation services to all those who need help. The bill firmly establishes that alcohol abuse is a medical, not a criminal problem, and sets an example for the rest of the country in its treatment of alcoholism among employees of the Federal Government.

In addition, the provision for research gives great hope for discovery of the biological basis of chronic alcoholism, the key to a medical cure.

In my statement of May 14, when Senator HUGHES introduced S. 3835, I offered caveats on a number of provisions of S. 3835, many of them dealing with veterans' matters which are presently under study by the Subcommittee on Veterans' Affairs, of which I am chairman. I have been conferring with officials in the Veterans' Administration and elsewhere about these provisions, which have been deleted from the reported bill. They will be dealt with separately in the Veterans' Affairs Subcommittee in coordination with Senator HUGHES' subcommittee.

In addition, I am pleased to note that the provision for expansion of health insurance plans available to Federal employees, which, in the original bill could have been construed to apply to existing as well as future policies and plans, has been made applicable to prospective insurance policies only in the reported bill.

There are few problems facing American society that are as destructive of human and economic resources and yet hold as great a promise for solution as that of alcohol abuse and alcoholism. The bill which Senator HUGHES has proposed is a long needed first step in attacking this vicious problem. I congratulate and thank the distinguished Senator from Iowa for his outstanding leadership on this bill.

I also wish to extend my appreciation to the distinguished Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) the ranking member of both the full committee and the subcommittee, and the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK). Their sustained interest and bipartisan cooperation was most helpful in the consideration of this legislation.

I ask unanimous consent that a letter and resolution I recently received from the county of San Diego in support of S. 3835 be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter

and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AUGUST 6, 1970.

DEAR SENATOR CRANSTON: On August 4, 1970 the San Diego County Board of Supervisors passed a resolution supporting Senate Bill 3835, "The Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970."

This bill has particular significance to the County of San Diego. Recent estimates indicate that 80,000 of our 1.4 million residents are alcoholics. During the period July, 1968 through February, 1969, there were 5,315 drunk bookings in the San Diego City jail and an additional 5,200 bookings for drunk driving. These statistics only serve to echo the extent of the problem indicated in the hearings of the Senate Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Narcotics.

Over the past five years the County's alcoholic detoxification case load has doubled. Most treatment has taken place in our jail facilities. However, this year we plan to move the detoxification program into a new center separate from the jail. Persons apprehended as a result of drunkenness will be given the option to be admitted to the detoxification center rather than go to jail. This will increase our ability to provide medical care, reduce the number of alcoholics receiving criminal records, and provide a more positive environment in which to motivate patients to help themselves.

We have budgeted $125,700 for the detoxification program this fiscal year. However, Federal and State assistance, as proposed in S. 3835, will be necessary to meet the full budgeted amount.

We know that as a sponsor of the bill, you will give it your full support when it comes before the Senate. I hope the formal endorsement by the Board of Supervisors will be of assistance toward that end. If I can help in any way, please give me a call.

Sincerely,

ROGER F. HONBERGER,
Deputy Administrative Officer,
County of San Diego.

RESOLUTION URGING CONGRESS TO ENACT U.S. SENATE BILL 3835, COMPREHENSIVE ALCOHOL ABUSE AND ALCOHOLISM PREVENTION, TREATMENT AND REHABILITATION ACT OF 1970

On the motion of Supervisor Craven, seconded by Supervisor Austin, the following resolution is adopted:

Whereas, the Congress of the United States finds that Alcohol abuse and alcoholism are illnesses or diseases that require treatment through health rehabilitation services and are rapidly increasing throughout the country; and

Whereas, Alcohol abuse and alcoholism are found in virtually every community and should be treated and controlled utilizing the full range of health services provided by both governmental and private agencies; and

Whereas, Members of the United States Senate have introduced S. 3835 the "Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970" which provides for Federal Support of State, Local Government and Private Agency Alcoholism treatment and control programs; and

Whereas, the County of San Diego, aware of the severity of Alcohol abuse and alcholism, has a program for the medical and professional treatment of Alcoholism and is continuing in its efforts to develop a comprehensive alcoholism treatment program.

Therefore, be it resolved by the Board of Supervisors of the County of San Diego:

That this Board does hereby urge the enactment by the Congress of the United States of S. 3835, the "Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment and Rehabilitation Act of 1970", introduced by Senator Hughes and 37 other Senators.

Be it further resolved and ordered, that the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors is directed to send copies of this Resolution to the co-authors of S. 3835, Chairman of the committees which will hear S. 3835 and other State and Federal agencies as are appropriate.

Passed and adopted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of San Diego, State of California, this 4th day of August, 1970, by the following vote:

Ayes: Supervisors Boney, Scheidle, Austin, Craven.

Noes: Supervisors, None.

Absent: Supervisor Walsh.

In accordance with the previous order, the following statement of Senator YARBOROUGH is printed in the RECORD at this point:

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, S. 3835 is before the Senate for consideration this morning largely due to the untiring efforts and perseverance of Senator Harold Hughes of Iowa, Chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Narcotics of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. I wish to express my deep appreciation to the Senator from Iowa for the dedication and single-mindedness with which he has urged the committee to develop legislation to meet this most serious problem of alcoholism. Senator Hughes has dramatically brought home to the Senate of the United States the scope of this blight from which over nine million Americans suffer.

Since I appointed Senator Hughes Chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Narcotics in April 1969, he has held extensive hearings in Los Angeles, New York City, and Washington, D.C. As a member of the subcommittee I had the pleasure of participating in many of these hearings. They were among the most informative I have ever attended, and they produced an invaluable record which for the first time has gathered together in one place a large body of information on alcoholism. This information will enable the Senate to act on a truly informed basis.

There is strong support for S. 3835. It has the endorsement of the American Medical Association, the North American Association of Alcoholism Programs, the National Council on Alcoholism, the National Association of State Mental Health Program Directors, the American Public Health Association and many other organizations and individuals.

The hearings held by Senator Hughes brought out the fact that alcoholism costs our society from $4 to $7 billion every year in economic waste: absenteeism, sick benefits, accidents on the job, mistakes in industrial production.

The hearings also showed that alcoholism is the number one problem on our public highways. Approximately 50% of all highway fatalities can be attributed to problem drinkers. Eight hundred thousand crashes and 25,000 deaths each year are attributed to problem drinking or alcoholism. No one can calculate the cost to our nation in broken families, early deaths, mental illness, emotionally disturbed children, loss of human dignity and respect, which is the result of the dread disease of alcoholism.

Dr. Roger O. Egeberg, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, testified that alcoholism is "one of the most prevalent, destructive, costly, and tragic forms of illness in the United States."

To meet the problem of alcoholism it will take a total effort of the entire Nation, at all levels of government, to make significant progress in controlling alcoholism. The legislation presently before the Senate sets out a plan by which the Federal Government can assume its appropriate responsibility and leadership in this effort.

The bill would:

Establish a national health institute for dealing specifically with alcoholism—the National Institute for the Prevention and Control of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism,

Require the Secretary of HEW to submit to the Congress, by June 30, 1971, a report on the health consequences of the use of alcohol, similar to the Surgeon General's report on smoking and the upcoming report on the use of marijuana,

Require the U.S. Civil Service Commission to guarantee persons afflicted with alcoholism the same employment conditions and benefits as persons who are ill from other causes,

Require federal agencies to establish programs for dealing with alcohol abuse among federal employees,

Authorize grants totaling $75 million over the next three years to help states develop and administer programs for dealing with alcoholism,

Authorize grants totaling $320 million over the next three years to state and local agencies, both public and private, to help finance specific projects,

Establish an independent National Advisory Council on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism and an Intergovernmental Coordinating Council on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism to insure coordination of federal efforts.

Mr. President, I again congratulate the Senator from Iowa for his perseverance, legislative ability and diligence in bringing this bill to the Senate floor for our consideration.

I heartily recommend the passage of S. 3835.

In accordance with the previous order, the following statement of Senator RANDOLPH is printed in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, I join the distinguished Chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Narcotics, on which I am privileged to serve, in commending to the Senate the "Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970."

There are approximately 9 million Americans suffering from compulsive overuse of alcohol. However, the numbers of persons actually directly affected by alcoholism in our society is many times that number—families, victims of highway accidents, victims of crime in which alcohol is a contributory factor, and the employer whose business operations are crippled by absenteeism and inefficiency. It has been estimated that 75 million Americans are directly and tragically affected by this illness. Alcoholism has been classified as our Nation's 4th most serious health problem. Last year, more than half of the 56,400 highway deaths came in accidents caused by drinking drivers—most of them problem drinkers. The human waste caused by alcoholism is tragic. Equally unacceptable is the economic waste which has been estimated at $7 billion a year.

The legislation before us today will provide the necessary means for a coordinated and effective attack on the problems of alcoholism in America at the Federal, State, and local levels. It is long overdue. Of primary importance in this effort is the official recognition of alcoholism as an illness and not a crime. The bill will establish a National Institute for the Prevention and Control of Alcoholic Abuse and Alcoholism within the Public Health Service to coordinate all Federal health, rehabilitation, and other social programs related to the prevention and treat-

ment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism. It will provide Federal assistance to State and local programs to promote effective treatment and rehabilitation programs for alcoholics throughout the country. It sets out procedures for prevention and treatment of alcohol abuse and alcoholism among all Federal Government employees.

The time has come to put as great an effort and investment in curing people and saving lives as we have been putting into apprehending and punishing those caught up in this addiction.

Alcoholism is a problem of our entire society. It will require a total effort and commitment by our whole Nation. We must be prepared to invest at all levels of our government in contrast to the relative pittance that is being put into existing programs.

I am confident that this measure will provide the necessary mandate to begin to resolve this crisis situation in America. The landmark legislation before us is a tribute to the leadership and dedication of the Chairman of the Special Subcommittee (Mr. HUGHES). His efforts in this field will be the lifeline for many Americans.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that comments that would have been made by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS) be printed in the RECORD at this point. The Senator from New Jersey is absent from the Senate because, as chairman of the Special Committee on Aging, he is away from the city conducting hearings and is unable to be present.

There being no objection, the statement of Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LANDMARK IN SOCIAL-MEDICAL LEGISLATION

Mr. WILLIAMS of New Jersey. It is with a great deal of pleasure that I rise to support passage of S. 3835, the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970.

The Bill is the first substantive Federal legislation to declare unequivocally that alcoholism is a disease and then provides for medical treatment of this disease on a national scale. The Courts have addressed themselves to this problem but response to their decisions has been far less than the needs this Bill is designed to meet.

I wish to commend the distinguished Chairman of the Special Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Narcotics, Senator Hughes, for his tireless dedication, legislative skill and deft handling of this bill from date of introduction only three months ago to its consideration on the floor of the Senate today.

I am truly impressed with the skill with which this Bill has been guided through hearings and executive session consideration. Senator Hughes' willingness to hear all viewpoints and to work with all interested in the Bill has resulted in legislation that is truly a milestone in the field of social-medical legislation.

It is significant that the Bill was reported unanimously by both the Subcommittee and the full Labor & Public Welfare Committee. And again, tribute must be paid to Senator Hughes for a unanimity achieved with no sacrifice of a single significant particular of the Bill.

As an original co-sponsor of S. 3835, I am very pleased to see it include establishment of the National Institute for the Prevention and Control of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. Institute status should insure high visibility for this program and will permit line item consideration of funding for research and rehabilitation technique development. I am confident that the discretion the Bill affords to the Secretary of H.E.W., in placing this institute in its proper structural and administrative position within the Department, will be justified. It is essential that the Secretary declare the Department's deep commitment to the philosophy and programs contained in S. 3835. This can best be done by insuring the independence of the Institute and supporting full appropriations for the educational, rehabilitation and program coordination efforts of the Institute and the National Advisory Council on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism.

Congress has legislated previously in P.L. 89–749; P.L. 90–174; P.L. 9–574, and other laws, to help solve the problem of alcohol abuse and rehabilitation. But, admittedly, there was not sufficient momentum or follow-up. The problem was and is massive and these prior legislative efforts were just not up to the task. However, in S. 3835, we have the comprehensive and coordinated national effort that we so urgently need.

I wholeheartedly support this legislation and urge its immediate passage by the Senate. Both Senate and House must have the opportunity to legislate on this important issue in this Congress. I support the Bill and urge Members of both Houses to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

So the bill (S. 3835) was passed.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

Mr. HUGHES. I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order the Senator from Missouri is recognized.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17711) to amend the District of Columbia Association Act. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the report.

(For conference report, see House proceedings of August 6, 1970, p. 27622, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate agree to the conference report.

The motion was agreed to.

ABM REVISITED

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, once again the logic of military technology tempts us to build what can be built, whether we need it or not.

Once again our fears in an unstable world urge us to take steps willy-nilly which can only make the world more fearsome and unstable.

Once again we are asked to deny the American people the use of their own wealth for things that really count in human terms, and to spend it instead for protection against a threat generated in part by our own past military authorizations.

And once again we have an opportunity to assert some mastery, however small at first, over the continuing arms cycle that has engulfed us.

The history of the ABM offers an instructive lesson in the insidious mechanism of the arms race. Advances in technology made an anti-ballistic-missile system an interesting scientific possibility—"one rifle bullet hitting another" as scientists put it in 1955.

This concept has grown and changed during the intervening 15 years. As the Nike-Zeus begat the Nike X, and the Nike X begat the Sentinel, and the Sentinel begat the Safeguard, now the Safeguard has begotten this year's limited Safeguard.

Spurred on by the possibility of an ABM, technology has simultaneously produced ABM counterweapons—MRV's, MIRV's, penetration aids of all sorts, and a myriad of other sophisticated plans to neutralize it.

Penetration methods sketched out on drawing boards in the late 1950s and early 1960s are now deadly reality. They are being tested and deployed.

In one example of this phenomenon—perhaps the most ludicrous investment in national insecurity ever made by any country, anytime, anywhere—the U.S.S.R. deployed fewer than 64 ABM's around Moscow. In response, over 5,000 additional MIRV'ed warheads will be added to our arsenal to "insure penetration and a continued high level of assured destruction capability."

Now, in 1970, MIRV's and ABM's threaten to set off another round in the arms race—a totally useless round, because it will not give us more protection. The Pentagon predicates its ABM case on the fear that the United States will not be able to absorb a first strike and still maintain assured destruction capability—the ability to destroy 25 percent of the Soviet population and at least 50 percent of Soviet industry.

Of course, our assured destruction capability must be maintained. If it is not, and we revert to the "launch on sighting" doctrine, the decision to end civilization

may be made by some machine. The time between sighting incoming enemy missiles and the decision to launch before the impact is so short that Dr. Herbert York states:

The decision to launch our missiles must be made either by a computer, by a preprogrammed President, or by some preprogrammed delegate of the President. There will be no time to stop and think about what the signals mean or to check to see whether they might somehow be false alarms. The decisions will have to be made on the basis of electronic signals electronically analyzed, in accordance with a plan worked out long before by a political analyst in an antiseptic and unreal atmosphere. In effect, not even the President, let alone the Congress, would really be a party to the ultimate decision to end civilization.

I would vote for Safeguard if it were necessary to maintain the credibility of our deterrent.

But it is not.

Our second strike retaliatory capability is not based solely—or even primarily—on ICBM's, which the ABM is designed partially to protect.

And I have yet to hear anyone argue persuasively that our 41 Polaris submarines with their 900 nuclear warheads—about 5,500 when Poseidon is added by the mid-1970's, our Strategic Air Force bombers, tactical nuclear weapons in Europe, capable of reaching the Soviet Union, and an unspecified number of nuclear weapons at other foreign bases can all be almost simultaneously obliterated.

However, if indeed our deterrent is threatened and if indeed we must protect our Minuteman missiles, Safeguard is far from the best way to do it.

As I stated of the ABM last year:

Its indispensible components are a complex radar system and its complex computers. Each ABM site depends on one radar and should it break down or be destroyed, all intercept missiles would be useless.

And yet this extremely expensive radar system, according to most estimates, is ten times more vulnerable than the offensive missiles it must defend. The Soviet Union could target their SS–11's with far smaller payloads against the radar, either exhausting the supply of missiles available to protect it or destroying it with a smaller payload carried by the SS–11. In so doing, the Soviets would be able to target the larger SS–9 at the missile silos where the larger 5-megaton warhead is essential.

I see nothing in the testimony offered this year to indicate this major problem has been overcome.

In fact, certain developments have made this fragile radar even more vulnerable. For instance, on August 1 the Washington Post reported the new version of Russia's SS–11 ICBM carrying multiple reentry vehicles was fired into the Pacific test area twice that 1 week.

According to this report, the reentry vehicles were new devices intended to fool Safeguard antimissile radars. Further, the Post reported that highly authoritative sources confirmed that each missile carried more than one such vehicle and described the new penetration aids as pretty good ones, indicating that they were heavier and more sophisticated than such relatively simple devices as balloons and wire chaff that are often used to foil radars.

Obviously, pretty good SS–11 decoys will pose an even greater threat to the survival of Safeguard's lone radar or the effectiveness of its limited number of interceptors.

Prominent members of the scientific community have adjudged that Safeguard is not cost effective. As Sidney Drell, a member of the O'Neill panel on Safeguard convened by Dr. John Foster, stated in June of this year:

All analyses of which I am aware make it clear that if defense of Minuteman is the principal or sole mission of Safeguard, its further deployment cannot be justified.

Further indictments of Safeguard's adequacy come from Jerome B. Weisner, Presidential Science Advisor to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson; Herbert F. York, Director of Defense Research and Engineering under President Eisenhower; Wolfgang K. H. Panofsky, director of the Stanford Linear Accelerator; Marvin L. Goldberger, member of the O'Neill panel on Safeguard, and Herbert Scoville, Jr., former Deputy Director of Research for the CIA, and former Assistant Director of Science and Technology at the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, all of whom joined to state:

The protection offered by Safeguard for the Minuteman is negligible. Even if Safeguard functions perfectly, it offers significant protection to Minuteman only over a very narrow band of threats; if the threat continues to grow as rapidly as it is at present, Safeguard is obsolete before deployed; if the threat levels off, Safeguard is not needed. For Safeguard to have any significant effectiveness at all in protecting Minuteman, the Soviets would have to "tailor" their threat to correspond to it.

The point is this: Safeguard is not needed—it evolved.

In 1955, an area defense role against Russia was envisioned for the Nike Zeus. But its four cumbersome radars and its one-on-one missile concept were both costly and technologically infeasible. Then Nike X added the Sprint missile and its missile site radar—MSR—to the carryover Zeus interceptor.

With the subsequent discovery that the larger Spartan warhead could kill incoming missiles "out of atmosphere" with the help of a perimeter acquisition radar—PAR—the Spartans and PAR's were joined with the short range Sprint and the MSR's in what was considered a quantam jump in ABM technology.

Dubbed the Sentinel in 1967, 480 Spartans and 192 Sprints were to provide a limited area defense against "the Chinese threat."

When public outcry arose against Sentinel—because it required giant nuclear warheads to be stationed in the suburbs—the rationale changed again.

The "versatile" Safeguard was unveiled soon thereafter. Safeguard was supposed to protect our land-based retaliatory forces against direct Soviet attack, the American people against "primitive" Chinese attack, and the United States against accidental attack or an attack from any other source.

The major components of Safeguard have been around for quite some time; only the rationale and mix have changed, apparently to protect continued deployment.

This year, the basic Safeguard system was left intact, but the rationale changed again. Two of the three reasons designated by President Nixon in his March 14, 1969, statement—light area defense against Communist China and general protection against an accidental attack—were rejected by the Armed Services Committee, further compromising a bad system. For if area defense is not required, the long-range Spartan missile needed to kill incoming missiles far from cities makes little sense in a system which can allow a near miss.

Instead of addressing themselves to whether Safeguard is needed, will work, or is the best system to protect our land-based deterrent, should that necessity arise, the proponents of expansion have fallen back to yet another rationale: "The ABM is needed as a 'bargaining chip' in SALT talks."

What kind of "bargaining chip" is Safeguard?

I believe a negligible one.

If we accept the administration arguments that the Russians fear Safeguard only because it might be extended nationwide to threaten the Soviet second strike capability, then the Senate Armed Services Committee has itself taken away the greatest supposed "bargaining chip" by refusing to authorize further area defense.

The Senate Armed Services Committee report also states:

The Secretary of Defense, the Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and others argued forcefully that unilateral termination of the Safeguard program would undermine the American negotiating posture and diminish, rather than increase the likelihood of a successful agreement (at SALT).

If we accept this, there is no need to vote against Hart-Cooper because Hart-Cooper does not call for "unilateral termination" of the Safeguard program. In fact, it authorizes:

Continued research and development.

Continued deployment of phase I of Safeguard.

An accumulative investment of $2 billion since fiscal year 1970.

Deployment of several times the number of deployed Soviet antiballistic missiles.

This is hardly "unilateral suspension." Considering the infirmities of Safeguard, I do not think Hart-Cooper goes far enough. I have therefore joined with Senator HUGHES in an amendment that would apply the new Pentagon slogan "Fly before you buy" to the ABM by requiring further research and development before deployment.

But perhaps the most farfetched question was rhetorically offered to the Members of this body last Wednesday:

If the Senate stops the forward motion of the Safeguard program, what are our negotiators in the SALT talks going to offer the Russians as an inducement to stop building their SS–9's?

That inducement, quite simply, is the knowledge that we, in the United States,

have the economic resources and the technological ability to do what is necessary to protect our security—and to do it in an effective manner.

They know, as we do, that unless reasonable men agree to limit the weapons of destruction, we can and will build more—to everyone's detriment.

Do we really believe that because the Senate refuses to expand the questionable system, the United States no longer cares to maintain an adequate deterrent? I think not. And the Soviets are not so naive.

They know, as surely as we do, that if we enter into competition for a new generation of weapons of destruction, security for everyone is diminished.

And they know, as I know we do, that there is much work that both governments must be about. Inflation, pollution, education, health, and a myriad of other problems which breed discontent all require a more rational distribution of national resources to meet national needs.

This knowledge on both sides is why we bargain.

We have already begun to deploy MIRV's on Minuteman III and Poseidon. Work on ULMS continues. And we have the technical ability to eventually build a hard-point missile defense to do what Safeguard cannot. We are not standing still.

Yes, we both have the ability to build new and even more deadly systems of death if we must.

But in the final analysis, if agreement is to be reached—either implicit through mutual restraint or explicit through formalized SALT agreements—it is this knowledge that will bring the arms race to an end.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG) is recognized for 30 minutes.

SEA BURIAL OF NERVE GAS ROCKETS WHICH NEVER SHOULD HAVE BEEN PURCHASED AND STORED

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it is amazing and terrifying that Army officers are now in the process of shipping 3,000 tons of nerve gas rockets encased in sealed concrete and steel coffins or boxes to Florida from whence all this lethal material will then be conveyed, according to the present plans, some 250 miles out into the Atlantic and sunk. It is claimed that these tons of nerve gas rockets can be safely transported by rail from its present storage depots at Anniston, Ala., and Lexington, Ky., through North Carolina and other Southern States to this destination.

Mr. President, I denounce Department of Defense officials for purchasing and maintaining this huge amount of nerve gas for possible use in putting down riots in our country and for possible use in warfare. Pentagon officials disclose that this is but one-ninth of the total amount of nerve gas which had been purchased with American taxpayers' money.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I yield.

Mr. DOMINICK. I think I heard the Senator correctly, but I just want to make sure. I may be wrong, but I thought I heard the Senator say the nerve gas was to be used for putting down riots in our country. That is not so. It was for possible use in war.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. I hope the Senator from Colorado is correct. I was told by a Pentagon official that that was one purpose of it, but I hope that is not true. I hope the Senator from Colorado is right, because it was shocking to me to be told that.

Mr. DOMINICK. The nerve gas, of course, was produced many years ago. It is nothing new. In other words, it was not produced under this administration or this Secretary of Defense.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Yes, indeed. I did not mean to imply, nor would I assert, that the present administration had anything to do with the accumulation of the nerve gas. It had been going on over many years preceding the present administration.

Mr. DOMINICK. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, there is no rhyme nor reason nor cause for our procuring these nerve gas rockets in the first instance at great expense to our taxpayers.

In addition, the American people should know that the United States is not a signatory to the Geneva Convention outlawing the use of chemical and biological materials in warfare. The truth is that of all the great nations of the world, the United States stands alone among the great powers in failing to enter this covenant.

I hope that will be changed within the near future.

Mr. President, there should be a congressional investigation to determine what poison gases Pentagon officials have purchased and still have in the vaults at various Army bases in our country and overseas. Then, of course, the facts disclosed should be revealed to the American people. Our citizens are entitled to be fully informed regarding operations of top officials of our Defense Department in procuring and storing such huge amounts of nerve gas.

MURDER ON KENT STATE UNIVERSITY CAMPUS

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, officials of the Department of Justice have made an extensive investigation of the tragedy on the campus at Kent State University on May 4, 1970. Shortly after high noon on that beautiful, warm Monday, at a time the university was in operation and students were attending classes and had every right to be on their own campus and many were necessarily there going to and from classes, Ohio National Guardsmen at about 12:22 p.m. shot a volley killing four students and seriously wounding nine others.

More than 100 FBI agents made on-the-spot investigations interviewing students, members of the faculty, guardsmen and officers of the Ohio National Guard. Their investigation covered a period of 2 weeks. In fact, they took the statements of many hundreds of witnesses including members of the Ohio State Highway Patrol who were present throughout Monday, May 4. Also, they interviewed helicopter pilots of the Ohio State Highway Patrol who had been flying back and forth over the university buildings and campus for many hours throughout May 3 and from early morning May 4 right up to the time the National Guard unit fired a volley into defenseless students who were not rioting. Many of these students had just come from classes and others who were on the commons had been verbally heckling the National Guardsmen. Many were simply on the commons out of curiosity.

The observations made from helicopters and by faculty members and others who were present throughout the morning hours of May 4 proved that there was no sniper fire as falsely alleged by Adjutant General Del Corso, who later admitted this statement was not true.

Mr. President, the facts are as stated by the FBI and also by the seven investigative reporters of the Knight newspapers, including staff reporters from the Miami Herald, Detroit Free Press, Akron Beacon Journal and other metropolitan newspapers, that the four students who were shot to death were unarmed and had harmed no one and that the 10 students wounded by National Guardsmen were not rioting. Nine of the students suffered serious disabling wounds. In fact, the FBI report clearly states that there was no riot on the campus of Kent State University at any time Monday, May 4, and that the shooting by the Ohio National Guard was "not necessary and not in order."

Officials of the U.S. Department of Justice have reported that six National Guardsmen could be criminally charged with murder in the second degree and with shooting to kill. This is according to my present information.

Those who were killed by Ohio National Guardsmen were Allison Krause, 19-year-old coed of Pittsburgh; Sandra Scheuer, 20-year-old coed of Youngstown; William Schroeder, 19-year-old student of Lorain, and Jeffrey Miller, 20-year-old student from Plainview, N.Y.

Only four of 14 students were shot in front. All others were struck in the side or in the back.

The facts are, Mr. President, that Robert Stamps of Cleveland who was seriously wounded by a rifle bullet was 610 feet away from the frontline of the National Guard. That is approximately the distance of two football fields. He was struck in the rear by a bullet entering his buttocks and missing his spinal column by approximately an inch or an inch and a half and this rifle bullet emerged from the front part of his body. He is still disabled and under treatment. Does that political Adjutant General Del Corso have the arrogance to claim that some guardsmen shot Robert Stamps in self-defense?

Mr. President, Kent State University is within 35 minutes drive from my home

in Shaker Heights, a suburb of Cleveland. This university is located in Portage County adjacent to Cuyahoga County. I predict that within the near future that a team of lawyers from the Department of Justice will work with Robert B. Krupansky, U.S. attorney for the northern district of Ohio, and a Federal grand jury will be convened in the Federal Building in Cleveland to make a complete and thorough investigation to determine whether there is probable cause to indict six or more officers and members of the National Guard for the crime of murder in the second degree or shooting to kill, or both.

One hundred FBI operatives who made this thorough investigation have reported that the National Guard unit on the campus was not surrounded by demonstrators, that the National Guardsmen had not run out of tear gas and that they could have controlled the situation without any shooting whatever.

It is stated that the report of the FBI agents is so detailed and extensive that it covers 7,500 pages. I have not read that report; I only know somewhat of a summary of it.

I know that the official report has been summarized in a 14 page report; and I, as senior Senator from the State of Ohio, made it my business to ascertain all that I could about this tragedy. I dispatched staff members from Ohio immediately to the campus, and they remained on the campus until the dormitories were locked and everyone was barred. I am familiar also with the statements in this summarized 14-page report.

It is most unfortunate that Gov. James A. Rhodes on the preceding Saturday night, May 2, was negligent and displayed an abominable lack of judgment in ordering from Cleveland the National Guard unit which he had summoned from their homes to go to my home city, Cleveland, on the preceding April 29. At that time two factions of the Teamsters Union were battling. There was a wildcat strike, accompanied by assaults and shootings. Trucks on the turnpike from Cleveland to Toledo, in Cleveland and on other freeways within the city and suburbs had been overturned and burned and drivers assaulted. Throughout Thursday and Friday these truckdrivers and their friends roughed up many National Guardsmen, inflicting some injuries, and the National Guardsmen and their officers, trying hard to end the violence and restore order, were able to have but little sleep on Thursday and Friday nights. Some had not fully recovered from their injuries by late Saturday when the two factions of Teamsters composed their differences and the wildcat strike ended.

Word that this wildcat Teamsters strike had ended evidently reached the Governor's mansion in Columbus Saturday evening, when, perhaps, the Governor was relaxing at home. On that Saturday and the preceding Friday night, it is true that there had been some students rioting in the center of the city of Kent, some distance from the commons or campus of Kent State University.

Evidently the mayor called and asked the Governor to send in some guardsmen to help maintain law and order in Kent. Mr. President, Gov. James A. Rhodes and Adj. Gen. Sylvester T. Del Corso are guilty of the grossest sort of negligence and bad judgment in that they ordered this wornout 2d Squadron, 107th Armored Cavalry Regiment which had been mauled by various teamsters and truckers in the course of the wildcat Teamsters strike. These were the guardsmen Governor Rhodes through Adjutant General Del Corso ordered from Cleveland to Kent Saturday night but a few hours after the wildcat strike in Cleveland ended. This, despite the fact that there were numerous other National Guard units including military police in Cleveland and in other cities close to Kent, located in fact in counties adjoining Portage County. We have some 1,500 National Guardsmen in Cleveland. If the Governor and his adjutant general had exercised ordinary care and judgment these various Cleveland or other National Guard units should have been called into active duty instead of this wornout Guard unit, it is highly probable that the tragedy and murder on the campus of Kent State University on Monday, May 4, would never have occurred.

Also, it appears an outrageous lack of judgment and ordinary care as there were many National Guard companies in cities closer to Kent than Akron where the 1st Battalion, 145th Infantry, and 2d Squadron, 107th Armored Cavalry Regiment were based. In nearby Warren, county seat of Trumbull County, there was an entire military police battalion. I repeat, military police trained in riot control and arrest of violators of law and order. In Alliance, in adjoining Stark County, there was a platoon of National Guardsmen and in Canton, also in Stark County, there was another platoon of guardsmen. Governor Rhodes could have ordered any one of these units to Kent had he exercised ordinary care and used any sort of good judgment. Furthermore, Adjutant General Del Corso was derelict in his duty in subjecting this one tired and weary unit to further active duty when there were so many other fresh National Guard units available.

Adjutant General Del Corso must share the blame for this and for what occurred on Monday. I believe, Mr. President, that it was unnecessary to send in any National Guard unit and that the hundreds of members of our State highway patrol and additional deputy sheriffs or special duty sheriffs along with the members of the police department of Kent could readily have maintained law and order on the campus or commons of Kent State University throughout all of Monday, May 4. I repeat, there was no riot there at any time Monday, May 4.

Mr. President, we have a State highway patrol in Ohio—a fine outfit of men, who have made a career of making arrests on the highways of Ohio, when there is violence, and of maintaining order on all our highways. All of those members should have been called out to be in Kent. That would have been very proper. They are fine career men, older men, men of judgment, and in addition they have helicopters to fly around in making observations.

In truth and in fact, the FBI investigators report that there was not any rioting on the campus on May 4, the day of the shooting. They report that about 200 demonstrators, who were verbally heckling the guardsmen on their own campus during a time when the university was in full operation, could readily have been dispersed if arrests had been made or more tear gas fired. On that Monday, the guardsmen did hurl many tear gas canisters. There was quite a distance, 75 yards or more usually, separating the front rank of the National Guardsmen from any of the students. Frequently, some of these students, though affected by the fumes of the gas, hurled back the half empty canisters and those canisters rolled along the ground and guardsmen felt the effects of tear gas, receiving some of their own medicine, as the saying is. This evidently further angered them.

Mr. President, the FBI report states that not one guardsman was hurt by flying rocks or projectiles and not one guardsman was in danger of his life at the time of the shooting on Monday, May 4. The report is that there was no hail of rocks beforehand, as claimed by Adj. Gen. Del Corso. One guardsman, according to the testimony fired his rifle at a student who was making an obscene gesture toward that guardsman.

Another guardsman fired at a student preparing to throw a rock. I have obtained many, many statements from students and professors and eye witnesses and also from a few guardsmen and, according to my information, perhaps as many as 15 to 17 stones were thrown by students toward the National Guardsmen, not one of them striking a guardsman. The FBI report also says that not one rock hit a guardsman.

Not one National Guardsmen on Monday, May 4, at any time throughout the morning or up to the time of the fatal shooting, which was about 12:22 p.m., was injured in any manner whatever. Not one required first-aid treatment on that day. It is said that one National Guardsman fainted and one had a heart attack at the time or directly after the guardsmen fired their rifles, loaded with live ammunition, at unarmed students, boys and girls, on their own campus.

Mr. President, Gov. James A. Rhodes has said that Monday, May 4, the day that National Guardsmen on the campus of Kent State University shot and killed four Students and seriously wounded nine others, was the saddest day of his life. This should be the saddest day in his life. He manifested poor judgment, in the first place, in calling out armed Ohio Guardsmen on the preceding Saturday night to Kent and to Kent State University, and in particular abominable judgment in calling to move immediately from Cleveland to Kent these guardsmen, sleepless and worn out from strike duties over preceding days and nights. Also, there was grosser negligence in permitting those Guardsmen to have rifles loaded with live ammunition and permitting them to fire without a direct order to fire.

It is true that there had been disorder in downtown Kent on Friday evening,

May 1. Students had broken windows in some business buildings, and the ROTC building, which is located 1 minute's walk from the Kent police station, was burned by some students.

I have statements of witnesses that policemen were present and did nothing to interfere, nor did they arrest any students charging them, as they should have, with malicious destruction of property. It is stated that this 23-year-old building was regarded as an eyesore by city officials of Kent and businessmen of that city. Whether that is true or not, I have no use whatever for any students who destroy any property of the university that he has attended. I have stated that I know lawyers in Cleveland who could not have made it, who could not have secured their education and become lawyers, except for the ROTC. So I feel that anyone who damages or burns an ROTC building in any university in our country not only should be expelled by the president of that university but also should be prosecuted if there is sufficient evidence to prove that he participated in that action. I believe that in matters of that sort, certain punishment, like a shadow, should follow the commission of any act of violence.

It is to the discredit of Governor Rhodes that in the first place he called out the National Guard to take over the campus of Kent State University with their bullhorns and tear gas. He compounded this blunder by calling into further service a worn out, angered outfit when he had fresh military police guardsmen who presumably had been trained for riot control available.

The overwhelming weight of evidence produced by the FBI and other investigators is that there was no riot whatever on the campus of Kent State University at any time that morning or early afternoon of May 4; yet, National Guardsmen called there on order of Governor Rhodes shot to kill students on the campus of their own university, not one of whom had injured any national guardsman. The fact is that the first coed, a young girl, who was shot and killed had just walked onto the commons, with her schoolbooks under her arm. She had been attending her speech class. After the Guard's volley of shots, she lay dead, covered with blood, her schoolbooks beside her. That was what the FBI found in their report.

MAKING PENTAGON PINCH LESS PAINFUL

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, Jack Anderson, in his nationally published column, the Washington Merry-Go-Round, wrote a most interesting and most important column commenting on the extravagance and waste which is the way of life of the top brass and bureaucrats in the Department of Defense.

This column, under the caption "Making Pentagon Pinch Less Painful," exposes luxurious living of U.S. soldiers, sailors, and airmen, particularly the officers and men of our Armed Forces who are still standing watch on the Rhine and the Riviera joyfully joined by some 225,000 dependents.

Jack Anderson is rendering a needful public service in exposing the inexcusable, extravagant, and unnecessary expenditure of billions of dollars of taxpayers' money. I hope that many Americans, heavily burdened with taxes, will read this expose of gracious living at tremendous cost.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this column be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 4, 1970]

MAKING PENTAGON PINCH LESS PAINFUL

(By Jack Anderson)

The budget pinch has stirred the brass hats and bureaucrats, all too typically, to scramble for economies that won't interfere with their special privileges.

The brass, for instance, want to cut out social programs on military bases, such as day camps for underprivileged youngsters and employment programs for disadvantaged youths. But no move has been made to reduce the number of enlisted men who serve as chauffeurs, waiters, bartenders, orderlies, and handymen for the brass.

The Pentagon has also persuaded President Nixon to pull 20,000 troops out of Korea, where living conditions are austere and the duty is rugged. But scarcely a man will be called home from Japan and Germany, where Americans live in luxury.

The brass, quite naturally, prefer the beerhalls of Berlin and the geisha houses of Tokyo to the grim garrisons on the Korean demarcation line.

But 20,000 troops could be spared more logically from Japan which has no demarcation line to guard. South Korea also desperately needs the $160 million that the troop withdrawal will cost its struggling economy. The Japanese economy, in contrast, is booming.

Along Korea's 38th parallel, of course, the terrain is rough, the weather harsh, the nights menacing. Nearby Seoul offers more attractions for Americans. Still only 7,945 dependents have joined the 62,000 U.S. troops stationed in Korea.

In comparison, 41,856 dependents eagerly share the happy life of the 39,000 servicemen pulling duty in Japan.

DUTY ON THE RHINE

There are even more compelling reasons why the 20,000 troops should be pulled out of Europe, where American garrisons have become an absurd anachronism. Yet 295,000 U.S. soldiers, sailors and airmen are still standing watch on the Rhine and the Riviera, joyfully joined by some 225,000 dependents.

These troops are engaged in a game of military make-believe that does little but fill the continental coffers at U.S. expense. In theory, they are stationed in Europe to prevent an armed takeover by the Russians. But most observers think the Soviet conventional war threat to Europe now is minimal, to say the least. Most of the troops are stationed in West Germany, which is about to sign a nonaggression pact with the Kremlin.

No one really believes that four American divisions, plus a few additional scattered units, are going to intimidate the Red Army, which could throw 175 divisions into European conflict. The Russians have a greater respect, no doubt, for the 7,000 nuclear weapons we keep in Europe. These thunderbolts of war, more than the presence of peacetime GIs, are keeping the Red Army in its place.

At most, the American presence merely symbolizes our commitment to defend Europe, much as the appearance of grizzly cubs alert forest creatures that Mama Bear is around to back their play. A couple of regiments—enough troops, say to man the nuclear weapons—should make just as convincing symbols as four divisions.

But Europe has been a pleasant fortress for the American military since the end of World War II, and the brass have no wish to leave. They live unbelievably well within easy distance of Europe's pleasure spots.

GRACIOUS LIVING

Military bases form American enclaves with schools, churches, movie houses, and clubs to make living gracious. Around cities like Frankfurt, there are noisy beerhalls and sprawling red light districts. As Senator Stephen Young (D-Ohio) has said: "The officers never had it so good. They and their wives and children, with German servants, live high on the hog."

The cost of keeping a peacetime army in Europe, of course, has been a continuing drain on U.S. gold reserves and is largely responsible for the unfavorable balance of payments that has worried our leaders. But when cutbacks were ordered, the brass hastily suggested that 20,000 troops could best be spared from Korea.

The State Department, too, has developed a taste for gracious living. Our diplomats are rotated more to suit their own convenience than the national need. The pleasant posts, such as Paris, Rome, London, Bonn and Vienna, are overstaffed. The disagreeable places all too often are neglected.

For instance, a happy total of 104 people are assigned to the embassy in Rome, where they are occupied largely stuffing themselves with Chianti and calories. Yet across the Mediterranean, the embassy in Tel Aviv has only 45 people engaged in the delicate diplomacy of bringing peace to the Middle East.

In Paris, four agriculture attaches and two secretaries are assigned to report on French farming. In Nairobi, a single attache and a secretary tried, until recently, to keep up with the agriculture of seven countries. Now agriculture attaches have been sent to most of her African neighbors.

All this has blunted the effectiveness of the State Department, whose vital mission is to keep the earth from being blown up.

WASTED LIVES

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, due to the use of helicopters as ambulances in Cambodia, Laos, and South Vietnam to remove the wounded within minutes or at most within an hour, the death rate of wounded GI's is but 2.3 percent compared to nearly 5 percent in World War II. Deaths in combat are down but GI's who would have been mortally wounded and would have died within hours in World War II now survive due to instant evacuation by helicopter and the advance of medical science. Yet for 50 years to come "basket cases" and GI's helplessly and hopelessly maimed for life will survive, many spending all of their remaining days in Army hospitals. This is a most terrifying and horrible end result of our fighting a major war in Southeast Asia which was commenced by intervention in a civil war in Vietnam, a faraway Asiatic country of no importance whatever to the defense of the United States.

Mr. President, that is a most unfortunate aspect of this undeclared, immoral, and most unpopular war. American fam-

ilies 50 years hence will still be paying burdensome taxes as a result of maintaining these unfortunate men who are helplessly and hopelessly maimed for life, fighting in a little country which is not worth the priceless life of one American GI.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio). Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of routine morning business with a time limitation of 3 minutes therein.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. HOLLAND) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, submitting, pursuant to Public Law 91-224, section 204, a report of the Council on Environmental Quality, which message, together with the report, were referred jointly to the Committees on Agriculture and Forestry, Commerce, Interior and Insular Affairs, and Public Works:

To the Congress of the United States:

This first report to the Congress on the state of the Nation's environment is an historic milestone. It represents the first time in the history of nations that a people has paused, consciously and systematically, to take comprehensive stock of the quality of its surroundings.

It comes not a moment too soon. The recent upsurge of public concern over environmental questions reflects a belated recognition that man has been too cavalier in his relations with nature. Unless we arrest the depredations that have been inflicted so carelessly on our natural systems—which exist in an intricate set of balances—we face the prospect of ecological disaster.

The hopeful side is that such a prospect *can* be avoided. Although recognition of the danger has come late, it has come forcefully. There still are large gaps in our environmental knowledge, but a great deal of what needs to be done can be identified. Much of this has already been begun, and much more can be started quickly if we act now.

SCOPE OF THE COUNCIL'S REPORT

The accompanying report by the Council on Environmental Quality seeks to describe the conditions of our environment, and to identify major trends, problems, actions under way and opportunities for the future. This first report by the Council is necessarily incomplete in some respects, especially in the identification of trends. The National Environmental Policy Act, which created the Council, became law only at the beginning of this year. Existing systems for measuring and monitoring environmental conditions and trends, and for developing indicators of environmental quality, are still inadequate. There also is a great deal yet to be learned about the significance of these facts for the human condition.

However, the report will, I think, be of great value to the Congress (and also to the Executive Branch) by assembling in one comprehensive document a wealth of facts, analyses and recommendations concerning a wide range of our most pressing environmental challenges. It should also serve a major educational purpose, by clarifying for a broad public what those challenges are and where the principal dangers and opportunities lie.

Substantively as well as historically, this first report is an important document. No one can read it and remain complacent about the environmental threats we confront, or about the need both to do more and to learn more about those threats.

GETTING AT THE ROOTS

"Environment" is not an abstract concern, or simply a matter of aesthetics, or of personal taste—although it can and should involve these as well. Man is shaped to a great extent by his surroundings. Our physical nature, our mental health, our culture and institutions, our opportunities for challenge and fulfillment, our very survival—all of these are directly related to and affected by the environment in which we live. They depend upon the continued healthy functioning of the natural systems of the Earth.

Environmental deterioration is not a new phenomenon. But both the rate of deterioration and its critical impact have risen sharply in the years since the Second World War. Rapid population increases here and abroad, urbanization, the technology explosion and the patterns of economic growth have all contributed to our environmental crisis. While growth has brought extraordinary benefits, it has not been accompanied by sufficiently foresighted efforts to guide its development.

At the same time, in many localities determined action has brought positive improvements in the quality of air or water—demonstrating that, if we have the will and make the effort, we can meet environmental goals. We also have made important beginnings in developing the institutions and processes upon which any fundamental, long-range environmental improvement must be based.

The basic causes of our environmental troubles are complex and deeply imbedded. They include: our past tendency to emphasize quantitative growth at the expense of qualitative growth; the failure of our economy to provide full accounting for the social costs of environmental pollution; the failure to take environmental factors into account as a normal and necessary part of our planning and decision-making; the inadequacy of our institutions for dealing with problems that cut across traditional political boundaries; our dependence on conveniences, without regard for their impact on the environment; and more fundamentally, our failure to perceive the environment as a totality and to understand and to recognize the fundamental interdependence of all its parts, including man himself.

It should be obvious that we cannot correct such deep-rooted causes overnight. Nor can we simply legislate them away. We need new knowledge, new perceptions, new attitudes—and these must extend to all levels of government and throughout the private sector as well: to industry; to the professions; to each individual citizen in his job and in his home. We must seek nothing less than a basic reform in the way our society looks at problems and makes decisions.

Our educational system has a key role to play in bringing about this reform. We must train professional environmental managers to deal with pollution, land planning, and all the other technical requirements of a high quality environment. It is also vital that our entire society develop a new understanding and a new awareness of man's relation to his environment—what might be called "environmental literacy." This will require the development and teaching of environmental concepts at every point in the educational process.

While education may provide ultimate answers to long-range environmental problems, however, we cannot afford to defer reforms which are needed now. We have already begun to provide the institutional framework for effective environmental improvement.

ORGANIZING FOR IMPROVEMENT

As my first official act of the decade, on January first I signed into law the National Environmental Policy Act. That Act established the Council on Environmental Quality. I have charged the Council with coordinating all environmental quality programs and with making a thorough review of all other Federal programs which affect the environment.

Federal agencies are now required to file with the Council and the public a statement setting out in detail the environmental implications of all proposals for legislation and for other major activities with a significant environmental impact. With the help of this provision, I intend to ensure that environmental considerations are taken into account at the earliest possible stage of the decision-making process.

On July 9 I sent to the Congress a reorganization plan which would establish an Environmental Protection Agen-

cy, consolidating the major environmental pollution responsibilities of the Federal Government. This reform is long overdue.

Responsibility for anti-pollution and related programs is now fragmented among several Departments and agencies, thus weakening our overall Federal effort. Air pollution, water pollution and solid wastes are different forms of a single problem, and it becomes increasingly evident that broad systems approaches are going to be needed to bring our pollution problems under control. The reorganization would give unified direction to our war on pollution and provide a stronger organizational base for our stepped-up effort.

The Council on Environmental Quality has begun the vital task of identifying indicators of environmental quality and determining the requirements for monitoring systems, in order to enable us to assess environmental trends. These systems are needed to give early warning of environmental problems. They will provide data for determining environmental needs and establishing priorities, and for assessing the effectiveness of programs to improve the environment. The development of such monitoring systems is essential to effective environmental management.

There is also a need to develop new knowledge through research. We need to know far more, for example, about the effects of specific pollutants, about ecological relationships, and about human behavior in relation to environmental factors. The Environmental Protection Agency should develop an integrated research program aimed at pollution control. The Council on Environmental Quality will continue, in cooperation with the Office of Science and Technology, to review and coordinate our overall environmental research effort, as well as to undertake its own environmental studies and research.

These actions represent important additions to the institutional, procedural, and informational base for effective environmental management. They hold the promise of a real leap forward in the years to come. At the same time, we must move ahead now in those areas in which we already possess the knowledge and capability for effective action.

RECENT ACTIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

On February 10 of this year, I sent to the Congress a special message on the environment. This presented a 37-point action program, with special emphasis on strengthening our fight against water and air pollution.

In the field of water pollution, my major legislative recommendations included:

—Authorization of $4 billion to cover the Federal share of a $10 billion program to provide treatment facilities.

—Establishment of an Environmental Financing Authority to help finance the State and local share of treatment plants.

—Reform of the method by which funds are allocated under the treatment grant programs.

—Greatly strengthened enforcement authority, including provisions for fines of up to $10,000 a day for violations.

Among my major legislative recommendations for the control of air pollution were:

—More stringent procedures for reducing pollution from motor vehicles.

—Establishment of national air quality standards.

—Establishment of national emissions standards for extremely hazardous pollutants.

—A major strengthening of enforcement procedures, including extension of Federal air pollution control authority to both inter- and intra-state situations and provision for fines of up to $10,000 a day for violators.

Other legislative actions recommended in my February 10 message included:

—Appropriation in 1971 of the full $327 million authorized under the Land and Water Conservation Fund to provide additional parks and recreation areas, with increased emphasis on locating new recreation facilities in crowded urban areas.

—Establishment of new procedures to encourage and finance the relocation of Federal facilities now occupying land that could better be turned to public recreational use.

—Authorizing the transfer of surplus real property to State and local governments for park and recreational purposes at public benefit discounts of up to 100 percent.

In addition, the message spelled out 14 separate measures I was taking by administrative action or Executive Order. These included such wide-ranging initiatives as launching an extensive Federal research and development program in unconventionally-powered, low-pollution vehicles, requiring the development of comprehensive river basin plans for water pollution control, re-directing research on solid waste management to place greater emphasis on re-cycling and re-use, and the establishment of a Property Review Board to recommend specific Federal properties for conversion to recreational use.

I again urge the Congress to act soon and favorably on the legislative proposals contained in that message. They are vital to our growing effort to protect and improve our environment.

I consider the recommendations in my February 10 message only a beginning—although an important one. I said at the time that we must do much more and that we would do more as we gained experience and knowledge. Our Administration is living up to that commitment.

Previously, on February 4, I had issued an Executive Order directing a prompt clean-up of air and water pollution caused by Federal agencies. This task is well underway. As I said then, the Federal Government should set an example for the rest of the country. We are doing so.

On April 15, I sent legislation to the Congress that will, if enacted, bring to an end the dumping of dredged spoils into the Great Lakes as soon as disposal sites are available. At the same time, I directed the Council on Environmental Quality to make a study of ocean disposal of wastes and report to me by September 1.

On May 19, I proposed enactment of a special tax on lead additives in gasoline, to encourage industry to provide low or non-leaded gasoline.

On May 20, I sent to the Congress a special message dealing with oil pollution caused by marine transportation of oil. The comprehensive, 10-point program set out in the message included legislative proposals, the announcement of administrative actions, and the forwarding to the Senate of two international conventions and amendments to a third for ratification. The nations of the world must take aggressive action to end the growing pollution of the oceans.

On May 23, I announced that the United States would propose a new treaty placing the natural resources of the deep sea bed beyond the 200 meter depth under international regulation.

On June 4, a revised National Contingency Plan for dealing with oil spills was announced at my direction by the Chairman of the Council on Environmental Quality.

On June 11, I sent a message to the Congress requesting the enactment of legislation cancelling twenty Federal oil leases for off-shore drilling which had been granted in 1968 in the Santa Barbara Channel and creating a Marine Sanctuary.

As I mentioned above, on July 9 I sent to the Congress a reorganization plan to create a new Environmental Protection Agency. On the same date, I sent another reorganization plan to consolidate Federal marine resource management functions in a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, within the Department of Commerce. This would provide better coordination and direction of our vital ocean resource programs.

TOWARD A LAND USE POLICY

Lately, our attention as a people has repeatedly and insistently been seized by urgent concerns and immediate crises: by the sudden blanketing of cities or even whole regions with dense clouds of smog, for example, or the discovery of mercury pollution in rivers. But as we take the longer view, we find another challenge looming large: the mounting pressures of population. Both the size and the distribution of our population have critical relevance to the quality of our environment and thus to the quality of our lives.

Population growth poses an urgent problem of global dimensions. If the United States is to have an effective voice in world population policies, it must demonstrate willingness to face its own population problems at home.

The particular impact of any given level of population growth depends in large measure on patterns of land use. Three quarters of our people now live in urban areas, and if present trends continue most of them in the future will live in a few mammoth urban concentrations. These concentrations put enormous pressure on transportation, sanitation and other public services. They sometimes create demands that exceed the resource capacity of the region, as in the case of water supply. They can aggravate pollu-

tion, overcrowd recreation facilities, limit open space, and make the restorative world of nature ever more remote from everyday life. Yet we would be blind not to recognize that for the most part the movement of people to the cities has been the result neither of perversity nor of happenstance, but rather of natural human aspirations for the better jobs, schools, medical services, cultural opportunities and excitement that have traditionally been associated with urban life.

If the aspirations which have drawn Americans to the city in the first instance and subsequently from the city core to the suburbs are often proving illusory, the solution does not lie in seeking escape from urban life. Our challenge is to find ways to promote the amenities of life in the midst of urban development: in short, to make urban life fulfilling rather than frustrating. Along with the essentials of jobs and housing, we must also provide open spaces and outdoor recreation opportunities, maintain acceptable levels of air and water quality, reduce noise and litter, and develop cityscapes that delight the eye and uplift the spirit.

By the same token, it is essential that we also make rural life itself more attractive, thus encouraging orderly growth in rural areas. The creation of greater economic, social, cultural and recreational opportunities in rural parts of the country will lead to the strengthening of small cities and towns, contributing to the establishment of new growth centers in the nation's heartland region.

Throughout the nation there is a critical need for more effective land use planning, and for better controls over use of the land and the living systems that depend on it. Throughout our history, our greatest resource has been our land—forests and plains, mountains and marshlands, rivers and lakes. Our land has sustained us. It has given us a love of freedom, a sense of security, and courage to test the unknown.

We have treated our land as if it were a limitless resource. Traditionally, Americans have felt that what they do with their own land is their own business. This attitude has been a natural outgrowth of the pioneer spirit. Today, we are coming to realize that our land is finite, while our population is growing. The uses to which our generation puts the land can either expand or severely limit the choices our children will have. The time has come when we must accept the idea that none of us has a right to abuse the land, and that on the contrary society as a whole has a legitimate interest in proper land use. There is a national interest in effective land use planning all across the nation.

I believe that the problems of urbanization which I have described, of resource management, and of land and water use generally can only be met by comprehensive approaches which take into account the widest range of social, economic, and ecological concerns. I believe we must work toward development of a National Land Use Policy to be carried out by an effective partnership of Federal, State and local governments together, and, where appropriate, with new regional institutional arrangements.

RECYCLING OF WASTES

The prospect of increasing population density adds urgency to the need for greater emphasis on recycling of "waste" products. More people means greater consumption—and thus more rapid depletion—of scarce natural resources; greater consumption means more "waste" to dispose of—whether in the form of solid wastes, or of the pollutants that foul our air and water.

Yet much of this waste is unnecessary. Essentially, waste is a human invention: Natural systems are generally "closed" systems. Energy is transformed into vegetation, vegetation into animal life, and the latter returns to the air and soil to be recycled once again. Man, on the other hand, has developed "open" systems—ending all too often in an open sewer or an open dump.

We can no longer afford the indiscriminate waste of our natural resources; neither should we accept as inevitable the mounting costs of waste removal. We must move increasingly toward closed systems that recycle what now are considered wastes back into useful and productive purposes. This poses a major challenge—and a major opportunity—for private industry. The Council on Environmental Quality is working to foster development of such systems. Establishment of the proposed Environmental Protection Agency would greatly increase our ability to address this need systematically and creatively.

EVERYONE'S TASK

As our government has moved ahead to improve our environmental management, it has been greatly heartening to me to see the extent and effectiveness of citizen concern and activity, and especially the commitment of young people to the task. The job of building a better environment is not one for government alone. It must engage the enthusiasm and commitment of our entire society. Citizen organizations have been in the forefront of action to support strengthened environmental programs. The Citizens Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality, under the chairmanship of Laurance S. Rockefeller, has provided an important link between the Federal Government's effort and this broad-ranging citizen activity.

Similarly, the active participation of the business community is essential. The government's regulation and enforcement activities will continue to be strengthened. Performance standards must be upgraded as rapidly as feasible. But regulation cannot do the whole job. Forward-looking initiatives by business itself are also vital—in research, in the development of new products and processes, in continuing and increased investment in pollution abatement equipment.

On the international front, the level of environmental concern and action has been rapidly rising. Many of our most pressing environmental problems know no political boundaries. Environmental monitoring and pollution of the seas are examples of major needs that require international cooperation, and that also provide an opportunity for the world's nations to work together for their common benefit.

In dealing with the environment we must learn not how to master nature but how to master ourselves, our institutions, and our technology. We must achieve a new awareness of our dependence on our surroundings and on the natural systems which support all life, but awareness must be coupled with a full realization of our enormous capability to alter these surroundings. Nowhere is this capability greater than in the United States, and this country must lead the way in showing that our human and technological resources can be devoted to a better life and an improved environment for ourselves and our inheritors on this planet.

Our environmental problems are very serious, indeed urgent, but they do not justify either panic or hysteria. The problems are highly complex, and their resolution will require rational, systematic approaches, hard work, and patience. There must be a *national* commitment and a *rational* commitment.

The accompanying report by the Council describes the principal problems we face now and can expect to face in the future, and it provides us with perceptive guidelines for meeting them. These deserve the most careful consideration. They point the directions in which we must move as rapidly as circumstances permit.

The newly aroused concern with our national environment embraces old and young alike, in all walks of life. For the young, it has a special urgency. They know that it involves not only our own lives now but the future of mankind. For their parents, it has a special poignancy—because ours is the first generation to feel the pangs of concern for the environmental legacy we leave to our children.

At the heart of this concern for the environment lies our concern for the human condition: for the welfare of man himself, now and in the future. As we look ahead to the end of this new decade of heightened environmental awareness, therefore, we should set ourselves a higher goal than merely remedying the damage wrought in decades past. We should strive for an environment that not only sustains life but enriches life, harmonizing the works of man and nature for the greater good of all.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 10, 1970.*

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. HOLLAND) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(For nominations received today, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

COMMUNICATIONS FROM EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. HOLLAND) laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT ON FISCAL YEAR 1970 OUTLAY LIMITATION

A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, an interim report on fiscal year 1970 outlay limitations as of June 30, 1970 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT OF THE FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Home Loan Bank Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Board for the calendar year 1969 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROPOSED RESTRICTIONS ON DISRUPTIVE OCCURRENCES IN OR NEAR OFFICES OF THE U.S. GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Assistant Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 4 of the act of June 1, 1948, to increase the penalty provisions for the violation of rules or regulations promulgated under authority of said act, and to make restrictions on disruptive occurrences in and near premises upon which offices of the U.S. Government are located and to fix penalties for breach (with accompanying paper); to the Committee on Government Operations.

ARAPAHO NATIONAL FOREST, COLORADO

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to extend the boundaries of the Arapaho National Forest in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF CLAIMS PAID BY THE PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

A letter by the President, Panama Canal Company, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of claims paid by the Company for the period July 1, 1969, to June 30, 1970 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. EAGLETON, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, without amendment:

S. 3906. A bill to authorize the government of the District of Columbia to fix certain fees (Rept. No. 91–1076); and

H.R. 15381. An act to amend the District of Columbia Income and Franchise Tax Act of 1947 with respect to the taxation of regulated investment companies (Rept. No. 91–1077).

By Mr. EAGLETON, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment:

S. 3905. A bill to authorize the District of Columbia Council to fix the rates charged by the District of Columbia for water and water services and for sanitary sewer services (Rept. No. 91–1078).

By Mr. EAGLETON, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments:

S. 3903. A bill to provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91–1079).

By Mr. TYDINGS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment:

S. 2336. A bill relating to the parishes and congregations of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the District of Columbia (Rept. No. 91–1081).

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, without amendment:

S. 336. A bill to amend section 3(b) of the Securities Act of 1933 to permit the exemption of security issues, not exceeding $500,000 in aggregate amount, from the provisions of such act (Rept. No. 91–1082).

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, without amendment:

S. 2176. A bill to implement the Convention on Offenses and Certain Other Acts Committed on Board Aircraft, and for other purposes (Rept. 91–1083).

AMENDMENT OF MERCHANT MARINE ACT, 1936—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—ADDITIONAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 91–1080)

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce, I report favorably, with amendments, the bill (H.R. 15424) to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with the additional views of Senators GRIFFIN, HART, and HARTKE.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOGGS). The report will be received and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Washington.

AMENDMENT OF BANK HOLDING COMPANY ACT OF 1956—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—SUPPLEMENTARY AND INDIVIDUAL VIEWS (S. REPT. NO. 91–1084)

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, I report favorably, with an amendment, the bill (H.R. 6778) to amend the Bank Holding Company Act of 1956, and for other purposes, and I submit a report thereon.

I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with supplementary and individual views, and that the committee have until midnight tonight to deliver the copy for printing purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia). The report will be received, and the bill will be placed on the calendar; and, without objection, the report will be printed, as requested by the Senator from Alabama.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BELLMON:

S. 4203. A bill to amend the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 so as to provide for the establishment of a feed bank, an emergency livestock feed program to be carried out in connection with the diverted acreage program in effect for feed grains, wheat, and cotton; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(The remarks of Mr. BELLMON when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. CANNON, Mr. GOODELL, Mr. HATFIELD, Mr. MOSS, Mr. PELL, Mr. PERCY, Mr. SAXBE, and Mr. YARBOROUGH):

S. 4204. A bill to provide for the efficient disposal and recycling of motor vehicles, and for other purposes; to the Commitee on Public Works by unanimous consent.

(The remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. SCOTT:

S. 4205. A bill for the relief of Garrit Kleinburink; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

S. 4206. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to incur obligations for construction grants under section 8 of such act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

(The remarks of Mr. MAGNUSON when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. MURPHY:

S. 4207. A bill to permit expenditures in connection with the provision of certain public improvements or public facilities in the city of Hayward, Calif., to be counted as local grants-in-aid to federally assisted urban renewal projects in the city of Hayward, Calif.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. MURPHY (for himself, Mr. PROUTY Mr. DOMINICK, Mr. JAVITS, and Mr. SAXBE):

S. 4208. A bill to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act by providing for the establishment of a family physician scholarship and fellowship program; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(The remarks of Mr. MURPHY when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. METCALF (for himself and Mr. MANSFIELD):

S. 4209. A bill to provide for the disposition of the funds appropriated to pay a judgment in favor of the Blackfeet Tribe of the Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont., and the Gros Ventre Tribe of the Fort Belknap Reservation, Mont., in Indian Claims Commission Docket numbered 279–A, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. PERCY:

S. 4210. bill to amend the act of March 3, 1899, relating to penalties for wrongful deposit of certain refuse, injury to harbor improvements, and obstruction of navigable waters; to the Committee on Public Works.

(The remarks of Mr. PERCY when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

S. 4203—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL—TO ESTABLISH A NATIONAL FEED BANK ON AMERICAN FARMS AND RANCHES

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, today, I am introducing legislation to establish a national feed bank on American farms and ranches. The purpose of this legislation is to encourage and enable livestock and feed producers to grow and store an extra supply of forage in the good years and have it available when feed production is low.

Throughout much of our farming and ranching areas, climatic conditions vary from season to season. Almost every year, parts of America's great farming indus-

try are damaged by drought, insect pests, floods, or plant diseases.

Mr. President, according to figures from the U.S. Department of Agriculture, there is a disaster in American agriculture somewhere every year.

The record shows: In 1964, there were 1,230 counties in 34 States declared disaster areas for the grazing and haying programs, and 704 counties in 33 States declared disaster areas under the livestock feed program.

In 1965, there were 856 counties in 30 States declared disaster areas for the grazing and haying program, and 253 counties in 22 States declared disaster areas under the livestock feed program.

In 1966, there were 1,042 counties in 35 States declared disaster areas for the grazing and haying program, and 265 counties in 20 States declared disaster areas under the livestock feed program.

In 1967, there were 443 counties in 14 States declared disaster areas for the grazing and haying program, and 43 counties in six States declared disaster areas under the livestock feed program.

In 1968, there were 300 counties in 21 States declared disaster areas for the grazing and haying program, and seven counties in three States declared disaster areas under the livestock feed program.

In 1969, there were 357 counties in 19 States declared disaster areas for the grazing and haying program, and 96 counties in 10 States declared disaster areas under the livestock feed program.

Mr. President, to show how widespread the disaster areas are, let me read a list of the States involved:

Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, West Virginia.

In 1970, as of August 6, there are 40 counties in four States declared disaster areas for the grazing and haying program. The livestock feed program is usually effective in the fall and winter, so that no figures are available yet for this program in 1970.

The cost to the Federal Treasury of these programs is impossible to calculate because of the complexity of the program, but it runs into many millions of dollars in an average year.

In spite of the cost, the programs, while helpful to farmers in stricken areas, fall short of meeting the needs when a disaster of major proportions strikes.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a copy of publication No. PA533 entitled "What the United States Department of Agriculture Can Do When Natural Disaster Strikes." This is an enlightening document, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks, together with a letter detailing information on USDA drouth relief programs, from Mr. Harold V. Hunter, Oklahoma Director of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, these documents detail the various programs the USDA administers for the benefit of rural people and other citizens who are the victims of natural disasters. These are well-intended and beneficial programs. They have been widely used and have lessened the impact of natural disaster for millions of Americans, but they have fallen short of the need. As a result, large numbers of food producers have been forced out of business by adverse weather conditions.

Mr. President, the feed bank which I am proposing to establish can become a valuable additional tool for rural America and can be of major benefit to urban food consumers, as well, by stabilizing food production. The problem with current disaster relief programs is that when drouth strikes, no feed grows on either private or Government-controlled lands. Permission to graze or harvest forage from diverted or retired acres may mean little if a drouth has scorched the land or if these acres are being held in a fallow condition, in accordance with program requirements. As a result, frequently, when there is a declaration that an area is a disaster zone, hay prices shoot up and livestock producers pay more—not less—for feed, even after receiving USDA help.

Mr. President, under the terms of this proposal, every agricultural community in this Nation can produce and have available in sealed storage an extra supply of forage. When disaster strikes, as it has frequently in the past and will again in the future, every producer can have available on his own land, and at no cost to the Government, the forage he needs to feed his herd through the drouth or until more feed can be produced.

The effect of this legislation is to give every livestock or forage producer the authority and the resources to provide his own insurance against disaster.

Some will ask why each farmer does not already provide for his own "feed bank." There are two basic reasons: The first is that at the present time, 378,000 tenants operate farms or ranches in this country. In most cases, these operators cannot construct storage on land they do not own, for reserve feed supplies, and they do not have available additional land to produce extra feed.

Also, due to generally low prices and poor economic conditions, most American farmers and ranchers are hard pressed for operating funds and do not have funds available for use in building the storage needed for holding extra feed.

Mr. President, this legislation is not lengthy, and I ask unanimous consent that the language of the feed bank bill be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio). Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The bill (S. 4203) to amend the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 so as to provide for the establishment of a feed bank, an emergency livestock feed program to be carried out in connection with the diverted acreage program in effect for feed grains, wheat, and cotton, introduced by Mr. BELLMON, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 4203

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965, as amended, is amended by adding at the end of title VII a new section as follows:

"SEC. 710. (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any producer who is participating in the feed grain program under title III of this Act, in the cotton program under Title IV of this Act, or in the wheat program under Title IV of the Act, shall, in any year in which an acreage diversion program is in effect, under either such program in which such producer is participating, be permitted, subject to the conditions prescribed in subsection (b) of this section, to plant and harvest forage from an acreage on the farm equal to 25 per centum of the acreage on the farm diverted from production under such programs or 25 acres, whichever is greater.

"(b) Any producer who elects to plant and harvest forage on diverted acreage must first agree not to use any forage harvested from such acreage unless authorized to do so by the Secretary.

"(c) When any diverted acreage has been planted and harvested under authority of this section, the forage harvested therefrom shall be stored in sealed storage on the farm in accordance with such regulation as the Secretary may prescribe and shall be available for use during periods of emergency declared by the Secretary. In order to avoid deterioration of forage stored on the farm for emergency purposes pursuant to this section, the Secretary may permit such forage to be removed and used or sold from time to time so long as an amount of forage equal to the amount removed is previously placed in storage and sealed.

"(d) Any farmer who has forage stored on his farm for emergency purposes pursuant to this Act may remove such forage from storage and use it whenever the Secretary has (1) designated as an emergency area the area in which such farm is located, and (2) specifically authorized the use of emergency forage by farmers in the area.

"(e) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make or guarantee loans to farmers, both tenants and landowners, to assist such farmers in the construction of storage facilities on the farm for the storage of emergency forage pursuant to the provisions of this section if such farmers are unable to obtain loans from commercial sources at reasonable rates and on reasonable terms and conditions. Loans made by the Secretary under this subsection shall be made at the current rate of interest for periods not exceeding 10 years, and on such other terms and conditions as the Secretary may prescribe."

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, the type of construction contemplated by this legislation need not be expensive or complicated to build. In fact, most farmers or ranchers with the help of neighbors can construct the needed structure. One suggested plan is described in publication No. 1000 of Oklahoma State University Extension Service. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of this document be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the document was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLE BARN PLANS FOR OKLAHOMA

(By Pat Lewis and George W. A. Mahoney)

The following pole barn plans are similar in design and construction. The basic plan for each barn is 39'–0 wide and 60'–0" long, and can be extended (in 15'–0" units) to the length desired.

[Illustrations not printed in RECORD.]

These plans include details for changing the structures shown to 52'–0" width barns by adding a 13'–0" wide shed to the open side of the barn. Plans No. 5781 and 5782 would require raising the basic building approximately 5'–0" to obtain a 9'–0" clearance at the open front. For such an alteration, be sure and order poles 5'–0" longer than shown in the basic plan.

There are double rafters fastened to each 6" minimum top quality pressure treated pole to form the main structure. The 2"x6" purlins (24" o.c. laid perpendicularly on the rafters) are then added, with corrugated metal or other suitable material used for the roofing. The barn may be completely enclosed or enclosed on three sides, as shown, with the open side to the south or east. The movable feed racks may be used if the barn is for feeding and hay storage.

An important factor in any pole barn is the alignment and anchorage of the poles. First, the four corner poles are lined up, plumbed and backfilled before the intermediate poles are erected. It is recommended that concrete be used for the backfill. This insures better stability against wind and other loads, and eliminates the laborious task of tamping earth back in around the poles. Concrete fill increases the resistance to uplift approximately 4 times over well tamped earth or gravel backfill.

Ring shank (30d or larger) type nails, bolts, or lag screws should be used when fastening the rafters to the poles. Screw shank nails with lead or neoprene washes should be used when nailing the corrugated metal to the purlins.

DESIGN LOAD

Design loads for this structure as shown are for 10 lb. per square foot snow loads, which are 25 year occurrence loads for the southern two-thirds of Oklahoma. For the northern one-third of Oklahoma, or for a greater safety factor for the entire state, use 2 by 12-inch rafters and increase the bolts to seven (7) in each truss heel joint. Rough (undressed) 2 by 10 inch, No. 1 members would also satisfy with no increase in bolts. Purlin sizes need not be increased, since the maximum load will occur when you are working on the center of the span. No. 1 grade lumber is required for the purlins. If a lower grade lumber is used, use the next larger size member, or use rough, graded lumber.

The 17" x 22" blueprints for each plan may be obtained by writing to Oklahoma State University Plan Service, Extension Agricultural Engineering Department, Box 1008, Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074. Please order by plan number.

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, I also have a letter from Mr. Charles W. Nichols, Oklahoma State University Extension Service, relating to the feeding value of hay stored for extended periods. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY,
UNIVERSITY EXTENSION,
July 31, 1970.

Mr. HAROLD V. HUNTER,

DEAR MR. HUNTER: Enclosed is a Fact Sheet which discusses various aspects of hay quality.

Hay stored out of the weather should lose little nutritive value except for carotin or vitamin A. Either prairie hay or alfalfa would have lost little in value except a good part of its vitamin A after 2 years.

If the hay is used in a mixed ration or fed with other feed supplements it is fairly easy and inexpensive to supplement vitamin A.

If a large volume of hay of unknown quality is to be fed a protein analysis should be made.

Sincerely,

CHARLES W. NICHOLS,
Extension Animal Breeding Spec.

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, to sum up, the bill contains three provisions:

First. It allows cooperators in our farm program permission to plant and harvest up to 25 percent of the diverted acreage of their farm and store the forage in sealed, weatherproof storage.

Second. It permits the Secretary of Agriculture to make feed bank storage construction loans.

Third. It permits the use or rotation of forage out of the feed bank when the Secretary of Agriculture decrees.

Traditionally, rural Americans have been self-reliant and able to cope with the vagrancies of nature. This tradition still lives. The establishment of a national feed bank will provide a valuable tool to help our Nation's food producers cope with the uncertainties of nature and assist them in producing a dependable supply of low-cost products for city consumers.

EXHIBIT 1

AGRICULTURAL CENTER OFFICE BUILDING,
Stillwater, Okla., August 4, 1970.

Subject: Proposal to design an ASCS program to provide a "hay bank" program so hay might be on hand in cases of drouth such as now exists in western Oklahoma.

Hon. HENRY BELLMON,
U.S. Senate,
Oklahoma City, Okla.

DEAR SENATOR: The present situation has pointed up that provisions for grazing and haying of acreages diverted under ASCS programs do not substantially alleviate drouth problems because many of these acres have little, if any, grazing capacity when a drouth occurs.

As you have suggested, the "Hay Bank" program might provide a supply of hay to be made available when drouth conditions were declared in an area. Such a program might provide (1) construction of facilities in which hay might be stored, and (2) low cost financing using the stored hay as collateral for the loan.

Questions to resolve would be:

1. Would it be necessary that such hay be released only when a drouth occurred?

2. Would it be possible that after a specified number of years such hay could be released even though the area had not been designated as a drouth area during that time?

3. What would provide motivation to the farmer to participate in such a hay bank program?

4. Would the possibility of having the hay on hand if a drouth occurred be sufficient to cause the farmer to harvest and store such hay?

Attached is some information from the Extension Service relating to the above, and a summary of recommendations for disaster designation from 20 western counties.

Sincerely,

HAROLD V. HUNTER,
State Executive Director.

WHEN NATURAL DISASTER STRIKES

SEVERE WINDSTORMS OR FLOODS

When hurricanes, tornadoes, or hailstorms strike, or floods overrun the land, the Department of Agriculture can:

Provide food from Consumer and Marketing Service donated supplies for emergency group feeding to assist the homeless, evacuees, or others affected by the disaster.

Arrange Farmers Home Administration credit to eligible disaster-stricken farmers for operating expenses, replacing lost or destroyed livestock, and repairing or replacing damaged or destroyed buildings and farm equipment.

Donate Government-owned feed grain for starving livestock through the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service.

Sell Government-owned feed grain at reduced prices, through ASCS, to needy livestockmen unable to pay market prices.

Permit, through ASCS, grazing or haying on land otherwise retired from crop production under Department programs.

Approve ACP (Agricultural Conservation Program) cost sharing for authorized soil conservation practices.

Give practical advice on necessary repairs and on cleaning up after storm damage.

Make emergency loans and provide other assistance, through the Rural Electrification Administration, for repair and replacement of damaged rural electric or telephone facilities. In nearly all States, electric cooperatives have well-established plans whereby they assist a system hit by disaster.

Make Federal Crop Insurance indemnity payments on insured crops damaged or destroyed by storms.

Allow credit after hailstorms, through FHA, for reseeding land.

Give assistance after floods, through the Soil Conservation Service, in planning and carrying out measures for flood prevention, erosion control, and drainage. SCS can also help with reclamation of land overlaid by sand and other flood debris.

The educational program of Cooperative Extension Service agents and specialists help people understand the danger of possible disasters. They make plans to minimize danger and loss, and they provide technical information after a disaster on problems involved in getting back to normal.

DROUGHT

As drought conditions develop, the Department helps first with credit and grazing assistance.

If conditions grow worse, special feed programs may be authorized.

The Department, through ASCS county offices, can grant permission to harvest hay or graze cattle on land retired by Department programs.

ASCS county offices may be authorized to sell CCC-owned grains at reduced prices.

ACP can give help by cost sharing in restoring pastures.

FHA can arrange emergency loans to farmers whose needs cannot be met locally.

FCIC can make indemnity payments on insured crops damaged or destroyed by drought.

C&MS can seek freight rate reduction for moving hay or feed into an area or livestock to other pasture or forage.

Farmworkers and others whose income is seriously reduced may become eligible for family food donations or the food stamp program, where these activities are operating through local welfare agencies.

RURAL FIRES

When fires break out in or near National Forests, the Forest Service provides leadership in fire control or helps local fire units.

After a fire, ASCS, SCS, and FS assist with flood control on burned areas by planting trees, seeding grass, and building reservoirs.

EARTHQUAKES

After earthquake disasters the Department can provide emergency food for group feeding to assist the homeless, evacuees, and others.

It can arrange FHA emergency loans to disaster-stricken farmers for operating expenses, replacing lost or destroyed livestock, repairing or replacing damaged or destroyed buildings and farm equipment.

It can donate Government-owned feed grain at reduced prices through ASCS to needy livestockmen unable to pay market prices.

PRESIDENTIAL DECLARATION OF DISASTER

State and local agencies have primary responsibility for disaster relief. They are expected to use their own resources, facilities, and funds to the maximum extent.

Under the Federal Disaster Act, however, the President can bring all the resources of the Federal Government to bear in a disaster situation by declaring a major disaster. He can use emergency funds provided for this purpose.

If stricken area warrants it, the Governor of a State asks the President for a declaration under the major disaster law. If the President finds that the situation calls for emergency action, he issues a declaration to that effect.

The Governor certifies to the Department and agency heads the need for certain types of aid, such as the sale of livestock feed at reduced prices in specific counties and donation of livestock feed in others. Emergency aid funds are provided to State and local government units who work with the affected individuals. These funds do not go directly to individuals.

CIVIL DEFENSE

Disaster relief operations of USDA serve to train officials who will be responsible for similar work in a nuclear attack. Many services needed as a result of sudden natural disasters are much the same as those which would be needed in the event of enemy attack.

Where possible, an official charged with a specific defense task is responsible for the corresponding function in a natural disaster. The Department's disaster assistance is coordinated under the Secretary's assistant for defense mobilization.

STEPS YOU TAKE TO GET USDA HELP

Food. State agencies distributing foods donated by the Consumer and Marketing Service for school lunch and needy persons can release these food stocks for emergency group feeding.

To obtain this help, contact your local agencies—disaster relief agency, civil defense, American Red Cross, or Salvation Army. Local school lunch or welfare offices have authority from the State agenices to release USDA-donated foods.

Credit. The Farmers Home Administration can make 3 percent emergency loans in authorized areas when needs cannot be met locally. Local FHA offices recommend to the State Director who recommends to the national office.

To obtain this help, contact your nearest field office of FHA. It is usually located in the county seat. If not, any USDA local office can direct you to the proper location.

(*Note:* Federal Crop Insurance policies are good collateral for crop loans from banks, Production Credit Associations, FHA, and other lenders.)

Feed and Forage. In disaster areas designated by the Secretary, emergency assistance may include either or both of the following:

1. Sale of Government-owned feed grains at reduced prices to approved livestockmen.

2. Seasonal grazing and haying on retired or diverted cropland with a reduction in diversion payments, or for a short period at no reduction in payment following a sudden disaster such as a tidal wave or severe flood. When the President declares a "major disaster" area. Government-owned feed grains may be donated to prevent death of livestock.

To obtain such help, contact your local ASCS office. It is usually located in the county seat.

ACP Emergency Cost Sharing. The Government can share emergency conservation costs to rehabilitate damaged farmland. The Secretary designates counties for cost-sharing assistance.

To obtain this help, contact your local ASC Committee, usually located in the county seat.

Soil Conservation. The Soil Conservation Service can give technical help and, in the Great Plains Conservation Program areas, it can also offer financial aid. It can help plan and carry out flood prevention projects. During flood emergencies its engineers can supervise the construction of levees, bridges, and dikes.

To obtain this help, contact your local Soil Conservation District or area, or State office of SCS.

Forest Disasters. The Forest Service can help suppress fires, conduct rescue operations, prevent and/or remove avalanche debris; assist in flood, hurricane, and earthquake emergencies; mobilize its communications system for rapid action; and take other actions in or near National Forests or elsewhere as directed by the President.

To obtain this help, contact your nearest District Ranger, Forest Supervisor, or Regional Forester.

Diseases and Insects. The Agricultural Research Service has veterinarians, plant pathologists, and entomologists skilled at crop and livestock protection.

To obtain their help, contact your practicing veterinarian, State or Federal veterinarian, or county extension agent who will arrange for needed assistance.

Insect Damage. Federal Crop Insurance protects against loss from insect damage to the extent of the crop production costs. Insurance must be applied for before planting in counties where it is available.

To obtain this help, contact your nearest FCIC representative or the Crop Insurance State Director for your State. Any USDA local office can direct you to the proper location.

Information. The Cooperative Extension Service can advise on cleaning up damaged property, on sanitary measures, on water supply and sewage disposal, insect infestation, feed and water for livestock, substitute planting for damaged crops, grain storage, and other disaster problems.

To obtain this help, contact your county agricultural agent, home economics agent, or the director of extension at the State land-grant university or college.

PRECAUTIONS AGAINST NATURAL DISASTERS

Precautions can be taken against natural disasters.

Insurance

Carry machinery, building, and crop insurance (hail and all-risk).

DISEASE CONTROL

Report outbreaks of unusual plant and animal diseases to your county agent or veterinarian so that action can be taken to prevent such diseases from spreading.

FLOOD CONTROL

When floods threaten, strengthen embankments and levees, open drains and ditches, brace buildings, protect wells by sandbagging. As necessary, move household goods, feed supplies, and machinery to higher ground or upper stories of substantial buildings.

Drought

Develop sources of emergency water for community and agricultural needs such as larger farm ponds or sediment pools at floodwater structures in upstream projects.

Fire Control

Have an emergency plan for action in event of fire. Post fire-warning notices around woodlands. Remove dead trees and branches regularly. Discuss woods-fire problem with your local forest fire warden or State forester.

EXAMPLES OF HELP GIVEN

When Hurricane Betsy devasted the Louisiana Gulf coast in September 1965, over 5½ million pounds of USDA foods were made available to help feed and rehabilitate nearly 320,000 victims of the disaster—the largest emergency feeding activity in USDA's history. A few months later, when a typhoon struck American Samoa, over 300 tons of USDA foods were rushed from the State of Hawaii to assist the 12,000 victims.

A series of tornadoes struck 11 counties in southern Michigan with little warning April 11, 1965. The storms killed several people and thousands of livestock.

Many buildings containing hay, grain, mixed feeds and ensilage were destroyed or damaged.

The Governor certified the need for temporary grazing of land previously withdrawn from production under USDA programs, for a short-term feed grain donation program, and for the livestock feed program under which sales of CCC-owned grain could be made to eligible farmers at reduced prices. The Secretary of Agriculture approved the requests for all three programs.

* * * * *

For several mid-June days in 1965 torrential rains threatened land protected by the 90 floodwater retarding structures in Colorado's Kiowa, Big Sandy, and Franktown-Parker watershed projects. The 1965 Kiowa area flood approached the severity of a 1935 storm which took seven lives and caused property damage in excess of $2 million. The 1965 Kiowa flood caused total damage of $72,000, one-tenth of the estimated damage that would have occurred without the Kiowa project. The Big Sandy project prevented an estimated $500,000 loss. Similar protection was afforded property in the Franktown-Parker project area.

* * * * *

In the summer of 1964, a forest fire burned 70,000 acres of critical watershed lands on the edge of Santa Barbara, Calif. The Forest Service rushed to reseed and repair the water shed ahead of fall rains that could have brought greater destruction from flooding than from the fire itself. More than 40 construction workers and engineers worked 12 hours a day for 2 months. By December 11, just ahead of the rains, 69,000 acres had been seeded and other repair work had been done.

* * * * *

Disastrous floods in Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, and Missouri during the spring and summer of 1965 wiped out millions of dollars worth of crops. Farmers who had protected themselves with Federal All-Risk Crop Insurance were able to get back the production expenses on crops washed away by the flood waters.

AGRICULTURAL CENTER OFFICE BUILDING,
Stillwater, Okla., July 30, 1970.

Hon. HENRY BELLMON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This relates to our recent conversation regarding USDA programs available to producers during times of drought.

The use of acreage diverted under various programs administered by ASCS and livestock feed programs are aids that may be

made available to alleviate hardship because of drought.

Seasonal Haying and Grazing of Wheat and Feed Grain—The national procedure provides that acreage diverted under annual ASC programs may be offered for haying and/or grazing by county ASC committees. The Oklahoma State ASC Committee has established a policy that county committees will not make this acreage available without the concurrence of the State committee. The reason for this is to maintain some control and also take some of the pressures from the county ASC committees. When haying and grazing are approved for the county, the producer makes application to the county ASC committee and, if approved, is charged for the use of the acreage. The amount of the charge is derived from the fair value of the forage expected to be removed from the diverted acreage.

Haying of Cropland Conversion Program Acres—This acreage is available to the producer for grazing the year round without charge. It may be made available for haying under the same conditions as above for wheat and feed grain diverted acreage.

Cropland Adjustment Program—Acreage diverted under this program may be made available to producers suffering from prolonged drought upon a recommendation from the County Disaster Committee, approval of the State Disaster Committee, a certification from the Governor that a drought situation exists, and the approval of the Secretary of Agriculture. The County Disaster Committee is composed of the Chairman of the County ASC Committee, the county FHA Supervisor and the County Extension Director. The State Disaster Committee is composed of the Chairman of the State ASC Committee, the State FHA Director, and the Director of the Cooperative Extension Service. Charges are made for the use of this acreage the same as acreage diverted under the wheat and feed grain programs.

Disaster Feed Program—There is a provision for furnishing feed grains to producers who have suffered crop losses due to prolonged drought, insect infestation, and other crop damage. Under this provision, grain from CCC stocks can be furnished producers to maintain basic herds at a reduced price. This program is designed to be used where, due to natural disaster, producers are experiencing undue financial hardships in caring for their cattle, or where the disaster is causing the liquidation of herds. The pricing of this grain for 1970 and until further notice is based on the local county loan rate plus 13 and 19 cents per bushel, respectively, for barley and corn, and 34 cents per hundredweight for grain sorghum. This cost to the producer for primary stocks (foundation herds) would be 80 percent of this figure. For other than foundation or primary livestock, the cost to the producer is 105% of the county loan rate plus the adding on of the amount shown above. In order for this program to be operated in any area it must be recommended by the County Disaster Committee, approved by the State Disaster Committee, certified by the Governor that disaster conditions exist, and approved by the Secretary of Agricuture. There are two methods of furnishing grain under this program. The producers may purchase the whole grain or the grain may be purchased in mixed feeds.

Enclosed is a memorandum from Mr. Herman Bartell of the Farmers Home Administration, giving a summary of emergency credit provisions that are available from that agency. Also enclosed is a pamphlet which summarizes programs available to victims of natural disaster.

Until this year the procedure for declaration of a county as a disaster area for drought and the subsequent provision for grazing of (1) acres diverted under annual programs and (2) those diverted under the Cropland Adjustment Program, were similar in nature. This year the regulations were changed to provide that grazing could be permitted on diverted acres under the anual feed grain and wheat programs upon the determination of need exercised by the county ASC committee. However, in cases involving lands diverted under CAP, the more cumbersome method of determination involving county and State disaster committee action, certification by the Governor, and authorization by the Secretary of Agriculture was retained. The enclosed excerpts from the legislation governing such action will indicate probably why no change was made to simplify authorization for grazing under the CAP Program. It would appear to me that if simplification is desired, an amendment to the Law relating to the Cropland Adjustment Program would make this possible.

If further information is needed, please contact us.

Sincerely,

HAROLD V. HUNTER,
State Executive Director.

STILLWATER, OKLA.
July 27, 1970.

Re Drought Condition.

Mr. HAROLD HUNTER,
State Executive Director, ASCS,
Stillwater, Okla.:

This has reference to your telephone call of this date.

This office is concerned about the continuing drought conditions in Western Oklahoma and have this date requested our District Supervisors to obtain reports from each of the counties concerning the drought conditions and need for emergency credit.

These reports should all be received on or before August 10, 1970. At that time, we will have a good current picture of conditions and the need for emergency credit.

In those counties where it appears that drought conditions have caused considerable production losses and there is a need for emergency loans from the Farmers Home Administration, we will recommend to the Farmers Home Administration national office that such counties be designated. The national office, if they concur, will also recommend to the Secretary of Agriculture that designation for emergency loans be made.

The Farmers Home Administration State Director can authorize emergency loans in non-designated areas provided the natural disaster is not general to the county and it is determined that not more than 25 applicants will receive emergency loans.

The Agency's authority for making emergency loans when designated is subject to producers being unable to obtain needed credit from other established lending sources. Such loans may be made for the purchase of feed, seed, fertilizer, replacement of equipment, livestock, and for other items needed to maintain normal operations. Loans are scheduled for repayment when income from crops or livestock financed is normally received. The interest rate on these loans is three percent.

HERMAN M. BARTELL,
Acting State Director.

ACT OF 1965

CROPLAND ADJUSTMENT PROGRAM

(b) The producer shall agree (1) to carry out on a specifically designated acreage of land on the farm regularly used in the production crops (including crops, such as tame hay, alfalfa, and clovers, which do not require annual tillage and which have been planted within five years preceding the date of the agreement), hereinafter called "designated acreage", and maintain for the agreement period practices or uses which will conserve soil, water, or forest resources, or establish or protect or conserve open spaces, natural beauty, wildlife or recreational resources, or prevent air or water pollution, in such manner as the Secretary may prescribe (priority being given to the extent practicable to practices or uses which are most likely to result in permanent retirement to non-crop uses); (2) to maintain in conserving crops or uses or allow to remain idle throughout the agreement period the acreage normally devoted to such crops or uses; (3) not to harvest any crop from or graze the designated acreage during the agreement period, unless the Secretary, after certification by the Governor of the State in which such acreage is situated of the need for grazing or harvesting of such acreage, determines that it is necessary to permit grazing or harvesting in order to alleviate damage, hardship, or suffering caused by severe drought, flood, or other natural disaster, and consents to such grazing or harvesting subject to an appropriate reduction in the rate of payment; and (4) to such additional terms and conditions as the Secretary determines are desirable to effectuate the purposes of the program, including such measures as the Secretary may deem appropriate to keep the designated acreage free from erosion, insects, weeds, and rodents. Agreements entered into under which 1966 is the first year of the agreement period (A) shall require the producer to divert from production all of one or more crops designated by the Secretary; and (B) shall not provide for diversion from the production of upland cotton in any county in which the county committee by resolution determines, and requests of the Secretary, that there should not be such diversion in 1966.

(c) Under such agreements the Secretary shall (1) bear such part of the average cost (including labor) for the county or area in which the farm is situated of establishing land maintaining authorized practices or uses on the designated acreage as the Secretary determines to be necessary to effectuate the purposes of the program, but not to exceed the average rate for comparable practices or uses under the agricultural conservation program, and (2) make an annual adjustment payment to the producer for the period of the agreement at such rate or rates as the Secretary determines to be fair and reasonable in consideration of the obligations undertaken by the producers. The rate or rates of annual adjustment payments as determined hereunder may be increased by an amount determined by the Secretary to be appropriate in relation to the benefit to the general public of the use of the designated acreage if the producer further agrees to permit, without other compensation, access to such acreage by the general public, during the agreement period, for hunting, trapping, fishing, and hiking, subject to applicable State and Federal regulations. The Secretary and the producer may agree that the annual adjustment payments for all years of the agreement period shall be made either upon approval of the agreement or in such installments as they may * * *.

EXCERPT FROM THE LAND USE SECTION OF THE LAW PERTAINING TO WHEAT

AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACT OF 1938, AS AMENDED

SEC. 339. (a) (1) As a condition of eligibility for wheat marketing certificates with respect to any farm, the producers on such farm shall be required to divert from the production of wheat to an approved conservation use an acreage of cropland on the farm equal to the number of acres determined by multiplying the farm acreage allotment by the diversion factor, and to participate in any program formulated under subsection (b) to the extent prescribed by the Secretary. Such diversion factor shall be determined by di-

viding the number of acres by which the national acreage allotment (less an acreage equal to the increased acreage allotted for 1966 pursuant to section 335) is reduced below fifty-five million acres by the number of acres in the national acreage allotment (less an acreage equal to the increased acreage allotted for 1966 pursuant to section 335). (7 U.S.C. 1339(a)(1).)

(2) The Secretary may require that the acreage on any farm diverted from the production of wheat be land which was diverted from the production of wheat in the previous year, to the extent he determines that such requirement is necessary to effectuate the purposes of this subtitle. (7 U.S.C. 1339(a)(2).)

(3) The Secretary may permit the diverted acreage to be grazed in accordance with regulations prescribed by the Secretary. (7 U.S.C. 1339(a)(3).)

S. 4204—INTRODUCTION OF MOTOR VEHICLE DISPOSAL ACT—REFERRAL TO COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on August 6, 1970, the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) asked and was granted unanimous consent that the bill of the Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY), S. 4197, the "Motor Vehicle Disposal Assistance Act," be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. President, I have also previously introduced a measure dealing with the same problem. I reintroduce it now, in slightly modified form, and, as there are hearings on the subject tentatively scheduled this month before the Public Works Committee, I ask unanimous consent that this bill likewise be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

I am joined in this bill by Senators CANNON, GOODELL, HATFIELD, MOSS, PELL, PERCY, SAXBE, and YARBOROUGH.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio). The bill will be received; and, without objection, the bill will be referred to the Committee on Public Works.

The bill (S. 4204) to provide for the efficient disposal and recycling of motor vehicles, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 4206—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE FEDERAL WATER POLLUTION CONTROL ACT

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill which would amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

This year, Congress is considering the most far-reaching amendments to the Federal Water Pollution Control Act since the Water Quality Act of 1965 and the Clean Water Restoration Act of 1966. On April 28 I appeared before the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution and described the progress that Metropolitan Seattle has been able to make in improving water quality. The results from a plan approved in 1958 have been dramatic, but Seattle, like every other major metropolitan area in this country, has a long, long way to go to achieve and maintain consistently high water quality standards. To achieve this goal a number of significant improvements will have to be made in the statutory base underlying our water pollution control programs. Among these will be "contract authority" or some similar precommitment technique which will permit and encourage planning for the use of funds over a period of several years. This will provide a much sounder and more efficient approach for our metropolitan areas. There will have to be, also, more money. Fiscal 1971 is the last year of the 5-year program approved by Congress in 1966 and an appropriation of $1.25 billion is authorized. The full authorized amount must be appropriated and at the same time we must legislatively lay new goals for the next several years.

The first section of the bill introduced today is the authorization section for funding of the Federal assistance for the construction of municipal waste treatment facilities. The range of proposals pending before the subcommittee at the moment is from the administration's 4-year, $1 billion program—for a total of $4 billion in Federal funds—to Senator MUSKIE's proposal in S. 3687 for a 5-year, $2.5 billion program—for a total of $12.5 billion in Federal funds. Last year the Senate voted to appropriate $1 billion for waste treatment facilities. This figure finally had to be compromised with the House at $800 million.

This year, fiscal 1971, an appropriation of $1.25 billion is authorized. It is clear to me, and I think to each one of us who has followed the fight against pollution that we must appropriate the full $1.25 billion. At the same time, in all future years we must meet, if not exceed, $1.25 billion annually. It is my judgment that Senator MUSKIE's proposed figure of $2.5 billion is realistic, but I left the figure open in my proposal so that I would have a chance to more carefully review other alternatives that will be before the committee and which will be presented shortly to the Senate.

My testimony on April 28 before the subcommittee was also for the purpose of introducing Mr. C. V. "Tom" Gibbs, executive director of the municipality of metropolitan Seattle and chairman of the steering committee of the association of Metropolitan Sewerage Agencies—AMSA. Mr. Gibbs' very excellent statement proposed two major changes in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

The first of these is an amendment to subsection (f) of section 8 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. It would authorize a special 20 percent incentive grant for new construction of pollution abatement works by any municipality which has built sewerage projects since 1956 that qualified for Federal assistance at the time they were built but did not in fact receive the 30 percent Federal grant then authorized. The total of these incentive grants for new construction would be limited to the total amount of Federal grants for which such municipalities were shortchanged over the period since 1956.

There is, of course, something basically unfair about penalizing those communities—for the most part large metropolitan areas requiring tremendous expenditures—which responded at an early stage to their local community needs and the concept underlying the Federal supporting program. Those communities did not receive the full Federal incentive grants due them under the program; this was not because of any failure on their part but, rather, because of the lack of full funding for the authorized program and the additional dollar ceiling imposed on all project grants—an obvious discrimination against the major metropolitan areas. Those cities which have, therefore, committed their resources and in effect mortgaged their bonding and financing ability for the future in order to initiate a program of water pollution control should, in my view, be given an opportunity to continue their efforts on the same scale available for those communities which did not respond and which did not take the initiative under the early Federal programs. Such a provision would not be supportable—and it certainly would not be incorporated in the bill that I introduce today—if the proposed incentive grants were to be paid into the general funds of the community. But, under the amendment that I proposed, the incentive grants would redress the discrimination and the past failure to fund the program adequately by facilitating the future construction of authorized facilities. Under the proposed amendment, the supplemental grant could not exceed 20 percent of any new project.

Cutoff dates always create difficulties; but where, as here, participants in a Federal program have been discriminated against through no fault of their own, I think it is imperative that we find a fair, equitable, and constructive way of redressing the situation. The amendment suggested by the Association of Metropolitan Sewerage Agencies and incorporated in my bill provides a proper way of doing so.

The second change is an amendment to subsection (c) of section 23 and would permit Federal funding of projects directed toward the solution of the combined sewer problem. Large cities will only be able to deal effectively with the problem of raw sewage overflows if they can either separate the combined flows of sanitary and storm sewers so that all of the sanitary sewage can flow to treatment plants, or provide for storage of heavy combined sewer flows during rain storms which can then be spread out for orderly delivery to disposal plants.

Recent research by AMSA indicates that 27 large metropolitan complexes—most of which exceed 500,000 in population—in the United States need almost $11.7 billion in the next 10 years for waste treatment works alone. These same 27 metropolitan areas serve 32 percent of the Nation's sewered population and have performed 24 percent of the Nation's pollution control work. Unfortunately, as of last September they had received only 6 percent of the Federal funds distributed for that type of work. Another fact included in the AMSA statement is that from 1956 to 1969, municipalities of over 250,000 population,

which contain more than 35 percent of the sewered population of the United States, received less than 8 percent of all Federal grant dollars for waste treatment. During the same period, cities under 50,000 population, with less than 35 percent of the sewered population of the United States, received more than 70 percent of all Federal waste treatment dollars. It is clear that a game of catchup has to be played by the Federal Government to enable large metropolitan areas to clean up some of the Nation's dirtiest waters. The bill introduced today, along with prompt funding and wise administration, will go a long way toward effective corrective action.

Finally, Mr. President, a word about two important matters which are currently being considered by the Department of the Interior, Federal Water Quality Administration, and the Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution. Mr. Gibbs, on behalf of AMSA, testified in support of river basin planning and a charge to waste discharges for the cost of pollution abatement. These are important concepts and ones which I hope the committee and the Senate will be able to give the administration guidance on handling. It is my judgment that a payment in proportion to pollution would rationalize our pricing structure and improve the efficiency of many operations. Sewer service charges, it seems to me, can make two major contributions: First, sewerage charges are capable of raising substantial funds, and second, sewerage charges based on the volume of waste delivered will discourage the amount of waste production.

The concept of river basin planning integrates pollution control and abatement plans into a much broader perspective and will help identify priorities and include such necessary dimensions as the political, social, and economic realities of a broader area.

S. 3687, introduced by Senator MUSKIE and four of his colleagues from the subcommittee, establishes an incentive program which will encourage the development of river basin planning and the utilization of user charges. This is an appropriate means of achieving these goals.

Mr. President, AMSA's testimony helps redirect much of our energies and resources to the major metropolitan areas, which is where the problem of water quality really has to be fought and won. It is my privilege to have worked with them in developing this legislative program and to introduce it today.

I urge all my colleagues to consider this measure carefully and specifically urge the Public Works Committee to include in its overall program the two major proposals envisioned by this measure.

One final word: Senator MUSKIE and Senator COOPER and their colleagues on the Air and Water Pollution Subcommittee are to be congratulated on the comprehensive and thorough job they are doing. Controlling water pollution and improving water quality involves difficult decisions based on complex and sometimes conflicting values. It takes time and extensive homework to sort through the facts, issues, and priorities involved in achieving high water quality. The subcommittee has given this kind of time and done this kind of work and deserves the gratitude of all of us.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOGGS). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4206) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act in order to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to incur obligations for construction grants under section 8 of such act, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. MAGNUSON, was received, read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

S. 4208—INTRODUCTION OF THE "FAMILY PHYSICIAN SCHOLARSHIP AND FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM ACT"

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I introduce today the "Family Physician Scholarship and Fellowship Program Act." The bill is cosponsored by my colleagues, Senators PROUTY, DOMINICK, JAVITS, and SAXBE.

Under this measure, family physician scholarships and fellowships would be offered to young men and women who agree to practice in areas designated as physician-shortage areas or to serve migratory agricultural workers and their families. For the first year, approximately 500 scholarships and 200 fellowships would be offered at a total cost of $4.5 million. The number of scholarships and fellowships would be increased until by the 4th year 1,000 scholarships and 500 fellowships would be authorized. In addition to migrant areas, these areas may also be an isolated rural community, an Indian reservation, or a poverty area of a central city. The basic purposes of the bill are:

First, to help with the physician-shortage problem in general;

Second, to encourage and increase the number of individuals entering the family physician specialty in particular;

Third, to attack the problem of the maldistribution of physicians by encouraging the location of doctors in physician-shortage areas;

Fourth, to increase the number of lower income and minority individuals in the medical profession; and

Fifth, to tap the idealism, social commitment, and energies of youth to serve where the medical needs of the country are the greatest.

Scholarship not to exceed $5,000 would be available to individuals agreeing to serve in physician-shortage or migrant areas. For each year of the scholarship, 1 year of service is required in a physician-shortage or migrant area.

Two types of postgraduate fellowships, intern and residency, are also provided. Since attracting medical school graduates into physician-shortage areas for their graduate work is a desirable goal in itself, no additional service requirement is demanded under the fellowship program. The fellowship program, then, will assist in providing needed medical assistance to physician-shortage areas or to the migrant population. Since there is a correlation between practice location and the location of internship and residency programs, this fellowship program should be a positive influence in attracting and hopefully attaching the doctors to physician-shortage and migrant areas.

As an inducement to encourage those who have been in the scholarship program to continue in the fellowship program, a year of their service obligation under the scholarship program is eliminated for those who complete their postgraduate work in this manner.

In keeping with the purposes of the measure, the following priorities for selecting individuals for the scholarships—and fellowships—are provided:

First, individuals from lower income families who reside in physician-shortage areas and who agree to return to those areas to practice;

Second, other individuals from physician-shortage areas who agree to return to those areas to practice;

Third, individuals from lower-income families who reside in nonphysician-shortage areas who agree to practice in a physician-shortage area; and

Fourth, other individuals from nonphysician-shortage areas who agree to practice in a physician-shortage area.

PHYSICIAN SHORTAGE PROBLEM IN GENERAL

Mr. President, today it is estimated that the need exists for 50,000 additional physicians. According to the Public Health Service, approximately 297,000 physicians were actively engaged in practice in 1966 and 50,000 were needed to meet increasing demands for health care. This survey estimated that 400,000 physicians would be required by 1975 to meet demands for personal health care, for teaching, research, medical administration, and public health and military service. Yet, the U.S. Public Health Service warned:

> The output of U.S. medical schools at presently planned levels, even with the continued immigration of foreign physicians, will provide no more than 360,000 physicians by 1975, a figure far short of meeting estimated needs.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a Library of Congress chart illustrating physician needs be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the chart was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PHYSICIAN NEEDS

	Physicians	
	1968	1975
Estimated need	363,000	400,000
Estimated supply	311,000	358,000
Estimated shortage	52,000	42,000

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President the National Advisory Commission on Health Manpower in its November 1967 report said this about the physician shortage:

> The Commission believes that there is currently a shortage of physicians, and this shortage will worsen in relation to the growing demand, despite the expected shortage in the supply of physicians in the years ahead.

This Commission cited a number of factors responsible for the physician shortage, one of which was the continuing trend toward specialization. As the Commission stated:

> Specialization has decreased the number of physicians available to provide care for the entire family, and has resulted in a reduction of the number of persons seen per family.

FAMILY PHYSICIAN SHORTAGE IN PARTICULAR

Mr. President, my bill responds to these developments. It does not yet respond to the physician shortage problem in general; its focus and thrust is aimed at the family physician shortage in particular. One of the measure's primary purposes is to reverse the alarming decline in the percentage of physicians in family practice. In 1931, 75 percent, or three out of four, of the doctors in the Nation were family practitioners; only 15 percent specialized. By 1949, or nearly two decades later, only 50 percent of the doctors were in general practice with 29 percent specializing. By 1967, again approximiately two more decades later, only 21.3 percent, or approximately one out of five, of the physicians were in general or family practice. According to figures in the report of the Citizens Commission on Graduate Medical Education, known as the Millis Report:

> In recent classes of medical school graduates, only 15 per cent have planned to enter general practice.

The trend is obvious; in my judgment, it must be reversed, if our health care system is to enjoy optimum health.

Recent testimony before the Senate Health Subcommittee indicated that the family physician "is capable of treating 85 percent of the illnesses that beset mankind." Yet, indications are that only 15 percent of our medical students will become family practitioners. Thus, it seems clear to me that we need more family physicians, capable of treating the "85 percent of the illnesses besetting mankind." Even in this age of specialization, the family doctor is a critical and central figure. I believe these statistics should make that self-evident.

My bill, Mr. President, then would recognize the primary role of the family physician. It seeks to reverse the trend away from family practice by providing scholarships for young people who want to become family physicians. Recent developments, including the following, convince me that we can attract more medical students into family practice:

First. The AMA approved the essentials for graduate training programs in family practice, December 1968;

Second. The American Board of Family Practice was established and approved in 1969 making family practice a specialty;

Third. The American Board of Family Practice offered examinations for certification of practice to eligible candidates in March 1970;

Fourth. A Residency Review Committee for Family Practice has been established and has members from the AMA Council on Medical Education, the American Council of General Practice, and the American Board of Family Practice; and

Fifth. Legislation, S. 3418, which has been introduced by Senator YARBOROUGH and cosponsored by me and which will provide grants to medical schools to establish programs in the family practice, was recently reported to the full Senate by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

My bill recognizes that there will not be enough graduate programs in the family physician specialty immediately, and therefore properly makes other primary-care physicians—pediatricians, obstetricians, and internists—eligible for the fellowship programs.

MALDISTRIBUTION OF DOCTORS

Mr. President, my measure has a sharper focus than merely providing more doctors, although more doctors are needed. My bill specifically focuses on the family-physician shortage and also addresses itself to the critical problem of the distribution of doctors. Some suburban communities have adequate numbers of doctors, while many rural areas or poverty areas of our cities may not have a single physician. My research reveals that in some areas of Los Angeles near the U.S.C. medical school, the ratio of physicians is one to 3,000 patients whereas the county average is one to 600. This means that in the East Los Angeles area and the Watts area, it is five times as difficult to find a doctor as it is in Los Angeles County. My proposal is an attempt to move doctors into the Watts and East Los Angeles areas and other areas of the country where they are needed the most.

Dr. B. L. Bible, who is on the staff of the Department of Community Health, Division of Health Services, American Medical Association, in a January 1970 article stated:

> Because of the tendency of physicians, like other professionals, to settle in urban areas, and because of the problems in communities and transportation experienced by rural dwellers, rural people, particularly those in isolated areas, have only one-half the access to physicians and other health resources that the rest of the nation has.

The Library of Congress, which has been so helpful to me in gathering background information on this proposal, attempted research on the number of communities across the country without a physician. It reported that:

> Little research has been published on physician-shortage in small communities, and definitive statistics indicating the number of communities across the country without physicians could not be located.

My attention, however, was directed to a 1965 survey of more than 1,600 towns and cities in Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Montana. The survey's investigators found that more than a thousand of the towns studied had no physician and 224 towns had only one physician. The physicians were usually older in relation to the rest of the physicians in the States. A median age of physicians in one-physician towns was 55 in Minnesota; whereas the median age of the total pysicians in the State was 46.5. In North Dakota the median age of physicians in one-physician towns was 54; the median age of the total number of active physicians in the rest of the State was 41. In South Dakota the median ages were the same. In Montana the median age was slightly younger.

The size of the town and the physician's age were also related. The smaller the town, the older the physician for the most part. In towns of less than 500 in population, the median age of the physician was 58; in towns with population of between 501 and 1,000, the median age was 47; the median age was 44.5 in towns of 1,001 to 1,250 population. This survey not only identified the 1,000 towns without a physician towns would soon become no-physician towns as the older physicians die or retire. These communities, unless we provide the incentive, are not likely to attract replacements for their older doctors.

My proposal, as I have indicated, has built-in various inducements to deal with the distribution problem. First, the scholarships are only available to students who agree to serve in physician-shortage and migrant areas. Years of expensive education are thus provided in return for a commitment by the student to serve in these areas. Students are also encouraged to continue their post-graduate service in physician-shortage areas by the offering of competitive intern and residency fellowships.

A recent report published in the Public Health Reports in January 1970 discusses the question, how does the physician select a location for his practice? It is based on a research project sponsored by the American Medical Association's Council on Rural Health. A random sample was taken of "all physicians in private practice who reside in nonmetropolitan counties of the United States" as available in AMA records. The random sample totaled 2,468 such physicians. Significantly, over 25 percent of the physicians surveyed in response to the question of how they decided upon their present practice location indicated that they were practicing in the area in which they were reared. That is why in designing my priorities, I have given first and second priority to students from physician-shortage areas. The study's results also indicated that "once a physician establishes a practice, he is unlikely to move." The study went on to say:

> At least 63 per cent of the physicians had not moved from their original practice location. This percentage was consistent regardless of community size. A more detailed breakdown of the area showed that about one-fourth of the physicians in non-metropolitan areas had practiced twenty years or more in the same place.

This same report indicated that:

> Physicians who practice in small towns are more likely to have rural rather than urban backgrounds . . . rural physicians have predominantly rural backgrounds and metropolitan physicians generally had urban locations during their youth.

The following hypothesis was offered:

> Physicians who practice in small towns are likely to have rural backgrounds.

Statistics from the report indicated that 49 percent of the physicians surveyed who were practicing in communities of less than 2,500 were raised in a small town. Therefore, the study concluded:

Physician recruitment for rural areas would be enhanced if more young men with rural backgrounds were encouraged to enter the medical profession.

Based on this information, and I believe what commonsense would tell us, I have designed the priorities for the scholarship and fellowship program so that first choices would come to individuals from physican-shortage areas. I believe if we can offer them a scholarship and in turn secure from them a commitment to spend 4 years in an area, they will be more likely to continue to practice in that area after their obligation ends.

Furthermore, we also learned from this information that the longer we can attach a physician to an area, the more likely he is to stay there. Who could be greater motivated than a man or woman from an area to serve the people from the vicinity in which he was reared

ATTRACTING LOWER INCOME AND MINORITY STUDENTS

Mr. President, there is a need in the country to attract more lower-income and minority youngsters into the medical profession. An additional and attractive feature of my bill is that it would have the effect of attracting more of these young adults into the medical profession.

In its 1968–69 survey of medical education, the American Medical Association asked the medical schools to report the racial origin of its medical students. Ninety-six out of 99 schools replied. Although the results may not be completely valid because most schools do not require their students to report their race, the survey said:

Of the total medical school enrollment of the 96 reporting schools, 2.2% are Afro-American. Excluding the two predominantly Negro schools, only 0.8% of the total enrollment is Afro-American. Three regions, East North Central, South Atlantic, and Pacific, show a 1% Afro-American enrollment. The Pacific region also has a 6% Oriental enrollment. The Mountain region, which has 0.1% Afro-American enrollment, shows a 2% Oriental enrollment. The East North Central region has a 1% Oriental enrollment. Only the West South Central region has as much as 1% Mexican-American student enrollment in its medical schools.

President Nixon in his outstanding Indian message of July 8 to the Congress said:

Almost unbelievable—we are presently able to identify in this country only thirty physicians and fewer than four hundred nurses of Indian descent.

Medical education is expensive making it difficult for lower income and minority individuals to enter the medical profession. Great efforts are being made. For example, in my State of California, the University of California has five medical schools in its system. Only eight minority students were enrolled on the five medical school campuses of the University of California system in 1968, and they were all at the San Francisco campus. By 1969, 54 minority students were enrolled, with each of the five campuses showing minority enrollment. By 1970, the number had increased to 93. The percentage of the minority enrollment varied from 13 to 25 percent, which shows that great efforts are being made in this direction.

TAPPING THE IDEALISM AND ENERGIES OF YOUTH

Mr. President, we know that many young people today are filled with idealism and have a strong commitment to help make this country a better place in which to live. I have talked to some of the medical students and found that there is a great interest and desire among them to serve the disadvantaged to meet the medical needs of the citizens of this country. Their commitment to service is great indeed, and they seem willing to forgo some of the more lucrative locations in order to have an opportunity to serve. My measure would provide a means to channel their talents, energies and idealism into the communities of the country which are crying for medical attention.

My measure is designed to train more doctors and to direct these doctors into the right places.

CONCLUSIONS

Mr. President, the Scripps-Howard newspapers recently concluded a month-long survey of doctors, both in private practice and working in government. Mr. Donald Kirkman writing in the July 7, 1970, Washington Daily News said:

With surprising unanimity, those interviewed agreed that: The U.S. needs an immediate crash program to increase the number of health workers, with primary emphasis on doctors;

Doctors in the U.S. are over-concentrated in suburbia and most have little desire to practice in ghetto and rural areas;

Many of the nation's medical colleges and other health education institutions are on the verge of bankruptcy;

Medical education is so costly that Negroes, the children of other minority groups, and poor whites are prevented from becoming doctors and dentists;

The number of Negro and minority doctors is not keeping pace with the increase in the nation's Negro and minority population.

I believe, Mr. President, that my measure responds to most of the needs which the survey indicates are recognized by the doctors themselves.

As a member of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Subcommittee on Health, I have supported and helped to shape the various programs that have been enacted to advance medical research, to provide the medical manpower necessary to do the job. Only recently I supported the Health Training and Improvement Act, a bill to extend and improve the allied health professions program which was initially enacted in 1966.

Recent years have seen a quantum leap in the demand for health services. This is as it should be as the nation moves to provide quality medical care and treatment for all its citizens. Although the medical care in this country is the finest in the world, our medical system does have serious problems. One of the most serious problems, which has already reached the crisis stage in many areas of the Nation, is the medical manpower shortage. The demand for more and better medical care and services is likely to continue and accelerate. A serious obstacle to meeting that growing demand is, and will be, unless steps are taken, this medical manpower shortage.

Dr. Egeberg emphasized this point when he said:

I don't care what Congress does with medicare, medicaid and all the other programs. Nothing is going to improve the country's medical system until we get more doctors.

Mr. President, no one can say for certain that a new proposal, such as I advance today, will prove one hundred percent successful. Based on the evidence and surveys available, as well as common sense, I believe the program will work. It will help with the family physician shortage problem; it will help to redirect physicians to serious physician-shortage areas; and it will provide greater opportunity for lower income and minority students to enter the medical profession. I discussed this proposal with the California Medical Association, and I am very encouraged with their reaction, encouragement and support.

Mr. President, I am also delighted with the encouragement I have received from deans of medical schools in California. I sincerely hope that the medical community, the administration and my congressional colleagues study this measure and join me in working for its enactment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOGGS). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 4208) to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act by providing for the establishment of a family physician scholarship and fellowship program, introduced by Mr. MURPHY (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 4208

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Family Physician Scholarship and Fellowship Program Act".

SEC. 2. Title VII of the Public Health Service Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

"PART H—FAMILY PHYSICIAN SCHOLARSHIP AND FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

"SCHOLARSHIP AND FELLOWSHIP GRANTS

"SEC. 799a. (a) In order to promote the more adequate provision of medical care for persons who—

"(A) reside in a physician shortage area (as determined pursuant to section 799c (b));

"(B) are migratory agricultural workers or members of the families of such workers;

the Secretary is authorized, in accordance with the provisions of this part—

"(C) to make scholarship grants to individuals who are medical students and who agree, after completion of their professional

training, to engage in the practice of family medicine (i) in a physician shortage area, or (ii) at such place or places, such facility or facilities, and in such manner, as may be necessary to assure that, of the patients receiving medical care in such practice a substantial portion will consist of persons referred to in clause (B); and

"(D) to make fellowship grants to individuals who (while undergoing training, or receiving professional experience, designed to prepare them to engage in the practice of family medicine) are serving as interns or residents in public or nonprofit private hospitals which (i) are located in a physician shortage area, or (ii) a substantial portion of the patients of which consists of persons referred to in clause (B).

For purposes of subparagraph (D) of the preceding sentence, training or experience in obstetrics, pediatrics, or internal medicine shall be considered to be training or experience preparing an individual to engage in the practice of family medicine.

"(b)(1) Scholarship grants under this part shall be made with respect to academic years, and fellowship grants under this part shall be made with respect to 12-month periods.

"(2) The amount of any medical student scholarship grant under this part to any individual for any full academic year shall not exceed $5,000; the amount of any intern fellowship grant under this part to any individual for any 12-month period shall not exceed $9,000; and the amount of any resident fellowship grant under this part to any individual for any 12-month period shall not exceed $10,000 (in the case of an individual who, for a preceding 12-month period, has not received a resident fellowship grant under this part), or $12,000 (in any other case).

"(3) The Secretary shall, in awarding medical student scholarship grants under this part, accord priority to applicants as follows:

"(A) first, to any applicant who (i) is from a low-income family, (ii) resides in a physician shortage area, and (iii) agrees that, upon completion of his professional training, he will return to such area and will engage in such area in the practice of family medicine;

"(B) second, to any applicant who meets all the criteria set forth in subparagraph (A) except that prescribed in clause (i);

"(C) third, to any applicant who meets the criterion set forth in clause (i), and

"(D) fourth, to any other applicant.

"(c)(1) Any medical student scholarship grant awarded to any individual under this part shall be awarded upon the condition that such individual will, upon completion of his professional training, engage in the practice of family medicine—

"(A) in the case of any individual who, in applying for a medical student scholarship grant under this part, met the criteria set forth in subparagraph (A) or (B) of subsection (b)(3), in the physician shortage area in which he agreed (pursuant to such subparagraph) to engage in such practice; and

"(B) in the case of any individual who did not agree (pursuant to such subparagraph (A) or (B)) to engage in such practice in any particular physician shortage area or has been waived (pursuant to paragraph (4)) to engage in such practice in any particular physician shortage area—

"(i) in any physician shortage area, or

"(ii) at such place or places, in such facility or facilities, and in such manner, as may be necessary to assure that, of the patients receiving medical care provided by such individual, a substantial portion will consist of persons who are migratory agricultural workers or are members of the families of such workers;

for a 12-month period for each full academic year with respect to which he receives such a scholarship grant. For purposes of the preceding sentence, any individual, who has received a medical student scholarship grant under this part for 4 full academic years and who has received fellowship grants under this part for 3 full 12-month periods, shall be deemed to have received a medical student scholarship grant under this part for only 3 full academic years.

"(2) The condition imposed by paragraph (1) shall be complied with by any individual to whom it applies within such reasonable period of time, after the completion of such individual's professional training, as the Secretary shall by regulations prescribe.

"(3) If any individual to whom the condition referred to in paragraph (1) is applicable fails, within the period prescribed by paragraph (2), to comply with such condition for the full number of months with respect to which such condition is applicable, the United States shall be entitled to recover from such individual—

"(A) an amount which bears the same ratio to the aggregate of (i) the amounts of the medical student scholarship grant or grants (as the case may be) made to such individual under this part plus (ii) the amount of interest which would be payable on such amounts if such amounts had been loans bearing an interest rate of 7 per centum per annum and the interest thereon had been payable annually, as

"(B) (i) the number obtained by subtracting from the number of months to which such condition is applicable a number equal to one-half of the number of months with respect to which compliance by such individual with such condition was made, bears to (ii) the number of months with respect to which such condition is applicable.

"(4) (A) Any obligation of any individual to comply with the condition applicable to him under the preceding provisions of this subsection shall be cancelled upon the death of such individual.

"(B) The Secretary shall by regulations provide for the waiver of suspension of any such obligation applicable to any individual whenever compliance by such individual is impossible or would involve extreme hardship to such individual and if enforcement of such obligation with respect to any individual would be against equity and good conscience.

"(d) In awarding intern and resident fellowship grants under this part, priority shall be given to interns and residents in hospitals a substantial portion of the patients of which are economically disadvantaged persons.

"ADMINISTRATION; CONTRACTURAL ARRANGEMENTS

"SEC. 799b. The Secretary may, in the administration of this part, enter into agreements with schools of medicine, hospitals, or other appropriate public or nonprofit private agencies under which such schools, hospitals, or other agencies will, as agents of the Secretary, perform such administrative functions as the Secretary may specify. Any such agreement with any school, hospital, or other agency may provide for payment by the Secretary of amounts equal to the expenses actually and necessarily incurred by such school, hospital, or other agency in carrying out such agreement.

"AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

"SEC. 799c. (a) For the purpose of making medical student scholarship grants under this part, there is authorized to be appropriated $2,500,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, $4,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for each succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary to continue to make such grants to students who (prior to July 1, 1974) have received such a grant and who are eligible for such a grant under this part during such succeeding fiscal year.

"(b) For the purpose of making intern and resident fellowship grants under this part, there is authorized to be appropriated $2,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, $3,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1972, $4,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, $5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1974, and for each succeeding fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary to continue to make such grants to interns and residents who (prior to July 1, 1973) have received such a grant or a medical student scholarship grant under this part, and who are eligible for such a grant under this part during such succeeding fiscal year.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 799d. (a) For purposes of this part—

"(1) the term 'nonprofit', as applied to any hospital, means a hospital which is owned and operated by one or more nonprofit corporations or associations, no part of the net earnings of which inures, or may lawfully inure, to the benefit of any private shareholder or individual; and

"(2) the term 'practice of family medicine' means the practice of medicine by a physician (licensed to practice medicine and surgery by the State in which he practices his profession) who specializes in providing to families (and members thereof) comprehensive, continuing, professional care and treatment of the type necessary or appropriate for their general health maintenance.

"(b)(1) The term 'physician shortage area', when used in this part, refers to an area within a State which is determined, in accordance with this subsection—

"(A) to have an insufficient number of physicians practicing their profession therein so as adequately to meet the need for medical care of the population of such area; and

"(B) in which the ratio of physicians to population is lower than in other areas of the State.

"(2) The Secretary shall, in making determinations under this subsection, accept (in the case of any State) the determination, as to the number and location of physician shortage areas in such State, recommended to him by—

"(A) the State planning agency for such State (as designated pursuant to section 314(a)(2)(A)), or

"(B) if in such State there is no such agency, or if such agency fails or refuses to make a recommended determination to the Secretary within such reasonable time as he shall prescribe, by such other agency of such State as the Secretary finds to be qualified to make such a recommended determination and as the Governor of such State shall have designated to make such a recommended determination; but only if—

"(C) such agency, in making such recommended determination, has sought and obtained the advice and assistance of the State medical society for such State;

"(D) such agency, in making such recommended determination, classifies each area which it determines to be a physician shortage area as to the degree of the physician shortage therein as compared with other areas which such agency determines to be physician shortage areas; and

"(E) the Secretary is satisfied with the adequacy of the criteria employed by such agency as the basis upon which such recommended determination was made.

"(3) If, in the case of any State, the Secretary does not receive (within such reasonable time as he shall prescribe) a recommended determination with respect to such State which meets the requirements of paragraph (2), he shall (after seeking the advice and assistance of the State medical society

for such State) determine the number and location of the physician shortage areas (if any) of such State on the basis of the most current and appropriate data available to him."

S. 4210—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE ACT RELATING TO PENALTIES FOR WRONGFUL DEPOSIT OF CERTAIN REFUSE, INJURY TO HARBOR IMPROVEMENTS, AND OBSTRUCTION OF NAVIGABLE WATERS

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, too often we refuse to face a particular problem until it becomes a crisis. Because of this tendency, we often lack the necessary tool to deal effectively with it. An example of a problem that has been ignored too long is found in the crisis over mercury pollution.

Mercury has been found in our rivers, lakes, and fish. It is not unusual to find some mercury in our waters, since it is a natural component of the rain, the sea, the earth's crust, and its water resources. However, the mercury that has recently been found in fish has appeared in much greater quantities than the .5 part per million which the Food and Drug Administration recommends as the acceptable safe limit for human consumption.

As a result, many American citizens are now eating fish which have dangerously high concentrations of mercury. They are potential victims of mercury poisoning, which can result in premature senility, deafness, and death.

Despite this very great danger to the health of our Nation, the only law under which violators can be prosecuted is an 1899 law referred to as the Refuse Act. This act provides a maximum penalty of $2,500 upon conviction. Because of the ineffectiveness of such a penalty, the Justice Department is merely using this law as a basis to obtain a cease and desist order against eight firms charged with violations.

It is obvious that a stiffer and more effective penalty is needed. For this reason, I am today introducing legislation which would provide for a fine of up to $10,000 per day upon conviction in the future.

Though I hope that this penalty will never have to be imposed, and that neither individuals nor corporations will willfully discharge dangerous substances into our Nation's waters, I believe that it is incumbent upon Congress to provide effective remedies for this situation should it arise again.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in full at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOLE). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 4210) to amend the act of March 3, 1899, relating to penalties for wrongful deposit of certain refuse, injury to harbor improvements, and obstruction of navigable waters, introduced by Mr. PERCY, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Public Works, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 4210

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 16 of the Act entitled "An Act making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes", approved March 3, 1899 (33 U.S.C. 411), is amended by striking out in the first sentence thereof the following: "twenty-five hundred dollars nor less than five hundred dollars," and inserting in lieu thereof "$10,000," and by inserting immediately after such first sentence the following new sentence: "In the case of any violation which continues over a period of time, each day such violation continues shall be a separate violation for the purposes of this section."

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS

S. 2045

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS) be added as a cosponsor of S. 2045, to establish an Office of Consumer Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRANSTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 3311

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the names of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. PACKWOOD), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS) be added as cosponsors of S. 3311, the Crime Insurance Act of 1970, to allow storeowners and homeowners to obtain crime insurance at reasonable rates.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRANSTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

S. 3724

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. PROUTY) be added as a cosponsor of S. 3724, to amend the Internal Revenue Code with respect to ammunition recordkeeping requirements.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT—AMENDMENTS

AMENDMENT NO. 829

Mr. HUGHES (for himself, Mr. CRANSTON, Mr. NELSON, Mr. GOODELL, Mr. EAGLETON, and Mr. INOUYE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, as an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, for amendment No. 819, proposed by Mr. COOPER (for himself and other Senators), to the bill (H.R. 17123) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1971 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and other weapons, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selective Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(The remarks of Mr. HUGHES when he submitted the amendment appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

AMENDMENT NO. 830

Mr. BROOKE submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him, as an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, for amendment No. 819, proposed by Mr. COOPER (for himself and other Senators) to House bill 17123, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 831 AND 832

Mr. HUGHES subsequently submitted two amendments, intended to be proposed by him, to the amendment No. 819, proposed by Mr. COOPER (for himself and other Senators) to House bill 17123, supra, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(The remarks of Mr. HUGHES when he submitted the amendments appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON THE FIRST ANNUAL REPORT OF THE COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, for the information of Members of the Senate and the public, the Senate Interior and Insular Affairs Committee will be holding a hearing on Thursday, August 13, to receive testimony from the members of the Council on Environmental Quality and to review the first annual report of the Council on Environmental Quality. The Council's report together with the President's message to the Congress were transmitted to the Congress earlier today. The hearing will be open to members of the public and will be held in room 3110 of the New Senate Office Building at 10 a.m., August 13.

URUGUAY BAND KILLS MITRIONE, HOLDS TWO OTHERS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, this afternoon's Washington Evening Star has a headline entitled "Kidnaped American Found Slain." The story emanates from Montevideo, Uruguay. It reads in part:

> The Tupamaro guerrillas executed American police expert Daniel A. Mitrione during the night because the Uruguayan government refused to release an estimated 150 political prisoners as ransom for him and two other kidnaped foreign officials.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KIDNAPED AMERICAN FOUND SLAIN

URUGUAY BAND KILLS MITRIONE, HOLDS TWO OTHERS

MONTEVIDEO, URUGUAY.—The Tupamaro guerrillas executed American police expert Daniel A. Mitrione during the night because the Uruguayan government refused to release an estimated 150 political prisoners as ransom for him and two other kidnaped foreign officials.

Mitrione's body was found bound and gagged in a bloodstained car parked on a city street. He had been shot twice in the head. A bandage covered the chest wound he suffered when he was kidnaped July 31 while driving to work.

Police sealed off the area, removed the body from the car and declined to say where they had taken it. They refused to give official confirmation that it was Mitrione's, but police officials told newsmen there was little or no doubt.

A U.S. Embassy spokesman announced later that the body had been identified by a friend as that of Mitrione.

SECOND BODY REPORTED

Unconfirmed reports circulated that a second body had been found, but the police said nothing.

The car in which Mitrione's body was found was left parked at an intersection in a poor worker's residential section. It had been stolen yesterday. Police closed off the intersection, declaring it a "military zone."

People living in the area said they had heard two shots about 1:30 a.m. They did not hear a car driving off, indicating that the Tupamaros had departed on foot. Apparently, no one investigated immediately, and the police said a passing police patrol car made the discovery a few hours later.

The patrolmen were looking for stolen cars. They spotted bloodstains on the parked car, and the body inside.

Beside being bound and gagged, the body's eyes were covered with a bandage. It was dressed in a blue suit and wrapped in a blanket.

BELIEVED KILLED AFTER DEADLINE

Witnesses who saw the body before police rushed it away said the hair was black. This apparently made first identification uncertain. Mitrione, a tall, heavy-set man, had white hair. The Tupamaros apparently dyed it to facilitate hiding Mitrione during his 10 days of captivity.

Mitrione apparently was killed more than 12 hours after the deadline of noon yesterday set by the Tupamaros for his execution.

The Tupamaros have said nothing about what they plan to do with their other captives—Brazilian Consul Aloysio Mares Dias Gomide, 41, and Claude Fly, 65, of Fort Collins, Colo., a U.S. soil expert working for the Uruguayan government.

Dias Gomide was kidnaped July 31, the day Mitrione was seized. Fly was kidnaped from his laboratory last Friday by men claiming to be bodyguards assigned by the government.

Mitrione, 50-year-old former police chief of Richmond, Ind., is the second foreigner killed in the wave of Latin-American political kidnapings that began last September. Guatemalan rebels killed the West German ambassador, Count Karl von Spreti, last April after the Guatemalan government refused to release 17 political prisoners.

Local radio stations received several anonymous telephone calls shortly after the deadline yesterday reporting that Mitrione had been slain. The callers also said the other two hostages would be killed but the Tupamaros issued no communique to confirm either report.

Meanwhile, 5,000 troops and police kept up a street-by-street search. They arrested more than 100 persons yesterday, including nine suspected Tupamaros and a doctor believed to have treated Mitrione for a bullet wound in the chest he got when kidnaped.

Mitrione was sent to Montevideo by the U.S. Agency for International Development as an adviser to the Uruguayan police. Tupamaro communiques accused him of being a spy for the U.S. government and said he had admitted "providing lethal weapons to repress the Uruguayan people."

Mitrione's wife is in Montevideo with four of their nine children. The other five are in the United States.

(They are Mrs. Maria Hennequin, 26, of Hyattsville; Mrs. Linda Tarter, 24, of Forestville; Melanie Mitrione, 21, of Portsmouth, Va.; Dan Jr., 23, and David, 18, both of Mount Rainier.)

MRS. FLY GETS LETTER

Fly's wife, in Montevideo, received a letter from her husband yesterday. He wrote, "Please don't worry. I am well. Pray for me and wait. Go home, they are feeding me. Help me please. Always my love, Claude."

In a postscript, he added: "They have my glasses. I cannot read without my old pair, but they won't give them to me."

The Tupamaros, a leftist guerrilla group organized seven years ago, demanded the release of all political prisoners held by the government. President Jorge Pacheco Areco refused, saying the Tupamaros were "common criminals" and those held by the government were not political prisoners.

Pacheco Areco met with his 11 Cabinet members and other top officials last night and called a joint session of Congress today to suspend such individual rights as trial guarantees and habeas corpus.

DEATH PENALTY PROPOSED

Several congressmen proposed reinstatement of the death penalty, which was banned many years ago. There was also an unconfirmed report that a group of right-wing extremists calling themselves the "Death Squad"—like the killer squads of police vigilantes in Brazil—had threatened reprisals against the families of suspected Tupamaros.

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, our country should not maintain diplomatic relations with any country that is incapable of protecting American diplomats within that country. If our diplomats cannot be protected, it seems to me that the President and the State Department should forthwith order all Americans home from that country with the statement that we will not permit Americans to remain there as agents of the U.S. Government until that Government demonstrates clearly and unequivocally that it can protect the lives of American diplomats domiciled within that country.

It is the height of folly for Americans to go to foreign countries to carry out and represent the policies of the U.S. Government within those nations and be subjected to the savagery of executions by persons within those countries.

We have had too much of that in recent years. The time to stop it is long overdue. In my judgment, we could do so if we withdrew our diplomats immediately.

ARTISTS' EFFORTS FOR PEACE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, within the last few weeks a group of distinguished artists from all segments of the American arts community, and of art dealers, directors, and educators, met with the chairman of the Arts and Humanities Subcommittee, the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL), and with me, the ranking minority member, to express their deep concern regarding U.S. policy in Indochina and in behalf of peace. They had the idea that they had to make some demonstration or sit-in or engage in some other activity to call this matter to the attention of Congress. We told them that was not at all necessary, that we would be glad to introduce their views into the RECORD. We were impressed with the depth of the feeling and the sincerity of purpose manifested by this delegation with whom we participated in a detailed and fruitful discussion on the subject.

In keeping with their request and the pledge made to them, I am, on behalf of myself and Mr. PELL, bringing to the attention of the Congress the concern which has moved these artists and art dealers and their associates who so fervently feel that U.S. involvement in Indochina should be terminated. A petition presented to us eloquently summed up the feelings of the group—"a war so senseless abroad cannot help but tear us apart at home."

Also, I append two explanatory articles which appeared in the press further detailing their concern and a list of those who met with Senator PELL and me. I ask unanimous consent that this material appear as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times]

ART WORLD SEEKS WAYS TO PROTEST WAR

(By Grace Glueck)

Petitions are circulating. Paintings are coming off gallery walls. Posters are rolling off the presses. The city's art community is mobilizing for an all-out protest, aimed at war, racism and oppression.

Planned activities range from the carrying out of several resolutions passed at a general meeting of the art community Monday evening to staging special exhibitions by art students, released early from their spring terms. Debate is active on how best to get protest points across.

One resolution at the Monday meeting called for * * * galleries Friday as a protest gesture. However, none of the city's six major art institutions has made a decision to close—although two, the Jewish and the Whitney, have had shows canceled by exhibiting artists.

Instead of shutting down, the Museum of Modern Art will open on Friday a "pro-youth" photographic exhibition, "May 2 through May 9, 1970," concerning events in Cambodia, at Kent State and in other areas during that week. It will present a special film program, which may include a recent picture by the Japanese government on the bombing of Hiroshima.

TRUSTEES COULD DECIDE

Acknowledging "the difficulty, indeed the impossibility, of conducting business as usual," John Hightower, the Modern's director, said:

"Museums provide all of us with a positive form of intensely human communications. I intend to do all I can to see that arts institutions address themselves to relieving the sense of hopelessness we all share."

Museums that receive financial aid from the city, such as the Metropolitan and the Brooklyn Museum, so far have no plans to close either. A spokesman for August Heckscher, administrator of recreation and cul-

tural affairs, noted that any request for permission to close from a museum board of trustees would be honored.

The Whitney Museum, which will decide tomorrow whether to close, plans to give over a ground floor wall for the display of peace propaganda. At the request of its staff, it is also displaying prominently in its lobby an antiwar painting by Peter Saul entitled "Saigon."

A number of museum staff members have been active in signing and circulating antiwar petitions. One, declaring that "this society is being weakened immeasurably by the war in Indochina," will be printed in newspapers as an advertisement, if enough money and signatures are collected.

ONE CLOSING INDEFINITE

Many art galleries in the city, particularly those dealing with young avant-garde artists, will make the Friday closing gesture. Several, in fact, will close for longer than that. At the request of all its exhibiting artists, the Reese Pallye Gallery, 93 Prince Street, has closed completely for an indefinite period, with the enthusiastic endorsement of its proprietor.

But on the other hand, while the Bykert Gallery, 24 East 81st Street, has also closed is group show until June 1 at the request of its artists, Klaus Kertess, the gallery's director, calls it a self-defeating gesture.

"The activity of artists is a positive one," he notes. "Art is one of the first things repressed by a totalitarian regime."

Art schools around the city have plunged into protest activity, too. Interior design students at Pratt Institute, for instance, have organized a movement called "Design for Peace." As one of its activities, the group makes contact with professionals in the field, urging them to sign a petition promoting the Hatfield-McGovern amendment to halt funding of military operations in Southeast Asia.

And at the Parsons School of Design, students voted to suspend classes two weeks ago, and dropped plans for their annual exhibit. Instead, they prepared a protest show, "My God! We Are Losing a Great Country," that drew 1,500 visitors. Now closed, it will soon be reopened at the New School, with which Parsons is affiliated.

"As commercial art students they've been studying propaganda to sell corn flakes," explains David Levy, the school's president. "Now they've decided to use their skills to sell peace."

[From the New York Times, June 6, 1970]

ARTISTS TO WITHDRAW WORK AT BIENNALE

(By Grace Glueck)

Twenty artists of the 44 selected so far to show in the American Pavilion at this year's Venice Biennale have withdrawn their work "as an act of dissociation from United States Government sponsorship," according to the Emergency Cultural Government Committee of the New York Art Strike.

The committee hopes instead to exhibit at a New York museum this summer. The Biennale opens on June 24.

In behalf of the 20 artists, including such well-known names as Roy Lichtenstein, Claes Oldenburg, Robert Rauschenberg, Robert Morris, Andy Warhol and Robert Motherwell, the committee has sent a telegram to representatives of the international art program of the Smithsonian Institution, which sponsors United States art programs abroad.

The telegram says that the artists "are denying the use of their art as a cultural veneer to cover policies of ruthless aggression abroad and intolerable repression at home."

SHOW WILL GO ON

Officials of the art program said yesterday, however, that they planned to go ahead with the show.

"I feel that each artist should speak directly for himself," said Lois Bingham, the program's chief. "We'll only consider a direct request from each individual sufficient reason for canceling loan agreements." So far, she said, only Jim Dine and Ron Kitaj, both of whom are living in England, have sent in such requests.

Miss Bingham added that a letter to all participants was to go out today, explaining the purpose of the Biennale exhibition, and asking artists to share their views with her individually. In response to student-artist demonstrations that almost shut the Biennale down in 1968, the United States exhibition has been reformulated this year as an "experimental project."

Eschewing the "star" system of displaying paintings and sculpture by a few artists, it will consist of a graphic arts workshop, plus an exhibition of 75 to 100 contemporary United States prints.

KEEPING ELEMENTS DISCRETE

"The emphasis will be on creative experimentation in a nonpolitical setting and the exchange of concepts and ideas," Miss Bingham says. "For nearly 20 years the international program has worked hard to separate art from politics. I hate to see it get back into the political arena."

The Emergency Cultural Government Committee, which lists as its steering members the artists Irving Petlin, Frank Stella and Robert Morris, and the art critic Max Kozloff, is a subgroup of the New York Artists Strike Against Racism, Sexism, Repression and War.

The latter group, formed May 18 after a meeting of more than 1,000 members of the New York art community, called for a general art strike on May 22 that closed many galleries and two of the city's major museums.

In a manifesto it is sending out to artists across the country, the emergency committee says that it will "challenge the U.S. Government for the loyalties of American artists in each and every upcoming international art even in which Government sponsorship is a criterion for participation."

Asking for artists' support of its "general principle," the manifesto says that the committee is determined "to end all complicity with a government whose politics we consider illegitimate." It declares that it seeks to function as the "American artists agency" for organizing American participation in international art events formerly sponsored by the government.

Members of the group say that on June 16 they, in conjunction with several representative dealers, museum officials and critics, will try to meet in Washington with the Senate Subcommittee on Cultural Affairs to ask for its support.

They will also try to have the work of all American artists exhibited in United States embassies abroad recalled.

"Artists can no longer bear the onus of showing with our Government," Mr. Petlin said yesterday. "We'll carry out our own plans until this crisis ends."

Henry T. Hopkins, exhibition chief for the United States Pavilion, said that though artists had withdrawn from the print exhibition, the workshop program was at the moment "intact."

Mr. Hopkins, who is director of the Fort Worth Art Center Museum, said that for his part he had taken on "the professional responsibilities of seeing this project through," adding: "In every instance the art program has acted professionally and with integrity concerning its sympathies with dissident artists. I hope there is room for negotiations."

LIST OF ANTI-INDOCHINA WAR DELEGATION

Rauschenberg, Robert, painter.
Morris, Robert, sculpture.
Karp, Ivan, dealer.
Castelli, Leo, dealer.
Petersen, Robert, painter.
Cooper, Paula, dealer.
Neufeld, Tanya, artist.
Koppedge, Arthur, artist.
Johnson, Poppy (female), artist.
Kertess, Klaus, dealer.
Hopps, Walter, museum director.
O'Daughtery, Brian, NEA.
Jevis, Caryl, dealer.
Lichtenstein, Roy, artist.
Berkowitz, Leon, artist.
Greenly, Colin, artist.
Koslow, Max, artist.
Petlin, Irving, artist.

A RATIONAL CALL FOR ACTION

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, recently, Whitney M. Young, Jr., executive director of the National Urban League, in his keynote address to its 60th annual convention in New York entitled "A Strategy for the 1970's: Unity, Coalition, Negotiation," issued a stirring call for all Americans to work together for the elimination of poverty, crime, and racism.

In his address, Mr. Young stressed that blacks must unite and engage in a strategy of negotiation with white society to confront injustice. In addition, Mr. Young advocates a new coalition with other minorities to eliminate the problems of poverty and crime which imprison Americans of all colors and races. He outlines a vital leadership role for the prestigious Urban League he has headed in such a distinguished way for so long.

Also, Mr. Young's approach for a "Marshall plan" for the slums and ghettos of America—originally conceived by the Harriman Commission and by the Philip Randolph Institute and supported by me and other Senators—is finally brought to the center stage by this speech, is one which is badly needed in this time of division and strife. Moderating forces on all sides must seize the initiative and work out solutions which will bring peace and prosperity to all Americans. I commend Mr. Young's address to my colleagues and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A STRATEGY FOR THE SEVENTIES: UNITY, COALITION, NEGOTIATION

(Address by Whitney M. Young, Jr.)

There comes a time in the life of every great nation when it finds itself at the crossroads—on one side, the path of division, decline, and oblivion; on the other, the path of progress, purpose, and decency. There is every indication that this nation, almost two centuries after its birth by fire, is at that crossroads.

At every hand we see chaos instead of concern, drift instead of decision, and hate instead of hope. It may well be that we are witnessing the exhaustion of the American spirit; the full-scale retreat by a people nurturing false dreams of superiority; a retreat from the responsibilities and decency that characterize true greatness.

Six renowned historians recently probed the confused spirit of our country in a national weekly. One called this "The Age of Rubbish." Another proclaimed 'the end of the American era." Another said we are experiencing "a massive breakdown." Yet another said we suffer from "a case of hypochondria." All, Conservative and Marxist alike, agreed there is a crisis of confidence. The overwhelming impression one gets from

their comments is doubt that the quality of national leadership today is adequate to the magnitude of the challenges faced.

The signs, then, are unmistakable that this unhappy land, this bitterly polarized society, seems incapable of living up to the ideals and dreams that it purportedly held for so long.

A hateful war that no one wants has spread to neighboring lands. A public inured to "body counts" and "enemy kills" has found that its own children—at Kent State and Jackson—form a new set of body count numbers.

A country whose very survival depends upon the reconstruction of its young, its poor, and its neglected non-white minorities seems only capable of hate rather than love, isolation rather than reclamation, and killing rather than saving.

Repression is rampant. Americans—for the first time in decades—now have their own "show" trials, political prisoners, and midnight police raids that kill people in their beds, people whose crime was dissent from a society that persecuted them.

And fanning the flames of repression have been the mindless pseudo-revolutionists of the left whose idea of changing society is to plant bombs where they might kill the innocent—and the mindless pseudo-conservatives of the right whose idea of standing up for the democracy they are sworn to protect is to destroy it through division and hate. Those super-patriots who yell "America, love it or leave it" ought to recognize the words of the great French philosopher Albert Camus who said: "I would like to be able to love my country and justice at the same time."

This is an America that generously supports a giant welfare subsidy program for the rich in the form of unbridled defense spending, space programs, and supersonic planes, while refusing funds to feed starving black kids in Mississippi or housing to shelter the poverty-stricken of the rural areas and cities.

It is a nation whose answer to a disturbing inflation is to create an even more dangerous recession. It tinkers with the economic system to artificially induce unemployment, to bring housing construction to a virtual end, and to drive all hope from the hearts of the poor. And in so doing, it may yet create the Depression that will rob it of the wealth it tries so hard to protect.

Beset by the twin evils of repression and recession, black people today are fearful that the limited gains of the sixties are in danger. We have seen that in spite of legal and legislative victories, racism is still alive in new and different forms.

We know all too well that the cost of liberty is less than the price of repression, and that the cost of economic justice is but a fraction of the price of racial privilege and exploitation.

It has become more clear than ever, that the black man's fight for respect and for manhood is also a fight to right the wrongs of a bloated, sick society, and to bring it back to its senses.

Our task at this Conference will be to devise the strategies that will ensure that the cause of equality, for which so much blood and tears have been shed, will triumph in this land. In our sessions and workshops we will question the prevailing myths that entangle current thinking on economic and political problems afflicting blacks and other minorities, and we will continue to move beyond the narrow limits of debate to get at the roots of the problem of bringing power to the powerless.

I am hopeful that out of this Conference will come strategies for the seventies; the framework for organizing for results, results that will have an impact upon the millions of victims of racism and neglect, a neglect sometimes called "benign" but more accurately called "callous."

The Urban League, at this stage of its history, has the responsibility to continue in its efforts to pull together America's minority communities in order to mobilize its enormous reservoir of talent and skills to win political, economic, and social victories.

The Urban League is in position to assert such leadership, not only because of its historic strengths, its dedicated staff of full-time experts and the devoted cooperation of its thousands of volunteers, but also because of its own experience with change; its own success in developing a new thrust into the ghettos of America.

For, in this our sixtieth year, the Urban League has evolved far from the limited functions envisioned by its founders. The social services we once provided newcomers to the cities of the North have had to be supplemented and replaced by a much more comprehensive organization of the black community. Two years ago, we organized our New Thrust program to do just that. The Urban League moved into the ghetto—physically and spiritually—and is serving as an enabling vehicle for a black community determined to win unity, dignity, and power. We responded to that need. We responded with vigor, and with the realization that we exist to serve the community, to identify with it, and to provide the technical assistance and know-how to enable the community itself to organize for successful action.

For we believe that "Power to the People" is but an empty phrase unless the people can be provided with the mechanism, technical assistance, and opportunities to make that power work for them in their own communities, on their own terms, under their own leadership. And a clenched fist is useless, if, when forced open, it is found to be empty of the resources of money, intellect, and the will to do the job.

New Thrust has proved itself. In city after city, local affiliates have become more relevant to the needs of the ghetto. In city after city, while continuing to keep vital channels of communication with the white community open, we have served as the catalyst that brought blacks together to win victories.

The Urban League movement continues to be flexibile, relevant, and vital. We have successfully shifted gears from treating the results of racism and poverty to mounting a full-scale attack on the causes of racism and poverty. The Urban League has taken on a commitment to change the institutions and the society that perpetuates injustice.

And that is not a short-term commitment. The New Thrust activities that started as a laboratory for community change are now part and parcel of our movement. New Thrust is no longer a separate program; it is structurally a part of our ongoing operations, and its spirit and thinking permeate every facet of our movement.

In order to insure our increased effectiveness, we have implemented structural changes within the National Office, beginning with the addition of a competent Deputy Director, that will increase our accountability and provide better planning and operating procedures. Our new Departments of Research, Personnel and Training, and our strengthened Washington Bureau—together with a redefining of our program planning and operating procedures—will make possible more effective services to our now-almost 100 affiliates.

The past year also saw the Urban League initiate a broad coalition of groups to influence what we tried to make the first accurate Census count of non-white peoples in the history of the nation. The "Make Black Count" campaign was founded on the realization that by undercounting the actual numbers of blacks and browns in America, the government, in effect, was withholding from them the federal aid distributed on a per capita basis. Black communities across the land were not getting their fair share of hospital and school monies, or even proper representation in Congress and State Legislatures. The figures are not all in yet, but the "Make Black Count" staff will be "riding herd" on the Census Bureau to insure that blacks—for a welcome change—get a fair count.

But equal to the importance of the count itself was the way the campaign was able to bring black people together, making it possible to deal with the Census Bureau from a position of strength.

The "Make Black Count" campaign has been a unified effort of the black community. It has been a coalition of all representative groups—organized welfare mothers, street gangs, church members, sororities, civil rights organizations, and others. The Urban League was the catalyst, the enabler, the provider of resources and technical assistance. We were content to take a back seat in this. Our intent was not to hog headlines or be pictured on television. All literature, posters, publicity, etc., highlighted the coalition, not the Urban League. Our goal was to bring the community together on a vital issue, and to set in motion the national and local coalitions that will become the basis for further cooperation and unity. Our experience in this campaign convinces me that our purpose has been successful, and we shall build upon it in the coming months.

We joined, also, with others to mount campaigns to protest the willful murders of Black Panthers and black college students by our home-grown version of the SS, and to successfully protest the nomination of insensitive judges to the Supreme Court that protects our liberties from the very system of racism they represent.

The Urban League is active on a broad series of fronts:

At the request of key Congressional leaders we are submitting to the Congress a detailed agenda for an updated Domestic Marshall Plan which we first proposed in 1964 to do for the victims of American racism and the poor of all colors what America so willingly did for the European victims of World War II.

We have started the National Urban League Housing Foundation to expand the supply of low and moderate income housing and to give black people a share in the building and control of their own housing.

We took a giant step toward strengthening black colleges through the Black Executive Exchange Program that brings blacks who have made it in the competitive give-and-take of the professions and business to lecture and advise students and faculty at black institutions of higher education.

And we have served the needs of ghetto youth in a variety of ways, including consultation and assistance for Youth Organizations United, the national federation of over 200 city street gangs that is helping to channel the energies of these youngsters into constructive action on behalf of their communities.

And, further serving youth, our summer student program brought 100 college student leaders again into the ghettos of America in a constructive program to help organize the black community, and to place the talent and spirit of campus youth at the service of their brothers and sisters.

We moved to fill the nationwide vacuum in child care through a Day Care Center Corporation that promises to fill a crying need for neighborhood day care centers operated and controlled by the community.

Our new Consumer Protection Program is designed at organizing the exploited minority community to a new awareness of making the most effective use of their scarce dollars and

ending the callous preying upon the poor that typifies so much of the economic life of the ghetto.

The Urban League's pioneering Street Academies will come to many more communities through the establishment of an Urban Education Institute that will provide the framework for planning and consulting with other institutions and the community in order to duplicate many times over our successes in helping deprived youngsters to recover from the failures of the heartless educational bureaucracies, and go on to higher educational goals.

Our Labor Education Advancement Program (LEAP) is responsible for the greatest breakthrough of black apprentices into the building trades in history, while at the same time creating and supporting black contractors.

Our On-the-Job Training programs are the most efficient in the country, with the highest retention rate at the lowest cost per trainee.

Other Urban League programs are helping to develop black businessmen, bring new opportunities to returning veterans, and family planning and mental retardation services to the black community under its own control for the first time. And our various job placement and training programs pumped $400 million of cool, green cash into the black community in new and added wages and salaries.

But we cannot be complacent about our successes, accomplished with limited resources. They represent a challenge for still greater efforts in the future; a base from which we must build the coalitions and unity without which racism will remain supreme, and poverty will possess the souls of the real forgotten Americans—the blacks, the browns, and the reds of the rural and urban ghetto.

This new decade could bring promise of a new era in the relations between the races. Just as the nation as a whole is at a crossroads, so, too, black people face a new turning point, a decisive strategic moment that may put us on a new path to freedom. Just as there is some doubt whether the nation will choose the right path to greatness there must be doubts, especially in the light of the historic racism of America, that the seventies will bring true equality for black people. But while we may question the future, it becomes our duty to mobilize and steel ourselves for a new phase of struggle.

Black Americans first pursued a *strategy of conciliation*. Fresh from the prison of slavery, the Freedmen and their sons tried to work with whites and convince them to act with decency. Whites remained in basic control of all matters affecting blacks, and the strategy of conciliation became, above all, a strategy of survival a strategy to squeeze short-term gains under adversity.

Then there came a *strategy of organization*. Blacks created the institutions without which there can be no community and no progress in a hostile society. These were the years that saw the birth of the NAACP, the Urban League, and educational, civil, religious and business associations. The institutional structure of the black community took shape, and, abandoned by white society, blacks came together to build strength for the inevitable future confrontation with unbridled white power.

The next phase was the *strategy of confrontation*, in which the institution of the black community staged a frontal assault on the pillars of racism. This was the era of the boycott, the sit-in, ride-ins, wade-ins, lie-ins and all the other disruptive tactics that confronted Americans not with the pliant, silent oppressed blacks they wanted, but with the proud, determined black men and women who insisted on equality.

We will be forever grateful for the dedicated, fearless warriors of CORE, SNCC, SCLC, the NAACP and the Urban League who fought the evils of racism on its home grounds—in the Southern Black Belt, and in the rigged courts and bigoted cities of the North.

And, basically, this strategy worked. To it we owe the destruction of the formal, legal structure of racism in America. To it we owe the passage of laws and the legal decisions that provide a framework from which we can pursue the goals of complete equality. To it we owe the world-wide realization that America is plagued by racism, and our country has won not the respect, nor even the envy, of the world's peoples, but their pity that so great a nation can be so incapable of morality and action to end poverty and bigotry.

The suspicions harbored by black people of this Administration's intentions, suspicions that are supported by many of its actions, have led to intensified confrontations. Last year, at our annual Conference in Washington, I recited a long list of administration actions and warned that black people would not stand for a reversion to official attitudes and actions directed against them. A few weeks ago Bishop Spottswood, chairman of the NAACP, reasserted the widespread black disillusionment with the Administration in a forceful indictment that accurately reflected much of the mood of black people today. This mood was further reflected in the Gallup Poll of last week which shows the overwhelming majority of black people dissatisfied with the current Administration.

It is obvious that where blacks are concerned, the Administration faces a credibility gap of enormous proportions. But it persists in claiming that the record does not justify this suspicion; that progress is being made, and that it does not intend to abandon blacks to the evil expedient of a Southern strategy that tries to out-Wallace Wallace.

The record is sometimes muddied. As critical as I have been of Administration actions, I do admit that there are some signs that elements of this Administration are moving forward to bring about change. In recent weeks there have been indications that tax-exemptions for the South's private "Hate Academies" will be cut off; that school desegregation might be implemented; that the government proposes to move more strongly against job discrimination. And there are indications that agencies such as OEO and HEW will channel new funds and programs into black organizations that have the expertise and the community's respect to do the job that others failed to do.

All these may be but straws in the wind, but it would be a mistake for us to fail to recognize that within every Administration there are contending forces. To cease to fight for our victories and to fail to negotiate with those in power is to leave the field to the political Neanderthals that so far seem to have dominated decision-making in the past few years.

Early in his Administration, the President asked black Americans to judge him by his deeds and not his words. We have done that—and we have been greatly disappointed. Both words and deeds have left a bitterness that must now be transcended. Black people have—with justification—always judged white America with suspicion and disappointment. Promises have rarely led to performance, and words as well as well-meaning deeds have often been traps to further ensnare us.

We have been forced by this Administration to react with defensive measures, if not actual confrontation, and perhaps now a new strategy would be more fitting. For these tactics were based on protest born of powerlessness. I believe that we have demonstrated that we do have some power now—power to make America sit and listen, and to negotiate with us as equal partners. America can no longer afford to ignore its awakened black masses. And no Administration—unless it is willing to preside over the destruction of American democracy, can afford to refuse the just demands of its neglected minorities.

While we would hope that the nation's leadership would exercise the kind of determined, crusading sense of mission that is the hallmark of great leadership, it is a fact of life that there is developing a national stand-off between those of us who are fighting for justice and those who want to maintain the status quo.

This is an impasse that leads nowhere, unless it be to further polarization, further division, further bitterness. White society has shown that it lacks the courage and the imagination to break this impasse by moving constructively. It is up to the black community to show the way.

Our cause is just. But white America still possesses the power. We must forge the union of justice with power. In the words of Pascal: "Justice and power must be brought together, so that whatever is just may be powerful, and whatever is powerful may be just."

I propose that the just and the powerful deal with each other as equals in a *strategy of negotiation*.

White society has the trappings of power—its police, its army, its law. But blacks have demonstrated effectively that unless our just demands are dealt with, these trappings of power only make a society muscle-bound; only drive it into displays of raw, naked power, displays that solve nothing and tear apart everything.

The two Americas—black and white—need each other. Let us break the rigid confines of charges and countercharges, protest and neglect. Let us negotiate our way out of the impasse that threatens to split the country apart.

By all means, we must continue to confront injustice. A strategy of negotiation does not imply weakness; on the contrary, it implies strength—the strength a unified black community can demonstrate. In the words of John F. Kennedy: "Let us never negotiate out of fear; but let us never fear to negotiate." Such a strategy demands from white America that it face up to the realities of a situation in which black young men are sent thousands of miles from home to fight and die for a cause labeled democracy, while democracy is denied them in the swollen ghettos of New York and in the sullen farmlands of Mississippi.

It demands from white America that it implement a massive Domestic Marshall Plan that will rescue all Americans from poverty and disease.

And above all, it demands from white America that it demonstrate the will, the honesty, and the sincerity to face its black brothers on equal terms, as peers in a joint effort to rid the nation of the cancer of racism.

A strategy of negotiation demands from black America the power to negotiate from a position of strength. I believe we have demonstrated that power. In one sense, we have amply demonstrated a power to disrupt. In another sense, we have demonstrated, through the election of black mayors and legislators, political strength, and through the relentless accomplishment of our people against great odds, a changing economic and educational strength. We have made the most of the limited opportunities available to the point where we have the pride, the strength, and the accomplishments which should compel white leadership to sit down with us as equals.

A strategy of negotiation demands of black leadership a sense of unity and purpose, without which we will be subject to the old divide-and-conquer tactics oppressors have always used. It will demand of us a discipline and a willingness to rise above differences of doctrine and personality for the greater

good of all black people. We must, more than ever, impose upon ourselves and our organizations a community of spirit and a fraternal bond that will enable us to better negotiate from a base of strength and unity.

Because we believe so strongly in the need for a unified black community to negotiate from a position of strength, we here and now issue a *Call to Black Leadership* to meet and to discuss an agenda for change.

We want to arrive at a broad consensus of positions that can be negotiated with white America.

We call for a meeting of blacks that includes all points of view from all shades of the spectrum of opinion.

We would like to cooperate with our brothers and sisters of all persuasions. We seek peaceful dialogue, not only with those whose opinions we share, but with all representative elements of the black community.

In unity there is strength, and we seek to help to bring about a unified black position with which White Society can be confronted and with which it must negotiate.

It will not be easy to achieve such unity, because there are those whose experiences have led them to despair of White America ever acting in a decent way. But I have confidence that black people will muster the courage and the strength to make one last effort, based on our common sufferings, to stand united against the system that oppresses us.

And for America, this may be the last opportunity she has to deal with black Americans and to negotiate with leaders responsible to their people, before the terrifying prospect of internal strife, armed suppression and needless destruction descend fully upon us all.

Black unity is essential for black progress. This is no time for divisions. This is no time for us to mimic the polarization of white society. Only by unified action can we break the bonds that chain us. Only by unified action can we force America to become moral. Only by unified action can we forge the alliances across racial lines that promise progress.

And only through unity can we cut through the undergrowth of myth and misunderstanding and unite with other minorities to forge a new coalition for a better tomorrow.

I know that blacks have often been suspicious of such alliances. We have become contemptuous of an America that has "discovered" its problems so recently, although we have struggled with them for so long. We sense that other causes have higher priority than our own—that the motives of others are not always the same as ours, and that our suffering is so much more intense, and has been so prolonged.

But we must not let ourselves become imprisoned by concepts of race that ignore the other causes of our misery. As W. E. B. DuBois pointed out: "Back of the problem of race and color lies a greater problem which both obscures and implements it: and that is the fact that so many civilized persons are willing to live in comfort even if the price of this is poverty, ignorance, and disease of the majority of their fellow-men."

The economic and power dimensions of the problems facing us can be met through alliances with others in this twisted society who are hurting, too.

The problems of poverty are not black alone. There is hunger in the tenements and shacks of whites and browns and reds as well. There is misery in Appalachian ghost-towns, in the barrios of the West, in migrant labor camps, and in Indian reservations. And there is misery here in New York's Harlem, South Bronx, and Bedford Stuyvesant.

America has grown fat and heavy with the sweat and labor of all minorities now she must grow proud and strong through an alliance based on our realism and sense of purpose. There is at hand the raw material for building the strong alliance for social justice that is essential if America is to be saved—and we must save her if we are not *all* to go down the drain. While it is an historic fact that we came here on different ships, it is imperative that we realize that we're in the same boat now.

Coalitions for action can be formed with those whose frustrations may be somewhat different from those of minorities and the poor. White workers are hurting economically—just as we are. The top five percent of the population makes twenty percent of the income; the bottom twenty percent makes only five percent of the income. And that hasn't changed despite the New Deal, the Fair Deal, and all the other efforts at reform in the past. The white working class must be helped to understand that they, too, are dying in Vietnam; they, too, are hurting from the recession; and that they, too, are plagued by many of the problems that plague black people.

The white working class can also unite with us to combat crime. For all the talk of crime in the streets, it is the black community that suffers disproportionately from crime. If you are black, the chances that you will be robbed are triple those if you are white; the chances you'll know burglary and car theft are almost double. If you make less than $3,000 your chances of being robbed are five times higher than if your income is over $10,000; your chances of being raped are four times as high; and your chance of being burglarized, double. Blacks and whites can join together to combat the fear that grips both our communities.

Moreover, the deep frustrations caused by the expanding war; the horror of the Jackson and Kent State killings; the growing unemployment and recession; the stock market's steep decline; and the dissatisfaction with the rampant materialism that poisons the environment have convinced millions of Americans that you cannot tolerate injustice to the few without encouraging the erosion of justice for the many. Affluent Americans are beginning to see these connections, and they are beginning to listen to their children, who are not only concerned with the poverty of the ghetto, but also are angry at the poverty of the spirit that afflicts their elders.

I believe that the time is now for broad coalitions.

I believe that the many disparate and contending forces in our society today, the diverse people and groups trying to change some small corner of American life, can be brought to see how racism and mindless materialism work hand-in-hand to turn the American dream into a nightmare.

And I believe that—whether because they pursue their own self-interest or because they move their idealism to a higher, more realistic plane—a new coalition can be forged that will once more return America to a sense of purpose and a will to justice.

I believe the time has come when black people must unite, must create coalitions in order to negotiate a peace that will settle the issues that divide the country and, by so doing, bring us together.

The proud black spirit of today seeks justice and decency. It seeks to move beyond racism to a new era of progress and reconciliation. It seeks power not for its own sake, but in order to use it wisely and to prevent its misuse by racism. It seeks peace with honor, justice with respect. It seeks a newer world, and a better tomorrow.

"And for that tomorrow,
God, give us men,
Men who are proud of their Godliness,
Yet humble in their humanity;
Men who know themselves, but who in knowing themselves
Do not ignore others;
Men who are conscious of others, not only of what
They can derive from them, but also give to them;
God give us men,
Men like Abraham Lincoln, Frederick Douglass,
Franklin D. Roosevelt and John Brown
Who would not stop at the cheap art of espousing causes,
But who championed men among the anonymous mass of men;
Men like these whose piety
Lay not only in credal affirmation, but rather in the Confirmation of their deeds.
To this end,
We need Thy help,
And with Thy help we may yet, all of us, become men;
All of us brothers,
All of us Thy children;
All of us truly human."

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LONG MEMORIES

Mr. BELLMON. Mr. President, "Memory," said Freud, "is selective." We tend to repress unpleasant facts and think of only the good.

Some things, however, can never be forgotten, no matter how horrible they are to contemplate. One of these is the fate of our servicemen held captive by Hanoi.

We know they are suffering terrible deprivations.

We know they are tortured.

We know they are kept incommunicado from their families and friends.

These facts are unpleasant to think about. All Americans recoil at the treatment of our men held by the North Vietnamese. If Hanoi believes, however, that we will forget these men merely because we are revolted by their condition, they are sadly mistaken.

Our concern for their welfare will not diminish until their release. We will not allow our memories to become clouded by "pleasant thoughts" until the barbaric treatment of our men has ended.

Freud was wrong.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MIGRATORY FARMWORKERS

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, last Tuesday, August 4, 1970, during the course of the debate on the conference report on H.R. 14705, the unemployment compensation bill, which was adopted by the Senate 50 to 19 and cleared for the

President, I spoke in support of the action of the conference committee in deleting the amendment adopted by the Senate to cover certain agricultural workers—including migratory workers—under the bill. I also mentioned at that time the fact that the two documentary films that have been made in Florida on the living conditions of the migratory farmworkers were grossly unfair and not typical of the general situation in our State.

Mr. President, it is true that additional work must be done in improving the conditions of migratory farmworkers in Florida. Unfortunately, in depicting the living conditions of migratory workers, no effort has been made to show the good efforts in Florida that have succeeded in obtaining better housing, hospitalization, child care and education, along with much more adequate wages. Neither is the fact made clear that the migratory farmworkers must receive the minimum wage as provided under the Fair Labor Standards Act and that in many cases they receive substantially higher pay either on a daily or piece rate basis.

Mr. President, to emphasize the efforts that have been made to unfairly slant the story of the migratory farmworkers, which has been done throughout the television and news media, I ask unanimous consent to have an article written by Margaret Shaleuly, entitled "Migrant Tour 'Carried Hate'" appearing in the August 5, 1970, issue of Today, a daily newspaper, published in Cocoa, Fla., be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MIGRANT TOUR "CARRIED HATE"

(By Margaret Shaleuly)

A Cocoa High School dean blasted Brevard Junior College students Tuesday night for "carrying hate instead of encouragement" to fruit pickers.

Ruth Anderson, dean of women at the new Cocoa High School, was the only community representative on a two-day, BJC-sponsored tour of living quarters for fruit pickers in Frostproof and Avon Park last weekend.

Miss Anderson, a Brevard teacher for 10 years, said the delegation of five students and two professors "was more interested in furthering its own goal—which I haven't yet identified—instead of the human good."

She attacked their attempts to manage news coverage, the manner of questioning and the purpose of the trip.

Students limited their visits to groves belonging to Minute Maid—a subsidiary of the Coca-Cola Food Products Division.

Students were Leonard Smith, student government association president; Rick McDevitt, Jim King, Guy Tewksbury and Norman McDonald.

Black Student Council leader Nat Sanders and math teacher Jerome Cardell were the professors accompanying the students.

Smith said the group spent $200 funded from the school.

News media were verbally assaulted by the delegation trying to influence coverage, Miss Anderson said.

"I heard a reporter called an obscenity, a hypocrite, and attacked with statements such as 'I dare you to print this.'

"A reporter was riding in my car and we were having a discussion about the conditions seen with two of the students. We disagreed, but it was a calm, peaceful discussion.

"At the next gas stop, the first students were replaced with McDevitt and Sanders who forcefuly shouted their arguments," Miss Anderson said.

Miss Anderson said she was taking a picture of a house in Alpine Quarters and "a student told me not to include a late model car—that would be damaging."

"They didn't ask. They demanded.

"I just can't believe BJC contributed to finance this trip," said Miss Anderson who paid her own way.

"I heard students say things like 'capitalistic pigs,' referring to the Coca-Cola officials—'capitalism has got to go—socialism is in.'"

Group members, she said, had a preconceived idea of what they wanted to find.

The two places visited had only year-round resident pickers who lived in free housing. Migrant workers had moved on to other fields.

Lemon picking was to have started Monday.

"In two hours, we rushed into the lives of these people and tried to convince them they were destitute and enslaved," she said describing the visit to Maxcy Quarters in Frostproof.

Students promised "the big corporation which makes $124 million a year" would change conditions soon.

"Some of the people were afraid a change might come—officials would tear down the free housing and they would have to find their own housing in town."

Students failed to visit other areas—where the transients were housed or where pickers lived in rented housing.

Behind the Maxcy Quarters the group saw "ratty trailers, but they were unoccupied and we didn't know if they were ever occupied."

"I did notice that if a person was black and did not feel he was completely disenchanted with life and Coca-Cola, he was called a 'Tom' by the group," Miss Anderson said.

"And a white person was a redneck."

Several times people asked, "What's with Coca-Cola—there are worse conditions in other groves," she said.

"They didn't have to use school money, spend two days and travel 150 miles to find houses without plumbing and unpaved streets. They could look in their own backyard and see worse conditions."

Students "overlooked some of the people had pride in being good pickers or had planted flowers and gardens around their houses.

"I went into one house which was filthy. And another which was immaculate."

Leading questions were asked, she said.

"Instead of just asking, 'What's it like to be a picker?', group members asked, 'Do you feel you've been forced to live below human dignity?'

"A girl with two years of college started to answer the question and she was told to either say 'yes or no.'

"I couldn't help but wonder what the pickers thought these young people could do for them—the pickers were neater, better dressed and more polite," she said.

Smith, Sanders and McDevitt could not be reached for comment Tuesday night.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I asked that this article be printed in the RECORD for I believe that the manner in which the delegation of students and one or more teachers conducted the sponsored tour to view migratory farm workers' living conditions is typical of the approach and desired effect that the producers of the two documentary films wished to depict, rather than to show the true picture and the sincere and successful efforts which have been made to improve the living and working conditions of the migrants.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an editorial response televised over Station WJXT, Jacksonville, Fla., on July 31 and August 1, 1970. I ask that this editorial response be inserted in the RECORD as it shows clearly that WJXT, after presenting editorials, provides time for contrasting views as expressed in this case by Mr. Al Alsobrook, information officer of the Florida Farm Bureau.

There being no objection, the editorial response was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDITORIAL RESPONSE

NEWSMAN. In order to provide a better understanding of public issues, WJXT presents views contrasting with those expressed in our editorials. Responding to a recent WJXT Editorial, here is Al Alsobrook, information director of the Florida Farm Bureau Federation.

Mr. ALSOBROOK. NBC, in its so-called white paper on migrant labor in Florida, says that Florida has about 200,000 migrant workers and implied that all of them live in appalling misery, poverty and neglect. WJXT in an editorial tended to agree. What are the facts?

At the peak of the harvest season there are no more than 100,000 farm workers in Florida and of these roughly 30,000 can be truly classified as migrant. Admittedly some Florida farm workers, and they are in the great minority, are poor and ill-housed. But it is unfair to condemn the agricultural program of an entire state by suggesting the worst elements represent average conditions. That's about as fair as holding up the slum conditions of Jacksonville to nation-wide view, implying that such conditions represent the Bold New City of the South.

There's every good reason and the responsibility of news media to attack those areas in which the migrant or anyone else is a hapless target for abuse. To film, as NBC did, a part-time construction worker who has lived in the same area of Florida nearly all of his life and to imply to the nation that this man is an example of a migrant worker in Florida is more than unfair and borders on the dishonest. We are distressed that any representative of the news media would draw such an unbalanced, untrue picture.

It is shocking and indefensible to have people living in shacks and roach-infested houses, whether they be on Florida Avenue in Jacksonville or U.S. 27 in South Florida. It is also shocking that a major television documentary would claim that no progress has been made when in fact more than $61 million has been spent on farm labor housing over the past 10 years and nearly a million dollars is spent annually on health programs for Florida farm workers and their families.

Yes, there is poverty in all of Florida, but thankfully it is the exception rather than the rule. Would that the non-farm poor in the metropolitan areas received as much journalistic attention and could make as much progress as their counterparts down on the farm.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I find no fault in the presentation of the bad side of the migratory picture so long as it is truthfully told as not typical of the whole picture and so long as the successful efforts being made to improve the conditions under which many and I believe most migratory farmworkers live in Florida are also expressed in order that the public may obtain a true and unbiased picture of the whole situation.

Unfortunately, this has not been the case in the instance of the two documentaries on the subject.

EXTENSION OF PERIOD FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding that the morning hour will expire in a few minutes, at 12:30 p.m. today, the period for the transaction of routine business be extended, with statements made therein limited to 3 minutes; upon the conclusion of which the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOLE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS OF SENATORS

A DISTURBING ACCOUNT OF CONDITIONS IN GREECE

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the former director of the British Broadcasting Corp., Sir Hugh Greene, has written a perceptive and profoundly disturbing account of the conditions in Greece. The article was published in the London Sunday Telegraph of August 2, 1970.

It is embarrassing to find our country supporting actively, with large amounts of material and money, such an antidemocratic, oppressive regime as that now imposed upon the people of Greece.

Twice Members of this body have sought to restrict our assistance until the regime modified its tyranny, but each time a slim majority has supported the colonels. It raises serious questions about our sense of perspective and our judgment in selecting our allies.

I ask unanimous consent that the article by Sir Hugh Greene be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREEK DICTATOR DROPS THE MASK

(By Sir Hugh Greene)

In an exclusive interview (the first according to his entourage, that he has granted for a year or more) the Prime Minister of Greece, Mr. George Papadopoulos, gave notice in effect that he sees no end at any time in the near future to his tenure of absolute power.

He abandoned the phrases he has previously used, particularly for the benefit of the Americans, about a timetable, however gradual, for the restoration of parliamentary democracy, and he justified the continuation of martial law as a means of keeping the Greek people under the control of his regime.

Mr. Papadopoulos is not noted for the clarity with which he uses the Greek language. But no other interpretation can be put on what he said to me. In other words, the dictator was dropping the mask.

I felt myself in the presence of a man who is full of self-confidence after more than three years of absolute power and who no longer considers it necessary to maintain some of his previous pretenses. He is, I would judge, a man who is emerging from the chrysalis stage of the consummate conspirator he used to be into an absolute ruler fanatically convinced of the blessing and protection of God as well as of the tanks of his army and the massive security apparatus of his police state.

One sign of this new self-confidence was that I was not asked for my questions in advance in accordance with what I gathered had been his previous practice (I should not have agreed if I had been) and that we were alone apart from an interpreter. We talked for exactly an hour on a day when he had taken over the Foreign Office following the death of Mr. Pipinelis, and was also, no doubt, concerned about the situation created at Athens Airport by the Palestinian hijackers.

I was talking not only to the Prime Minister of Greece but to the Minister of the Ministry to the Prime Minister (responsible among other things for the Civil Service, the Intelligence Service, Press and Information, athletics and archaeology), the Minister of Defence and the Foreign Minister. He had just that morning divested himself of his duties as Minister of Education. But the concentration of power remained a formidable one by any standards.

DANGER FROM COMMUNIST ACTIVITY

Mr. Papadopoulos is a small man with receding black hair, a somewhat muddy complexion and a military moustache. He has expressionless eyes which do not change when he smiles. But he is not without considerable charm. Whatever one may think of his methods, his enemies have certainly tended to underestimate his capacities.

I asked him whether he still regarded his régime as a provisional one and the answer I got was anything but categorical. It was his Government's ultimate objective, he said, to provide the nation with those conditions that were essential for the function of the State within the framework of the Constitution of 1968. In that sense the present form of government was provisional.

I ask whether he had a firm timetable in mind for an evolution toward a parliamentary form of government. So far as the successive stages which had to be followed, said Mr. Papadopoulos, he did. But as regards the definite time to be allotted to each of those stages, the Government could not possibly maintain a fixed time schedule.

This means, I am sure, that the hope of elections in 1971, previously encouraged by Mr. Papadopoulos for the sake of foreign opinion, can be written off. It was in any case a completely unrealistic hope based on wishful thinking. No dictator commits suicide while his power is still unchallenged.

In a disquisition which followed, Mr. Papadopoulos made the interesting admission that in the years before his seizure of power democracy in Greece had not been in danger of being overthrown through the *direct* activities of Communism. That is undoubtedly true, but coming from him it was at least a change of emphasis.

ABSENCE OF PARTY BASIS IS A WEAKNESS

I asked him whether he saw himself at any time in the future emerging as the leader of a political party and fighting an election himself. He replied that he hoped it would not be necessary for him to continue to govern the country as a political Prime Minister. By that time his job should be done and he should be able to leave to others the continuation of the government.

I did not feel that I was talking to a man who was working on the assumption that that time was very close. I wondered while he spoke whether he did not see himself rivalling in his tenure of power a Franco or Salazar—even though he may lack the astuteness of the one and the intellectual grasp of the other.

I asked him whether he thought that the absence of a party political basis for his régime was a weakness. I was thinking of other dictators in recent European history such as Hitler and Mussolini whose power was firmly based on a party structure. He replied that it was indeed a weakness, but as his aim was to mitigate party political passions it was a weakness he had to put up with.

Did he genuinely believe, I asked him, in a democratic system as being preferable to an authoritarian one? With what seemed to me to be complete sincerity this strange man replied that he did indeed believe in a democratic system as the safest, in so far as it ensured conditions that were the most satisfactory as regards justice, freedom, security and human dignity. But he somewhat spoiled the effect of this by discoursing on the need for the elected representatives of the people to be "imbued with a deep sense of their responsibility" and "ideals" and not to be motivated by the sole desire to be re-elected.

It was not hard to draw the conclusion that in his eyes Greek politicians lacked all these rather vague qualifications.

We come now to what seemed to me to be, perhaps, the key passage in the whole interview. I asked whether he considered it imperative that martial law should be maintained indefinitely. Martial law, he said, was now a mere shadow and he hoped it would not be necessary to keep it much longer.

Since he described martial law as a mere shadow, I said, why did he not eliminate it right away? The necessity, he replied, was psychological. The spirit of anarchy was still intense. "Men are restrained by this mere shadow of martial law more than they would be by the whole normal legal structure."

This from a man who claims to have 92 percent of the Greek nation behind him is a remarkable admission of the need to maintain the whole apparatus of terror: the need for what Mr. Papadopoulos has called on another occasion "the element of fear."

I asked him about political prisoners and detainees. Could he show clemency? "Time alone," he replied, "will show." He fully intended to free himself of this matter at the earliest date possible—a somewhat ambiguous response.

We had a long discussion about his political thinking and the reading from which it derives—psychologically interesting, for this is a strange man. He clearly believes from his reading of ancient Greek history and philosophy in some sort of continual historical flow between democracy, anarchy and authoritarianism. But, unlike other dictators, he has no idealogy, apart from a rather curious mixture of Christianity and a belief in the eternal virtues of everything "Greek," and what is or is not "Greek" he would probably wish to determine himself.

My last question was whether he felt that the arms embargo (imposed after his *coup d'état*) embarrassed him in any way or weakened his position. "I always try," he replied, "to see things in as realistic a way as possible. The situation can be compared with that of a man who wishes to guard his estate from an enemy. If he considers it wise to provide the guard with a gun so that he may the better protect his own cottage as well as the estate he should then give the guard a powerful gun. If the guard has no gun he will still try to defend both his own cottage and the estate as well as he can, but his prospects of success will be very poor."

WHERE THE ARMS WILL COME FROM

In the last war, said Mr. Papadopoulos, Greece had defended herself against German aggression although very inadequately armed, and the arms she possessed had mostly come from Germany before the war. He smiled broadly. "Please," he said, "do not draw the conclusion that we shall now buy Russian arms. We can get what we want from one or the other of our allies (he no doubt had France particularly in mind) and I expect England will now be one of the first to do a deal.

"Some of our allies," he went on, "think that they can exert pressure on us by refusing to provide us with arms. But military aid is not an essential factor. No arms embargo can ever pressurise my Government or check its work and progress."

So there we have it in what for Mr. Papadopoulos are very plain words. He was, in effect, giving notice that he would not, as some of the former Greek politicians who have honourably refused to co-operate with his régime had hoped he might, trade a firm date for parliamentary elections against renewed arms deliveries from the United States.

At the beginning of our interview he had made one other comment on Greek foreign policy which is worth reporting. He had, he said, taken over the Foreign Office himself on the death of Mr. Pipinelis, whose name was linked with the *détente* with Turkey over Cyprus at the end of 1967, in order to stress the continuity of Greek foreign policy in just those two particular aspects, Turkey and Cyprus.

So it looks more and more as if the Colonels will not be a temporary phenomenon on the Greek scene as other military dictatorships have been. Having on April 21, 1967, pre-empted a generals' strike, which would probably have had the support of the King, the Colonels have shown a staying-power which few people at the time would have foreseen. "Long Live April 21st" proclaim posters all over Athens—not a very inspiring slogan, but perhaps a prophetic one.

The results for Greece, as those who at any other time would have been its élite see it, are sad and may well be sadder yet. Democracy is being strangled, not cured. Political life, and Greeks love politics, is stifled. Intellectual life—and there had been a great flowering of the arts before 1967—is pretty well dead. Education is perverted and Greek children are being brought up on new textbooks of which decent teachers are ashamed.

The most prominent illustrations in a history text-book for sixth forms which I saw was a full-page photograph of that former Minister for Education, Mr. Papadopoulos—not, perhaps, what one would expect of a "provisional" régime. Everything has to be "Greek" and the teaching of modern mathematics has been permitted only because somebody was ingenious enough to produce "proofs" that it had been invented in ancient Greece.

Day after day in their newspapers (and Greeks remain great newspaper readers even though any opposition Press has been smothered) people read that their country is a haven of peace in a disorderly world.

While I was in Athens a front-page editorial in the Government paper *Nea Politia* informed its readers that "Britain has been picked these days as the target of those forces which are striving to undo democratic principles in the West, using the method of upheaval aimed at dislocating the economies of free countries." The trade unions were defying the verdict of the majority and striking a blow at the new Government to prevent the implementation of its policies. Italy was disintegrating. Hence, declared the paper, a change in the attitude of Europe towards Greece.

"Most Europeans now feel that Greece is no longer the country which has abolished democracy to replace it with an authoritarian regime, as the opponents of the Revolution at first wanted to have people think. Greece is the country that first diagnosed the nature of the menace to democratic freedom and took the necessary steps. European peoples no longer look upon Greece as an example to avoid but as one to follow. They envy her for the tranquillity, order and continuous progress which she enjoys."

An example to follow? Since I spent five and a half years in Nazi Germany in the 'Thirties I was naturally tempted all the time to make comparisons between the Germany of that period and the Greece of the Colonels. It is a temptation which on the whole one should avoid, because the differences are at least as striking as the resemblances.

The number of political prisoners and detainees in Greece today (at a conservative estimate about 1,900) is, in relation to the sizes of the population, probably no less than it was in Germany in the middle 'Thirties. Many of the best and noblest people in the country have been sentenced to long terms of imprisonment, have been detained without trial, or sent into exile in remote mountain villages or island concentration camps. The greatest living Greeks cannot obtain passports to go abroad without, as they see it, going on their knees to Mr. Pattakos, the Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of the Interior.

The apparatus of terror—aided by modern technology—is, or is thought to be, all-pervading. As one small businessman (anything but an intellectual) said to me, on every bus at the rush-hour there is someone listening for subversive conversation—or people think there is; in every block of flats there is someone keeping an eye on visitors or anything else that may be going on—or people think there is.

Every police station holds the files of all the people living in its area. Without a certificate of political reliability from the police a student or school-leaver cannot get a job; you cannot even get a driving licence. Under this system the petty tyranny in the small towns and villages of Greece is probably worse than in Athens.

All the stories of police brutality and torture, which led to the decision to expel Greece from the Council of Europe, were confirmed to me in every detail by relatives and friends of those concerned. They have shown a remarkable courage in their appeals to world opinion. Much information circulates in the underground Press, which persists in spite of many arrests. One information leaflet which I was shown gave details of the 69 women still held for political reasons in Greek prisons last may, many of them suffering from tuberculosis, cancer, arthritic conditions, ulcers, angina pectoris, intestinal ailments and other diseases all aggravated by the conditions of their imprisonment and unsuitable diet.

I suppose it would be fair to say that, in the face of all this, the bulk of the population is apathetic or cowed, a small minority supports the regime and another minority is strongly opposed. The future is made more dark by the increasing organisation of children in the Corps of Alkimi, a jackbooted copy of the Hitler Youth.

One searches constantly for a bright side. There have been no political executions—and that is no small thing. Greece is not an aggressive power: indeed from the external point of view the present regime has been a stabilising influence in the Eastern Mediterranean. Some people say that there are less graft and corruption involved in everyday dealings with officials than there were before: some people say the opposite. There are plenty of stories of nepotism in the sense of favours done to relatives of leading members of the regime, and there are certainly plenty of jobs for members of the new military Establishment—even in control of the arts.

One thing that Greeks much resent is what they describe as the American theory that Greece has always been much the same under any regime and that the Colonels are nothing new and no worse than many of their predecessors. Indeed, one result of the last three years is a growing anti-Americanism, for America is associated, justly or unjustly, with support for the Colonels.

THE SHEPHERD WHO WAS NO SHEEP

Under any dictatorial system political jokes make an interesting study. In Greece they seem to centre round Mr. Pattakos, the robust and outspoken (in Greece you will hear worse adjectives) Minister of the Interior, as in Nazi Germany they did around Göring. Indeed, you will sometimes hear people calling Greece Pattakistan. It is said that Mr. Pattakos was once driving through northern Greece when his car was held up on the road by a flock of sheep. Improving the occasion, as he always does, he engaged the shepherd in conversation.

"You know," said Mr. Pattakos, "that if we had not come to power the Communists would have taken your sheep."

"But they are not my sheep," said the shepherd.

"Then they would have taken your house," said Mr. Pattakos.

"But it is not my house," said the shepherd.

"Then," said Mr. Pattakos desperately, "they would have raped your wife."

"So," said the shepherd, "you mean to say that you have made all this mess for the sake of my wife's virtue?"

But, being a liberal shepherd, he used a grosser name.

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES NAMES PANEL TO PROBE INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL ACTIVITIES

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, every Senator recognizes how important the issue of environmental quality has become in the past few years. In meeting this issue, we have confined most of our efforts to work at the national or subnational level. Yet the problems of global pollution, and the need for international environmental cooperation, have become obvious to members of the scientific community and to many members of the Government.

It was with this realization in mind, that pollution knows no national boundaries, that 40 Members of the Senate cosponsored my Senate Resolution 399, which I submitted on April 27 of this year. Senate Resolution 399 calls attention to the global nature of human ecology, and advocates that a World Environmental Institute be established, both for the purpose of gathering and disseminating environmental data, and to serve as a center for research on global environmental problems.

Some form of global environmental authority is inevitable, and that new authority will have to perform, as a minimum, the functions outlined in Senate Resolution 399.

The growing activity designed to create a global environmental agency has been

the subject of many of my remarks during the past 2 months, and today I am happy to share with the Senate the latest and perhaps most hopeful development in this urgent quest for worldwide environmental sanity.

The National Academy of Sciences has recently appointed a distinguished group of scholars and officials from a variety of disciplines to facilitate American participation in current and anticipated international environmental activities. This group, known as the Committee for International Environmental Programs—IEPC—will be headed by Dr. Thomas F. Malone, who is a Deputy Foreign Secretary of the NAS and chairman of the NAS Advisory Committee on International Organizations and Programs. The Executive Director of the IEPC will be Dr. Henry J. Kellermann, who served until recently as the Special Assistant to the Secretary of State for Environmental Affairs. Dr. Kellermann's brilliant performance in the State Department is in part responsible for the upgrading of the Special Assistant post to that of Assistant Secretary for Environmental Affairs.

I congratulate the National Academy, and the members of the IEPC, on the formation of this committee. Its task will not be an easy one, but the role that the IEPC will play in bringing the United States to active international environmental leadership is a crucial one.

I hope that the IEPC will recognize the support that this international effort has here in the Senate, and I hope that the committee will consider Senate Resolution 399 as a flexible and supportive piece of legislation. The resolution aims less at a specific form for the impending global environmental authority than it does at facilitating an affirmative diplomatic effort by the United States. Creation of the IEPC demonstrates that this effort has already begun, at the nongovernmental level at least. The success of the IEPC could very well lead to more active leadership on the part of the Department of State and other Government agencies.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a press release announcing the creation of IEPC be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the press release was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CREATION OF IEPC

WASHINGTON.—A committee to facilitate the participation of the U.S. scientific community in international environmental activities has been formed by the National Academy of Sciences (NAS).

The Committee for International Environmental Programs (IEPC) will also advise the Federal government in this area, act as an adhering group in the United States for international ecological programs on a nongovernmental level, and develop and maintain a clearinghouse for information on nongovernmental ecological activities.

Global environmental programs are increasing at a rapid rate. New and planned activities include a conference on the human environment to be sponsored by the United Nations in 1972; an intergovernmental research program called "Man and the Biosphere," now being organized by UNESCO to start in 1972; a meeting on problems of the environment scheduled for 1971 by the Economic Commission for Europe; and the Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment (SCOPE), newly created by the International Council of Scientific Unions.

The new NAS committee, established under the joint auspices of the Environmental Studies Board and Office of the Foreign Secretary, is headed by Thomas F. Malone, Professor of Physics and Consultant to the President of the University of Connecticut. Dr. Malone is widely experienced in international scientific affairs, being a Deputy Foreign Secretary of the NAS and Chairman of the Advisory Committee on International Organizations and Programs. A past president of the American Geophysical Union and the American Meteorological Society, he also served as chairman of the U.S. National Commission for UNESCO.

Henry J. Kellermann, a former senior Foreign Service Officer and U.S. Permanent Representative to UNESCO, has been appointed Executive Director of IEPC. He has been Special Assistant for Environmental Affairs in the Department of State and Chairman of the Interdepartmental Committee on International Aspects of Environmental Quality of the Federal Council for Science and Technology.

Members of the new committee come from a variety of disciplines, including the natural and social sciences, law, and medicine. This group will be supplemented as the program develops with special panels on such topics as international institutional arrangements, legal implications and instrumentalities, economic aspects of environmental changes, and environmental education.

Regular members of IEPC, in addition to the chairman, are Ivan Bennett, Director, New York University Medical Center; Lynton K. Caldwell, Professor of Government, University of Indiana; Robert A. Charpie, President, Cabot Corporation, Boston, Mass.; Abraham Chayes, Professor, Harvard School of Law; John P. Holdren, Sherwood Physics Group, Lawrence Radiation Laboratory, Livermore, Calif.; Hans Landsberg, Director, Appraisals Program, Resources for the Future, Inc., Washington, D.C.; George Lithcott, Associate Dean, College of Physicians and Surgeons, Columbia University; John P. Milton, Deputy Director for International Programs, The Conservation Foundation, Washington, D.C.; Walter O. Roberts, President, University Corporation for Atmospheric Research, Boulder, Colo.; Frederick Sargent II, Provost, Western Washington State College; Frederick E. Smith, Professor, Graduate School of Design, Harvard University; and M. G. Wolman, Professor, Department of Geography and Environmental Engineering, The Johns Hopkins University.

Participating as ex officio members of the committee are W. Frank Blair, Chairman, U.S. National Committee for the International Biological Program; Harrison Brown, Foreign Secretary of the NAS; David Gates and Harold Gershinowitz, Chairman and former Chairman respectively of the Environmental Studies Board; Arthur D. Hasler, President, International Association for Ecology; Bruce Old, Foreign Secretary of the National Academy of Engineering; Roger Revelle, Deputy Foreign Secretary of the NAS; Gilbert White, Chairman, UNESCO Natural Sciences Resources Board; and Carroll Wilson, U.S. Representative to the U.N. Advisory Committee on the Application of Science and Technology to Development.

TELEVISION TIME FOR "THE OPPOSITION"

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an editorial entitled "The Opposition on TV," published in the Christian Science Monitor of August 8, 1970.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, this is a very thoughtful editorial. I wish to make only one comment. There has been a misconception about my proposal regarding television time, in that it was not intended simply to answer the President on any specific point or in general. It was intended to furnish to the legislative branch of our Government a reasonable time for Members of either body, selected by the body itself, to have an opportunity to give expression to their views upon matters of public importance. It is not restricted to nor intended to be a means to answer the present President or any other President.

EXHIBIT 1

THE "OPPOSITION" ON TV

In the crescendoing American debate over how much television time should be accorded Congress—or the "loyal opposition"—for answering the President of the United States, one fact becomes immediately apparent. It is that there are no simple answers. All sorts of considerations impinge.

For instance: who shall be the chosen spokesman to represent Congress, or the "loyal opposition," or the Democratic Party? Also, when shall it be determined that the President of the United States is speaking partisanly, and not dealing with accepted policy and national concern, and therefore requiring to be "answered"? Again, shall President and opposition be accorded "free" time in all circumstances? And again still, shall there be different TV rules to govern allocations during the height of the campaign season, when most appearances on the tube would be presumed to have political intent?

In this complexity, the British experience is instructive. The British networks, government and commercial, allocate equally a definite number of "political broadcasts" to the two major parties, a lesser number to the smaller Liberal Party. But the prime minister may appear on TV-radio at any time, if dealing with a matter of national interest such as Rhodesians sanctions or a general strike. Legitimate political news is regularly covered by TV. And there are searching nightly quiz shows, on which political and other personalities appear.

The President has virtually automatic access to television whenever he requests. There is no reason why the Congress, another power source in the divided-powers system of American government, should not have somewhat similar access, when there is legitimate reason. Senator Fulbright is wrong in declaring that presidential access to TV has given the executive branch a "dangerous and unchecked power." But his proposal that the networks give Congress four television opportunities a year to present its views affords a worthwhile basis for discussion.

The decision as to who shall speak for Congress or the opposition is a rough one. When Lyndon Johnson ruled the Senate as Majority Leader, he was not about to share party-policy prerogatives with Adlai Stevenson, the party's titular head. But the choice could depend on the subject under discussion—whether Senator Fulbright on foreign policy, Senator Muskie on environmental topics, Senator Stennis on defense, or party Chairman O'Brien if he can avoid slashing political attack when the debate is higher-leveled.

More thoughtful discussion is called for. Nor should Congress—and the Democrats—

overlook the point that more complete television exposure of Senate and House hearings and debate would help, persuasively, to present the congressional viewpoint.

A VOLUNTEER ARMED FORCE

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, as the debate on Senate amendment No. 765 draws closer and a vote to effect an all-volunteer Armed Force becomes more imminent, I would like to commend to the attention of Senators the prepared testimony of Mr. Ralph Rudd, offered on behalf of the Friends Committee on National Legislation, and a letter from Edward F. Snyder, executive of the same organization. I ask unanimous consent that the two statements be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF TERMINATION OF CONSCRIPTION

This statement is offered in support of the proposal by Senator Hatfield and others to terminate military conscription in the United States by adopting the recommendations of the President's Commission on an All Voluntary Armed Force. It is offered on behalf of the Friends Committee on National Legislation, 242 Second Street, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002. I am a member of its Policy Committee.

I am Ralph Rudd. I live in Willoughby, Ohio. I make this statement not only as a Friend, a member of the Cleveland Meeting of the Religious Society of Friends, but also as an attorney who has had an extensive practice in the field of Selective Service Law. I have spent I suppose thousands of hours seeking to help registrants, many of them conscientious objectors, obtain recognition of their rights under the Selective Service law. Through my clients I have often experienced the satisfaction of successful advocacy in showing them how to present the facts and law of their cases more clearly. Sometimes I have written to their local boards or other Selective Service officials myself. On the other hand, I have experienced many injustices and errors that could be avoided by better administrative structure and practice. I have observed inequities that are inherent in the statistics of conscription. I have recognized hardships and wrongs that are inherent in conscription itself.

EXCLUSION OF COUNSEL

The single most glaring injustice that could be remedied by changing the administrative structure and practice, it seems to me, is the refusal of the Selective Service System to permit counsel to appear with a registrant in his personal appearance before the local board. This is written into the official regulations. 32 CFR § 1624.1(b). To change this rule would be expensive, for no doubt if registrants were permitted counsel in their appearances before the local boards the local boards would have to be supplied with counsel likewise. But the expense of fair administrative procedure and structure is usually regarded as well worthwhile in protection of the rights of the people who deal with and are affected by administrative agencies. In this case the validity of that view is very apparent. For from the lack of counsel in registrants' personal appearances before local boards flow many wrongs: Ignorance of the most elementary principles of the Selective Service statute and regulations on the part of many Selective Service local board members; application of erroneous standards of decision by local boards; a great shortage of attorneys in civilian practice who understand Selective Service law and regulations, inability on the part of many registrants to find competent counsel, and consequent loss of rights; the dragging out of review procedures over periods of many months and sometimes years simply because of legal error in initial decisions by local boards.

INADEQUATE CONSIDERATION

Another injustice that could be cured by an improvement in administrative structure and practice lies in the fact that apparently most local boards and appeals board members do not read the files they rule on. Very few of my clients who have asked local boards at personal appearances whether the board members had read their files have got unequivocably affirmative answers. Apparent failure to read the files has been covered by such euphemisms as "it has been read" (meaning, perhaps, that the board's clerk had read it), "we've gone over it," or "we know generally what's in it." This injustice might appear less frequently if counsel were present to exhort the board members to do their homework, but fundamentally it requires the creation of more boards or panels of boards, or else the employment of full time board members so that they may have time to give adequate attention to each case.

SURPLUS MANPOWER

Another kind of inequity is inherent in the statistics that relate to Selective Service. I refer to the fact that at force levels in effect during the past 20 years and at those projected for the future, the number of men in active duty is less than 12% of the total male population 18–45 years of age. Except in the years after the Korean War, it is less than 10%. See the report of the President's Commission on an All Voluntary Armed Force, Table 4–I. This inevitably creates a difficult problem of selection. Equity may be thought to require equal treatment of all who are similarly situated. We don't find advocates of women's rights urging that women should be included in the draft, but the logic of their position and the logic of the prohibition of discrimination on account of sex recently enacted into Federal law would seem to suggest that they should be. Yet that would only double the difficulty. Already it is impossible for the Army to use all of those even 19–26 years old who are mentally and medically qualified. For a long time the Selective Service law reduced the surplusage by allowing deferments for fatherhood, occupation, and student status. The law and regulations now frankly acknowledge the surplus and have resorted to the blind chance of the lottery to establish an order of call among those who are available and thus leave the surplus manpower uncalled. With this, steps have been taken by changes in the regulations to curtail deferments for fatherhood, occupation, and graduate study; and statutory changes are proposed to curtail deferments for undergraduate study. These curtailments of deferments for cause will enlarge the number of persons whose call-up is avoided for no cause, that is by lottery.

Lest my words be thought to suggest that I am entirely opposed to the lottery let me add that I recognize that the former process of selection by deferment involved the injustice of drafting only those who could not afford to go to college. It also involved the injustice of deferment by standards imperfectly understood and unequally applied by different local boards. These considerations only emphasize the difficulty of establishing and administering a just system of selection.

INHERENT DEPRIVATION OF LIBERTY

But the greatest injustice lies in the fundamental nature of conscription itself. For the young man who is drafted it means being taken from his home, his parents, his wife, his church, his work, his union, his political activity, and now his children and graduate study and perhaps soon his undergraduate education. He is taken to a distant Army base where he loses a great deal of his opportunity for independence and initiative, where he is dependent on the Army organization for his food, clothing, shelter and medical care with little opportunity for choice, where he is subject to a disciplinary regimen emphasizing unquestioning obedience and is indoctrinated in the psychology and arts of war to bring him to the ultimate effectiveness of a soldier as a killer. He is taught and ordered to obey the law of the jungle—the antithesis of the laws of civilization—that he must kill or be killed, and too often the truth is that he must kill *and* be killed.

This loss of freedom is surpassed otherwise only on arrest or conviction for crime.

It is inherent in the fundamental concepts of liberty that government may not deprive a person of his freedom without a justifying necessity to do so. In our Constitution this is articulated in the concepts of substantive due process under the Fifth Amendment provision that no person shall be deprived of life, liberty or property without due process of law.

Courts presented with the claim that conscription is not necessary and is therefore unconstitutional have refused to second guess Congress, holding, rightly or wrongly, that the degree of necessity is a legislative question. This casts on Congress the ultimate responsibility in this case or protecting the people's rights under the Constitution.

CONSCRIPTION NOT NECESSARY

For a number of years a growing number of members of the House and Senate have pressed for repeal of the draft on the ground that it was not necessary and could be supplanted by an all voluntary armed force. Their arguments have been gathered up and expanded and developed further by the Gates Commission, the President's Commission on an All Voluntary Armed Force, and the report of that Commission seems to convince nearly all who read it that the all-voluntary armed force is a thoroughly practical and far more just solution to the problem of providing whatever level of national defense Congress may deem it necessary to provide, in the absence of an all-out conflict requiring total mobilization.

The religious beliefs of Friends provide other grounds for advocating the abolition of conscription, but believe in personal freedom is fundamental to Friends and provides a ground for draft repeal that we share with the community at large and its representatives in Congress. This ground is amply sufficient.

The draft encompasses many administrative inequities and injustices and is fundamentally violative of human liberty. Under traditional democratic concepts it cannot be tolerated except under the direst necessity. The Commission report shows that that necessity does not exist. Therefore conscription should be ended.

Respectfully submitted,

RALPH RUDD.

FRIENDS COMMITTEE ON NATIONAL LEGISLATION,
Washington, D.C., August 10, 1970.

Senator MARK O. HATFIELD,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HATFIELD: We appreciate the leadership which you and the 12 cosponsors have taken in proposing amendment No. 765 to implement the recommendations of the Gates Commission and end the military draft.

Since the Armed Services Committee has not held hearings on the draft this year as promised, we are enclosing a statement of our views on the draft by Ralph Rudd which we hope you and other Senators will consider as the Senate debates this subject.

In general we support amendment No. 765. We would prefer to see the entire Selective Service System abolished rather than being put on a standby basis as is proposed. And instead of increasing military spending to support a voluntary military we believe the better policy would be to reduce U.S. military forces and concentrate on priorities at home and nonmilitary actions abroad at no overall increase in spending. But we believe adoption of your amendment is an extremely significant step for the Senate at this time.

We believe Section 603 of your amendment is one of the most important, for it restores the proper balance of powers between the Executive and Legislative Branches. Under the existing situation it has been possible for the Executive Branch to send more than half a million men to Southeast Asia without any real Congressional authorization other than the ambiguous Gulf of Tonkin Resolution. If your amendment had been in effect the President would have been required to ask Congress for authority to reinstitute the draft, and Congress would have had to take affirmative action to involve the nation deeply in a war in Southeast Asia.

In this age when wars are waged but not declared, Congress and the public require some device to assure adequate consideration before commitments are made—commitments which led in Korea to 136,000 casualties and to the still-growing total of more than 310,000 casualties in Vietnam. Your amendment provides assurance of adequate Congressional debate before such major foreign military policies are undertaken.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD F. SNYDER.

UNFAIR SCHOOL DESEGREGATION ENFORCEMENT POLICIES IN THE SOUTH

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the Columbus, Ga., Enquirer of August 5, contains an editorial protesting administrative and judicial policies affecting school desegregation in the South. It should be noted that these policies, requiring the busing of school children and their teachers out of their neighborhoods from one side of town to the other, are being enforced in the South alone.

It appears that neighborhood schools are acceptable in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, and scores of other cities outside the South, but they are not acceptable to the courts or the Justice Department when they occur in the South. This, of course, is extreme hypocrisy. Thus, we have Federal agents swooping down on schools in one part of the country to enforce laws and court decrees that apparently have no bearing anywhere else.

Schoolchildren and teachers have been made pawns in a gigantic political struggle. They are the ones who suffer, and I think it can be said without exaggeration that education has been relegated to secondary importance in our schools.

As this editorial points out, the President himself said last March:

Demands that an arbitrary "racial balance" be established as a matter of right misinterpret the law and misstate the priorities.

This was a sound statement but, unfortunately, neither his administration nor the courts apparently intend to pay much attention to it, although I would hope that more emphasis in the months ahead will be placed upon educating children at the neighborhood level and less on uprooting schoolchildren and teachers in order to achieve some kind of mathematical racial balance.

I bring this editorial to the attention of the Senate and ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BAR POLITICS FROM SCHOOLYARDS

What is so terribly wrong with just having schools? It wouldn't seem to be an oppressive manifestation of a sick nation to have predominantly white or black, or plaid schools if the neighborhoods or constituencies they serve happen to be white, or black, or polkadot.

Rather, such schools would simply reflect the realities of economics and the quite real existence of individual preferences people have for where they live, economics aside.

When the matter has run its full course, in fact, that is exactly what the situation will finally be. Parents are going to become completely fed up with their children being used as pawns in this argument between adults.

Political realities are bound to come eventually. What has kept a national revulsion from happening so far was the hypocritical cowardice of the Supreme Court in making that silly definition of segregation de jure—where it comes as a result of a situation created by past law, as in the South—and segregation de facto, where it comes as an outcome of rather natural population groupings, as in every other part of the United States.

Making one kind immune to the attention of posses of federal agents while making the other kind the object of special legal oppression is too much to expect a voting public to stomach forever. When the matter is nationally understood, the harrying of the South will cease.

Until that happy day, however, one could do worse than to clip out the words spoken by President Richard Nixon on this subject as late as March and to send them to him. He may need his memory jogged, what with school opening coming with apparently as many federal marshals, lawyers and missionaries appearing as school children when the opening bells ring.

In March, the President said: "One of the mistakes of past policy has been to demand too much of our schools: They have been expected not only to educate, but also to accomplish a social transformation. Children in many instances have not been served, but used—in what has proved a tragically futile effort to achieve in the schools the kind of a multiracial society which the adult community has failed to achieve for itself.

"If we are to be realists, we must recognize that in a free society, there are limits to the amount of government coercion than can reasonably be used; that in achieving desegregation we must proceed with the least possible disruption of the education of the nation's children; and that our children are highly sensitive to conflict, and highly vulnerable to lasting psychic injury . . . Demands that an arbitrary 'racial balance' be established as a matter of right misinterpret the law and misstate the priorities."

It is a long, long time from March until September. Perhaps it is time for the President and his administration to review what he said last March, one of the wisest statements in many years on this matter concerning our schools.

As of now, there really isn't a single federal court decision which doesn't fly in the face of that policy. As of now there isn't a single planned federal action for the coming school year which doesn't auger to make that statement into a myth, at best, and, a falsehood, at worst.

There has been enough stupidity about our schools. Let them teach the children in the communities where they are located. Let the parents in those communities have their schools back as a center of community interest and activity, a worthy possession which has been stolen from them already. Let the President remember what he said last March and tell Attorney General John Mitchell what the contents of that message was before this fall's threatened onslaught becomes an insane reality.

PETITION IN SUPPORT OF CHURCH-COOPER AND McGOVERN-HATFIELD AMENDMENTS

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, two of my constituents, Jeffrey N. Watanabe and James A. King, have forwarded to me a petition in the form of a short legal memorandum that they have circulated within the Hawaiian legal community in support of the Church-Cooper and McGovern-Hatfield amendments.

As a cosponsor of amendment 609, the Amendment to End the War, I am gratified by this positive response in the Hawaiian legal profession. The two young lawyers who undertook this project should be commended for their initiative and forceful response to the continuation of this tragic war in Southeast Asia.

Lawyers have a special responsibility in this country because they exercise an influence disproportionate to their numbers. We lawyers participate in every phase of business, labor, Government, and teaching. Those of us who are in a position to decide what polices our Nation should follow have a crucial role to play.

Our experiences in Vietnam have shown, if nothing else, that a war of this kind transcends purely military strategy and policy. Decisions will affect the interrelation of ethnic groups, the relations between generations, and indeed the basic quality of our life. It is incumbent upon every citizen to participate in the decisionmaking processes and to bring his opinions against the continuation of this war to bear on those who formulate policies. These lawyers have chosen to follow the ancient and hallowed tradition of petitioning the leaders of our Nation and to inform them of their strong opposition to our actions in Southeast Asia. These lawyers have concluded, quite correctly, that Congress under the Constitution has the right to withhold funds for the continuation of the war. They cite two instances as examples of the proper exercise of Congress' foreign policy powers. I strongly endorse their stand and their deep concern with the policies that this administration is pursuing.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the petition and the names of the petitioners be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PETITION

We, the undersigned lawyers urge Congress to enact the Church-Cooper Amendment (amendment to H.R. 15628—Military Sales

Act) and to enact the Amendment to End the War (amendment S. 609 to H.R. 17123—Military Procurement Authorization Act.)

Congress has the power, under the Constitution, to enact the Amendments. The framers of the Constitution granted Congress the sole power to raise and support armed forces and, to ensure popular control, provided that no such appropriation could be for longer than two years. U.S. Const. art. I, § 8. Since the Congress has the undoubted power to appropriate funds to raise and maintain armed forces, it has the power not to appropriate such funds, or to condition its appropriations on the size of American armed forces, and how and where they should be employed.

There are numerous instances in American history wherein Congress has, through the appropriation power, limited the uses made of the armed forces. For example, in 1909 Congress restricted an appropriation so that Marines could be used only in a specific way; in response to a request for ruling the Attorney General concluded that since Congress had the power to determine whether there would be any Marines at all, it had the constitutional power to limit the uses to which they would be put. In 1970 President Nixon himself, in signing without objection the Defense Appropriations Act with an amendment denying funds to "finance the introduction of ground combat troops into Laos or Thailand," recognized the power of Congress to so condition its provision for the armed forces.

We therefore conclude that the Congress has the power to pass, and should enact the Church-Cooper Amendment and the Amendment to End the War.

Jeffrey N. Watanabe, Donald K. O. Wong, Patricia Park, Walter W. Y. Hong, Olen E. Leonard, Jr., T. M. Pico, Wayne Minomi, Gerald Chiang, Sidney Ayabe, Gary Shigemura, Daniel Ukeshima, Ben Matsubara, Clifford L. Nakea, E. John McConnell, Roy N. Miyamoto, A. Akana, Edward C. Kemper, Hiromu Suzawa, Larry L. Myers, and John A. Chanin.

Peter C. P. Char, Hale H. Hitchcock, Kenneth Y. Sugita, Harvey E. Hutcheson, Jr., Roy L. Fanon, Steven Kroll, Gerald Y. Sekiya, Paul Alston, Robert G. LeClair, Ronald W. K. Yee, Wesley W. Ichida, John R. Gibbs, Gerald Sumida, Stephen M. Okano, Robert Toyofuku, James I. Kabita, James Conahan, Richard P. Schulze, Jr., Boyce R. Brown, Jr., Marshall Goodsill, C. Jepson Garland, and Gary S. Okabayashi.

Ray M. Anderson, Vernon Y. T. Woo, James Stubenberg, Durell Dovtry, Randall Ching, Robert G. Johnston, Bill Brainard, Andrew Levin, Jay Wilson, Gary T. Moen, Philip H. Lowenthal, Allen Wong, James A. King, Hideki Nakamura, Max N. Garcia, Edward Nakamura, Harriet Bouslog, Myer C. Symonds, and O. Vincent Esposito.

MAJORITY SUPPORT PRESIDENT NIXON

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, there were skeptics, to be sure, when President Nixon ordered the incursion into Cambodia in an effort to protect American forces in South Vietnam and to keep the Vietnamization program on schedule.

The latest Harris survey indicates that 61 percent believe President Nixon was justified in moving into Cambodia. In addition, other questions of interest indicate broad support for President Nixon.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article concerning the Harris survey, published in the Washington Post this morning.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HARRIS SURVEY—61 PERCENT NOW BELIEVE NIXON JUSTIFIED IN CAMBODIA MOVE

(By Louis Harris)

In the aftermath of the U.S. move into Cambodia, 61 per cent of the American people believe that President Nixon was "justified" in ordering the action.

Perhaps the most significant finding of a special Harris Survey on Cambodia is that Mr. Nixon has scored an impressive turnaround in what seemed to be a growing credibility gap over the Vietnam war.

Between May 25 and 30, after the dispatch of troops into Cambodia and again between July 25 and 30, after their return, cross sections of households across the nation were asked:

"As far as the war in Vietnam and Cambodia is concerned, do you think President Nixon has been frank and straightforward about the war, or do you think he has not told the American people the real truth about the situation there?"

[In percent]

	July	May
Frank and straightforward	48	42
Not told real truth	38	46
Not sure	14	12

Not only did the President's credibility rating sharply improve, but confidence that he would keep his pledge of troop withdrawal from Vietnam also turned completely around. The two cross sections were asked:

"President Nixon has said that we still will be able to withdraw 150,000 U.S. troops from Vietnam by next May. In view of the operations in Cambodia, do you think he will be able to bring back the 150,000 U.S. troops by then or not?"

[In percent]

	July	May
Will be able to	50	38
Won't be able to	30	49
Not sure	20	13

They were also asked:

"In undertaking the military operations in Cambodia, do you think the Vietnam war has now been widened into a bigger war in all of Indochina, including Laos and Cambodia, or do you think the move into Cambodia prevented a widening of the war?"

[In percent]

	July	May
Prevented widening of war	42	33
War has been widened	29	53
Not sure	29	14

By 57 to 23 per cent, a majority believe that U.S. troops were successful in destroying North Vietnamese bases in Cambodia. By 56 to 24 per cent, the public also denies the allegation that the incursion was a "mistake." In addition 55 per cent agree with Mr. Nixon's claim that by moving into Cambodia, "the lives of American fighting men in Vietnam were protected."

Just after the action started, most people believed that Mr. Nixon "had widened the war in Indochina—by 53 to 33 percent. But now that U.S. troops have been taken out of Cambodia and the fighting in Vietnam has tended to wind down, a plurality of the public (42 to 29 per cent) holds the view that "the war has been prevented from widening."

The public also has reversed its view that Mr. Nixon "did not act properly by not asking permission of Congress to commit U.S. troops in Cambodia." Just after the action started, a majority was critical of the propriety of Mr. Nixon's action, by 54 to 37 per cent. Now, by a narrow 45 to 42 per cent, most people say the President's course of action was "proper," even though Congress was bypassed.

TRIBUTE ON RICHARD RODGERS' 50TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, 50 years ago, America's most outstanding theater composer, Richard Rodgers, began his illustrious career. I am sure many of us would like to mark this happy occasion with some thoughts about both the man and his achievements.

The statistics alone are staggering. And most unbelievable. To date, Richard Rodgers has created the music for no less than 36 musicals on Broadway, three in London, nine on film, and two for television. Nineteen motion pictures have been adapted from his stage successes. He has been the producer or coproducer of 17 musicals and plays, nine of which also found him serving as composer. He has also written the scores for a ballet, a night club revenue, and two television documentaries. During World War II, he wrote the Bombardier song for the Air Force, the P.T. Boat song for the Navy, a song for the Army, and a special theme for the Fifth War Loan Drive.

The film version of "The Sound of Music" is the most successful motion picture of all time, and its soundtrack recording has been bought by more people—over 12 million—than any other album in the history of the recording industry. The original stage version has the distinction of being both the longest running American musical ever shown in London and the second longest running musical regardless of origin.

By achieving a run of 2,212 performances on Broadway, "Oklahoma!", Rodgers' first musical with Oscar Hammerstein, Second, broke the record for musical show longevity in New York. It held the No. 1 position for 15 years. Outside New York, the musical toured for 10½ years, playing in 163 cities in the United States and Canada.

For two television documentaries, "Victory at Sea" and "Winston Churchill—The Valiant Years," Rodgers was required to supply almost 13 hours of music for each series. His efforts resulted in the two longest orchestral works ever composed, each one only a little short of the entire "Ring" cycle by Richard Wagner.

More statistics? For almost 10 years, from April 1947, to January 1956, only musical plays with scores by Rodgers and Hammerstein were shown at London's historic Drury Lane Theater. In Tokyo alone, there have been five Japanese language versions of Richard Rodgers musicals, with one of them, "Oklahoma!", performed by an all-girl company. In the concert field, a recent

survey of American symphony orchestras conducted by Broadcast Music, Inc., reveals that Rodgers ranks first among the most frequently performed composers of works written since 1940.

As for awards, Rodgers has been honored with two Pulitzer Prizes—a special one for "Oklahoma!" and a regular one for "South Pacific"—four "Tony's"—for "South Pacific," "The King and I," "The Sound of Music," and "No Strings"—and three Drama Critics Circle citations—for "Carousel," "South Pacific," and "Pal Joey." The Academy Award "Oscar" for best film song was won by Rodgers and Hammerstein's "It Might as Well Be Spring"; in 1965, the best film of the year was judged to be "The Sound of Music." Television's Sylvania and Peabody awards went to Rodgers' score for "Victory at Sea," which was also responsible for the composer winning the Navy Department's Distinguished Public Service Medal. In 1960, the "Emmy" for the best television score was awarded to Rodgers for "Winston Churchill." The record industry has also recognized Rodgers' achievements by giving him the "Grammy" award for "The Sound of Music" and "No Strings."

Of course, as I have already noted, Richard Rodgers has been composing for a scant 50 years, and he is still a young man. So there is plenty of time for new statistics to be added, new records to be broken, new laurels to be won. To paraphrase one of his most haunting ballads, the sweetest sound he will ever hear may still be inside his head.

Rodgers' bow as a composer for the Broadway musical theater took place in July 1920. The production was a barely remembered item called "Poor Little Ritz Girl," and Rodgers was all of 17 when he was signed to write the score. Within a relatively short period of time he would become the most significant force in the history of the musical stage.

The great influence that Richard Rodgers has had in the development of this uniquely American art form stems mainly from his constant experimentation in dramatic form, subject matter, and musical expression. Both during his partnerships with Lorenz Hart and Oscar Hammerstein, and later on his own, Rodgers has been a restless innovator. From the very beginning of his career, he has led a continuing rebellion against the sameness and the tameness of the commercial theater, completely oblivious to the accepted rules of what the public would and would not accept. His only rule has been:

"This has never been tried before. I like it. Let's do it."

Rodgers and Hart first won recognition for their brash and impudent score for the "Garrick Gaieties" in 1925. But instead of following it up with something equally modern and youthful, the team next came up with a charmingly unpretentious operetta, "Dearest Enemy," dealing with what was then considered an uncommercial subject, the American Revolution.

More surprises followed. "Peggy-Ann", the very next year, was a strikingly original concept set almost entirely in a Freudian dreamworld. As early as 1928, the partners inserted a note in the program for "Chee-Chee" advising audiences that the musical numbers were so interwoven with the plot that they felt it would be confusing to list the individual titles of the songs. Sheer heresy. After "talkies" were introduced, Rodgers and Hart journeyed to Hollywood where, among other assignments, they created a score for the brilliant musical, "Love Me Tonight," that was a giant leap forward in the use of music as an integral part of the story.

After the team returned to New York in the mid-1930's they turned their attention first to a circus spectacular called "Jumbo," and then to a pioneering spoof of ballet called "On Your Toes." Here Rodgers used his "Slaughter on 10th Avenue" dance not only as an applause-catching specialty but as a vital scene within the framework of the plot. The tradition of the high-kicking chorus line was done away with in "Babes in Arms." "The Boys from Syracuse," based on "The Comedy of Errors," became the first musical comedy derived from a play by Shakespeare. The same year, "I Married an Angel" made further advances in the use of ballet and also, for the first time, skillfully employed music to heighten spoken dialog. In 1940, Rodgers and Hart created their masterpiece, "Pal Joey," which dared to examine unpleasant, three-dimensional characters without the customary musical comedy sugar coating.

Innovations in technique and subject matter continued in the musicals Rodgers wrote with Hammerstein. Though their first work, "Oklahoma!" had a simple story, it expanded the horizon of the musical stage by its innovation of a dream ballet and the close weaving of its story, songs, and dances. "Carousel" was a bitter-sweet fantasy whose "hero" committed suicide midway through the second act. Two years later, the sadly neglected "Allegro" dared to offer an epic tale dealing with the important issue of integrity in today's world. Both "South Pacific" and "The King and I" had worthwhile things to say about the need for understanding between peoples of different backgrounds. For their final collaboration, "The Sound of Music," took up the dilemma of freedom-loving people suddenly caught under the heel of a dictatorship.

Two years after Hammerstein's death in 1960, Rodgers returned to the theater with "No Strings." He also brought along a brand new lyric-writing partner—Richard Rodgers. Here there were many original touches in stagecraft, particularly in the utilization of musicians both backstage and onstage. The play's theme also took courage: an interracial love affair set against the corruptive influence of modern European society. Right now Rodgers is busily working on a new musical with Martin Charnin and Peter Stone based on the story of Noah. Of two things we can be sure: It will have music we can remember and it will be different from anything Rodgers has ever done before.

While Rodgers is probably too occupied with the future to bother about an occasion celebrating the past—even a 50th anniversary—we should not let this milestone pass without expressing our gratitude to the man and his remarkable accomplishments. Long may the sound of his music be heard.

THE AMERICAN SST

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, in the July issue of Aerospace magazine, the distinguished Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL) published a most informative and accurate article on the supersonic transport.

Since much of what has been said in opposition to this program has served to cloud what scientific and technical information we do have, this article should go a long way toward clarifying many of the issues.

Mr. President, the supersonic transport will soon be a fact of aviation life. The Russian and the British-French programs are progressing very satisfactorily. Those of us who believe in an American SST recognize that developmental problems will be encountered—that questions about environment must be answered. But, in the true American tradition, we must press forward to meet these challenges—to answer these questions—and perfect a technology with vast promise for all people. A "heads-in-the-sand" attitude at this point would be a gross waste of our resources and our potential.

Therefore, to help to bring more enlightenment on this matter, I ask unanimous consent that Senator GRAVEL's article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SUPERSONIC TRANSPORT—THE ECOLOGY AND ECONOMICS

(By Senator MIKE GRAVEL)

The United States Supersonic Transport will pollute the atmosphere less than any other known transportation means.

One SST carrying 300 passengers at 1,780 miles an hour will emit no more pollutants than three automobiles traveling at 60 miles an hour.

The entire contemplated fleet of SST's will put into the stratosphere in one day about the same amount of water vapor introduced by a single large thunderstorm—and there are some 3,000 to 6,000 thunderstorms active around the Earth continuously.

These and other facts established during intensive studies by both the U.S. Department of Transportation and the Boeing Company, prime contractor for the SST, have been somewhat obscured by recent criticisms of the program which claim the SST will further aggravate the nation's serious problems with the environment.

In recent months, during debate over the Federal budget and national spending priorities, a wide range of allegations has been made against the SST, by persons in and out of public life who believe that the supersonic transport will contribute heavily to air pollution, create unendurable noise, wreak havoc with its sonic boom—causing cattle to stampede, damaging structures, and so forth—and even change the weather adversely, by introducing large amounts of water vapor into the upper atmosphere.

All of these concerns, however well motivated, are the result of misinformation. Many misconceptions regarding noise and sonic

boom arise because critics persistently cite some unfavorable results of military supersonic flights made several years ago. These research missions, flown at relatively low altitudes over populated areas, bear little relation to the planned utilization of the SST, which will not reach supersonic speed until it is at 60,000 feet altitude and in any case will travel supersonically only over the oceans or above the Arctic Circle. Thus, the critics in effect are begging the question.

Here are some of the most common myths, and the corresponding facts.

Myth: SST's will add greatly to air pollution through the discharge of chemical material from their engines.

Fact: Automobile engines convert 30 to 50 percent of the fuel they consume into air pollutants. Aircraft turbine engines convert less than one percent of fuel consumed into pollutants. The air transport fleet—including future SST's—emits less pollution per 1,000 seat miles than any other mode of transportation yet devised. The smoke from today's jet aircraft indicates inefficient burning of fuel. A new combustor currently is being retrofited on transports already in service. The new-technology jet engines do not smoke, and by the time the SST enters commercial service in the late 1970's it is expected that there will be no visible emissions.

A study by Professor R. F. Stewart of the University of California shows that carbon monoxide and hydrocarbon emissions for today's jet engines during cruise conditions are under one percent of average automobile emissions. The SST will be equipped with emission controls at least as effective as those now being implemented.

Myth: SST sonic booms over land will break windows, crack walls and stampede cattle. The boom paths will cover practically everything. Even wilderness areas will offer no escape. Booms over the oceans will cause enormous vibrations which will disperse fish concentrations.

Fact: Damage has been caused in the past by sonic booms from military aircraft flying at low altitude. However, the force created by such aircraft is 10 to 50 times more powerful than that which the SST will produce.

The SST simply is not built to fly supersonically at low altitudes. It is designed to perform around airports just like subsonic jets, and normally will require about 100 miles to achieve supersonic speed after takeoff.

Because its boom, although not destructive to property, might annoy people on the ground, the SST will fly over land (except above the Arctic Circle) at a speed of about 700 mph. This is too slow to create a boom effect.

Above the Arctic Circle, of course, there are relatively few farmlands, reservations, or national parks.

Over the oceans, the boom will be mild—about one-fourth ounce per square inch, comparable to the impact of a fisherman's spinning lure hitting the water. Marine life will not be harmed. Porthole windows on ships are designed to withstand forces 100 times stronger than the overpressure created by the SST at cruise altitude.

Myth: There is evidence that the SST will pollute the upper atmosphere in such a way as may result in terrible alterations of global weather.

Fact: This allegation apparently relates to controls (condensation trails) from engines at high altitudes. What it overlooks is that these trails of water vapor seldom if ever form at the cruise altitude of the SST—60,000 to 70,000 feet.

The daily stratospheric water input by the SST fleet, as mentioned earlier, will be about the same as that created by one large thunderstorm. It has been theorized that water vapor from the SST's would form a global layer of cirrus clouds, and thus alter the climate. This claim, however, was based on an estimate that water vapor would remain in the stratosphere for 10 years. Recent studies show that the circulation time is more nearly one and a half years, which rules out any significant accumulation of vapor. Two scientific groups—the National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences, and the Office of Meteorological Research—have studied the situation and report that there will be no appreciable disturbance of the Earth's normal atmospheric balance by a fleet of SST's making 1,600 flights per day.

Myth: At takeoff, the SST would be much louder than the noisiest jet now in commercial service.

Fact: The powerful engines on the SST, with a total thrust of about 250,000 pounds, will enable the aircraft to climb quickly after takeoff. The engine sound will be less than that of today's jets at the standard measuring point from the end of the runway—usually three and a half miles after the takeoff run starts. On landing, the plane's design (wide span with separate tail and high-lift devices) will provide excellent low-speed handling characteristics allowing the pilot to cut power for landing. Also, approach noise will be reduced substantially because of the unique engine inlet required for supersonic flight.

Thus, most people living in the vicinity of airports served by the SST will be exposed to less community noise than they hear today.

The same engine power that provides rapid and steep climbout, cutting down on community noise, would create considerable airport (sideline) noise—if unsuppressed. With today's technology, that sideline noise would be susbtantially greater than that generated by jets now in commercial use. The SST airframe contractor believes that the noise level can be reduced significantly before the supersonic plane is slated to go into commercial service eight years from now. The airframe and engine contractors are working with other industry firms and the government to attain this goal.

Any major new technological development, in transportation or any other activity, should be subject to careful examination to determine whether it represents real progress—that is, whether its benefits can be expected to greatly exceed any potential drawbacks from the point of view of the general welfare.

From the standpoint of ecology, results of current studies indicate that air travel in general has proven to be not only efficient in travel time and cost, but also the most efficient means of travel known to man in terms of minimal impact upon the environment. The SST should further improve upon this remarkable record.

ECONOMICS OF THE SST

The greatest single consideration involved in America's Supersonic Transport program is technological: Whether the United States will continue to maintain its dominant position in the development and production of commercial transport aircraft for the world—with all that this means to the health of the domestic economy and the U.S. position in international markets.

Over the next two decades, the level of the world's commercial airline traffic is expected to gain by a factor of six as a result of increases in population, business activity, individual income, and leisure time. The SST is a logical and inevitable step forward to meet the demands of this new volume of air travel—regardless of who builds it.

The situation is highly competitive. Both an Anglo-French and a Soviet version of the SST have already been test-flown and are going into production. Last year, there was considerable skepticism that either of these aircraft would achieve such a degree of success; largely beacuse of this, members of a special Presidential SST Review Committee expressed doubts in early 1969 that the U.S. SST would be beneficial to the nation's balance-of-trade position. They argued that even if the U.S.-produced aircraft were sold abroad in the numbers forecast, increasing tourism by Americans traveling abroad in SST's would more than offset the benefit derived from SST sales to other countries.

However, the Committee observed, if the foreign-made aircraft flew successfully American tourism would increase regardless. That is the prospect for the near future. Since the U.S. SST—which is expected to fly more passengers farther and faster than either of the foreign-built aircraft—will not be available before 1978, the longer-range question is whether American air carriers in the late 1970s and the 80s will be purchasing the American SST or a second-generation version of those already being produced abroad. They simply will have to have supersonic transports, from whatever source, in order to remain competitive.

Should the U.S. fail to build SST's and sell them overseas, and American carriers be forced to buy foreign-built aircraft, it is estimated that the total damage to the balance of trade by 1990 would be $22 billion. If, on the other hand, the projected U.S. program is successfully carried out and approximately 500 SST's are sold (270 of these to foreign airlines), the U.S. may expect to obtain at least $20 billion of the anticipated $25-billion world market through 1990.

(The importance of aircraft to U.S. exporting is shown by the fact that in 1969 they accounted for nearly $2 billion in foreign sales. Without these sales, the United States would have had a critical negative balance of trade.)

The potential return to the Government is about $1 billion more than its investment in the development program, and will generate an additional $5.4 billion in federal tax revenues, and state and local governments will receive an estimated $1.3 billion in taxes.

On the domestic economic front, the SST program represents employment for more than 150,000 persons. Some 50,000 of these will be on the payrolls of the prime contractors and first-level subcontractors; more than 100,000 will be employees of other subcontractors, manufacturers of ground support equipment and installation facilities, and basic industrial manufacturers.

The combined and cumulative income of the direct and supplemental labor force involved in more than 6,000 companies may well exceed $33 billion in 1990.

This employment will be distributed among virtually all of the 50 states. By its nature, it will be high in quality as well as quantity, helping to nurture higher education and skill levels. The results will add to the economic health and wealth of our society, and thereby help to finance programs to meet our urgent domestic needs for social betterment.

Less easy to assess than employment in dollar terms, but of great consequence, are the advances the SST will bring in aviation technology. These will occur in the areas of sustained higher cruising speed, improvement of existing materials and development of new materials with wide applications beyond aviation. Aircraft safety and reliability will be enhanced through advancement of instrument and flight control systems (which coincide with the increasingly critical needs created by today's air traffic congestion), and development of larger, more efficient powerplants for both subsonic and supersonic aircraft.

For the air traveler, the SST will mean flying from the U.S. to Paris in less than three hours compared with more than seven hours aboard present jets. Time advantage is commercial aviation's most important product. Shorter travel times will be all the more attractive to the traveler for whatever purpose.

Although the U.S. SST is small in passenger-carrying capacity than the 747 (300 passengers compared with 440 in typical configuration), it will fly three times as fast. Although it will cost less than twice as much as the 747, it will be twice as productive: during a given time period it can carry twice as many people over a specific range. In the long run, the most productive aircraft is the most economical to operate, even if its initial cost is higher.

All studies of the SST in commercial operation have assumed no increase in fares over current rates.

The SST would become a prime national asset, a generator to the entire national economy with effects far beyond its primary mission of advancing air transportation.

BUSINESS AND THE ARTS

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, on April 14, Mr. Robert O. Anderson, chairman of the Atlantic Richfield Co. and chairman of the Business Committee for the Arts, spoke before the Seattle, Wash., Chamber of Commerce. In his speech, Mr. Anderson noted that the increasing involvement of business with the arts is indicated by the fact that, in 1968, approximately 80 percent of American corporations made contributions to the arts which totaled almost $85 million.

This substantial involvement of American business is extremely important in the United States where, as Mr. Anderson notes, "responsibility for the artistic life of the country has never been fixed." Despite the increasing appreciation for and eagerness to participate in the arts, Government support is in relative decline. As a result, many cultural groups find themselves on the brink of financial disaster.

The problem presented by the lack of adequate governmental support is particularly acute here in Washington. In a city where the largest "industry" is the Federal Government, the potential for significant corporate support is lacking and there are few foundations of significant size. Thus, the symphony, the ballet, opera, the theater groups, the Performing Arts Society, and the Corcoran Gallery face a continuing struggle for their very existence.

There can be no doubt that Washington would be a less attractive place to live if these cultural organizations did not exist. Every other great capital in the world possesses a firstrate symphony, ballet, opera, and theater. But, in every instance there is a large direct Government subsidy. And, even in our own country, in New York, the Metropolitan Museum receives more than $1 million from the city's budget.

Mr. President, the plight of the arts in the Washington area is a real one. As Mr. Anderson's speech indicates, the business community is attempting to do its part. If our concern for the quality of American life is a real one, the Federal Government should do more to accept its part of the responsibility for the continued health and vitality of the arts in this country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Anderson's excellent speech be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ARTS—THE CHALLENGE TO BUSINESS

(By Robert O. Anderson)

It is hardly news that the arts in this country are in serious trouble. The two weeks of testimony taken by the Special Sub-Committee on Arts and Humanities has been more than sufficient to bear out the warnings issued by arts leaders, foundation experts, and businessmen involved with the arts.

The indications are, that in this decade, many arts organizations will face dissolution unless an enlarged and dependable financial base can be established. Most important, the loss of opportunities to participate in the arts may have far greater effect on the health of society than a reduction in the number of concerts or museum hours might indicate.

A major premise of the Business Committee for the Arts, as stated by its first chairman, C. Douglas Dillon, is that "The arts are a major and effective weapon in any effort to improve the human condition."

We know there is nothing in any corporate charter that obliges business to support the arts. But members of the Business Committee believe that in many instances there may be no better way for a corporation to help enrich the lives of young people, people with increasing leisure time, the disadvantaged, and the aged than through the arts. And participation in the arts need not mean reshuffling priorities. Many corporations—as well as government agencies and foundations—have found that arts projects and social projects are not mutually exclusive.

However, in spite of the variety and vitality which the arts have achieved in this country, they are capable of far greater contributions to the quality of our society than they have yet been able to make. The real danger in the developing financial crisis is not only the loss of the arts institutions themselves, but the loss of their services to a society that is in need of positive approaches which emphasize the best that is within man.

For example, all available estimates indicate that the amount of leisure time Americans now enjoy will increase. The ways in which this time is used are an important issue of public concern. The arts are being called upon to help in solving this problem.

The arts will also play an important role in the attempt to halt the deterioration of our physical environment, which is certainly one of the major tasks of business and government in the years to come.

Some cities have found that not only do the arts aid in redevelopment; redevelopment can also provide for the arts by including arts facilities and programs in urban planning. The arts have also helped to ease the tensions of urban living—not simply as mass entertainments but as constructive outlets for creative energy and as sources of community pride.

The field of education offers examples both of promising successes and widespread failures in integrating the arts into the general curriculum. In recent years, the arts have been recognized not only as an important subject in their own right, but as a useful approach to other kinds of material. And educational programs which employ the artistic resources of a community also help to broaden the audience and the base of support for local arts groups.

However, one of the problems in the commendable effort to provide free exposure to the arts is that the issue of support tends to be obscured. Programs financed by Federal grants do not always encourage communities to consider how they will provide services in the arts in the event that such funds are no longer available.

While those concerned for the arts hope that public funds will become a dependable source of support, government leaders on all levels acknowledge that public agencies are often limited by the uncertainties of politics and the nature of bureaucracy. Our most persistent social problems must be attacked at the local level; they cannot be solved entirely by national fiat.

We also know that the technological and managerial resources of business can be applied to local problems of blight, pollution, and poverty. Many corporations have already committed some of their resources to dealing with these problems.

THE ARTS IN SOCIAL ACTION

But government agencies have also discovered that funds and buildings are not enough. In any program of social action, the "human element" must be the starting point. There must be provision for the spirit.

Almost every corporation involved with the arts is aware of the arts' relation to the social health of the community. While the arts cannot be regarded as a miracle drug that will halt all forms of social disintegration, they do present one avenue of approach that can yield dividends far beyond the cost of an individual project.

In fact, the funds necessary for the arts, while urgently needed, are not so great as to require a drastic reorganization of either corporate or federal priorities. Part of the tragedy of our current crisis in the arts is that a solution is well within our capacity. Hundreds of arts organizations that are curtailing services or facing dissolution could be preserved and strengthened with relatively little expenditure. Unfortunately, the crisis in the arts is not as dramatic as the challenges of the ghetto or the exploration of space. At the same time, the arts, however needy, require nowhere near the funds necessary to eradicate slums or collect lunar samples.

Almost all of our arts organizations face not only an annual operating deficit, or "income, but an alarming net deficit after all additional sources of income, such as gifts from individuals, foundation grants, and corporate contributions, have been counted. When an individual buys a seat at the orchestra, the opera, ballet or repertory theatre, he is actually receiving a matching grant, about equal to the price of his ticket, from a variety of other sources.

A recent study of five major orchestras estimates that they will either have to double their income from grants and contributions or seriously deplete what reserves they have been able to accumulate. These five orchestras will need almost four million dollars to meet outstanding obligations in this year alone. And if this money is taken from endowment funds, the financial burden in future years will only be greater.

It has often been pointed out that the arts are a craft industry in the machine age. An expansion of services does not necessarily mean a reduction in costs through increased volume. Recent estimates place museum attendance at about six hundred million in 1968—a threefold increase since the beginning of the decade. However, rather than increasing revenue, these growing crowds require greater expenditures for instructors, guards, administrative staff, insurance and construction.

NEED FOR OUTSIDE SOURCES OF SUPPORT

Under any social system in any historical period, the arts have depended for survival upon support from outside sources. Only the commercial theatre and the art market operate under the laws of supply and demand.

In Canada, Europe and many less developed areas, a minimum level of responsibility for the arts has become fixed at some point or points—whether in city government,

in national boards, ministries of culture, or some combination.

In the United States, responsibility for the artistic life of the country has never been fixed. Views on support range from complete government subsidy to indifferent Darwinism.

In many ways, however, our pluralistic system—perhaps "situation" would be a better term—offers the arts the optimum potential for both support and freedom. But this potential will only be realized if all the elements of our pluralism are more deeply involved.

As individuals, of course, American businessmen have been a sustaining force in the arts for a long time. And businesses have always employed the arts more or less consciously in design, marketing and manufacturing But most businessmen have only recently become aware of the value of the arts to the business and social concerns of their corporations.

This important change—the interest of the corporation *itself* in the condition of the arts—has already had an impact on the support of the arts in America.

During this past year, two surveys have been published which indicate that business involvement with the arts is not only greater than had been expected, but is increasing rapidly. For many years, the National Industrial Conference Board has conducted triennial surveys of corporate contributions to all philanthropies. In 1959 and 1962, gifts for cultural purposes were not even a separate category in the triennial survey, but were included under the heading of "Civic Causes"—a category which accounted for only three percent of total corporate giving. In 1965, the first year in which "Culture" was assigned a separate column, the arts alone received three percent of the total. In that year, 540 companies surveyed gave about six million dollars to the arts. In the 1968 Survey, published this year, 400 corporations reported grants to the arts of over thirteen million dollars, or about five percent of their total giving.

A rough translation of these figures into national terms can be obtained by applying the five percent figure to the estimate for total corporate giving of 900 million dollars offered by the American Association of Fundraising Council. The resulting figure—forty-five million dollars—is our estimate of corporate contributions to the arts in 1968.

However, even this considerable sum is only a part of the total, as the triennial survey includes only those commitments to the arts which were reported as contributions. A more detailed survey undertaken by the Business Committee indicates that projects in the arts reported as business expenses involved expenditures of about forty million dollars—almost as much as was reported under contributions.

INCREASING BUSINESS SUPPORT

One firm conclusion of these studies is that business is involved with the arts to a substantial and increasing degree. Another is that support of the arts is not the exclusive property of a few well-known companies. Eight out of ten corporations surveyed by NICB contributed operating funds, and four out of ten made capital gifts to the arts. And it is interesting that smaller companies tended to assign a higher percentage of their contributions to the arts than did large ones.

It would appear from these figures that a substantial beginning has been made. Some eighty percent of American corporations made a contribution to the arts, and the total amount given in 1968 alone was close to eighty-five million dollars.

Yet, when one has looked closely at the state of the country's arts institutions, and is aware of the enormous contributions which the arts are capable of making to our society, it becomes essential to regard these figures only as a beginning.

The arts simply cannot be left to the marketplace. As with schools, libraries, and hospitals, the higher the quality offered and the wider the public reached, the more support is needed.

The fundamental task of the Business Committee is to broaden and increase the base of corporate involvement with the arts. A country of two hundred million people spread unevenly over three and one-half million square miles cannot be served by a few national artistic organizations—even if these are among the best in the world. Each community—and the businesses which prosper there—must be concerned for the quality of cultural life available to its citizens and their children.

REVERSAL OF MIGRATION FLOW TO CROWDED CITIES

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, at a recent meeting with the Northern Plains States Governors in Fargo, N. Dak. President Nixon spoke of the administration's program of reversing the migration flow of our people into the crowded cities.

The President also indicated that an effort was underway to develop a new, progressive policy which would provide good jobs and greater opportunities for our people in the rural areas of America.

I am encouraged by the President's remarks, and am hopeful that the administration will accept—and implement—a vigorous program aimed at reversing the migration of our people into America's congested metropolitan areas.

In an address delivered on the Senate floor on March 3 of this year, I urged the administration to adopt such a policy and to explore the use of existing Federal programs in an effort to decentralize our overly concentrated population and industrial centers, and to encourage the growth and development of our rural areas—see the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 5597. In that address I suggested that consideration be given to the use of existing Federal programs—grants-in-aid—Federal procurement practices—and land-use policies—to accomplish an orderly and better balanced population growth in the United States.

I am convinced that the implementation of such a policy would ease the population pressures on our cities, the prime source of congestion and pollution, and increase and enhance the opportunities for providing a better environment and more meaningful way of life for all our citizens. A more dispersed population might also improve efforts to control the accelerating and intolerable incidence of crime in the United States. Many other benefits would, I am sure, accrue from a coordinated, determined Federal effort in this sphere of opportunity and responsibility.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, the brief and informal remarks President Nixon made on this issue at Fargo, N. Dak., on July 24, and an editorial on the President's statement entitled, "Migration Reversal," published in the Washington Daily News of July 29.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXCERPTS FROM THE PRESIDENT'S INFORMAL REMARKS AT THE CIVIC CENTER BEFORE HIS MEETING WITH THE NORTHERN PLAINS STATES GOVERNORS, JULY 24, 1970

I always like to talk to young people and I think that young people here are really with it in terms of their understanding of national issues, their interest in them and the like.

Sometimes people who live in Washington, New York, other cities, they get out to the Midwest, particularly North Dakota and Wyoming, and they think that that is sort of the sticks. It is not true anymore. This is really one country.

This is a country where, by reason of the communication, television and the rest, there is a tremendous interest in all the national issues here, just like there is in other places.

Let me say, too, that it was very interesting to find, as I went through the crowd, and I thought very encouraging, that a number of people who had lived in places like Los Angeles, St. Louis, one from Connecticut, had moved to North Dakota. We hear about the out-migration. I am convinced now that our program, which we are going to discuss in here now, our program of reversing the migration flow, so that for what is called rural America—and, of course, Fargo is a big city but it is part of rural America—this process of reversing the migration flow really can work, because the attraction, of course, is quite obvious. You have jobs, you have clean air, you have opportunity, you have schools, you have more of an opportunity than you would have in a much larger city to control your own future.

I think that is one of the reasons people like it here. I have always liked it here because they have always been good to me.

I want to say this, Governor, that I recall you as a young Republican. You have always been telling us how great this country was. You have been strong for your State, for this part of the country. And one of the reasons that I have developed this Rural Affairs Council, which, as you know, is something new in the Federal Government, and now bringing the Government of the United States, rather than just sitting there in Washington and waiting for people to come in—is bringing the Government to the country so that we can see what the country is like. You have to see it and feel it. You can read about it in a 150-page document, but there is nothing like talking with people, seeing people, seeing their faces, to know what their attitudes really are. That is something that we have been working for.

I think that leadership of men like yourself, and the other Governors that we are going to meet, can develop a new, progressive policy where this—what is called the great heartland of America, which has so much to offer in the way of good life—can have the good jobs and the greater opportunity that will bring people from the overcrowded cities back to the country where they will have a better life.

That is our program. And I think your 150-page document probably deals with that.

[From The Washington Daily News, July 29, 1970]

MIGRATION REVERSAL

Exhilarated, possibly, by the good breathing air of the Great Plains, President Nixon last week in North Dakota threw out some ideas about "reversing the migration flow."

This, it appears, would involve not only

slowing down the trend from the country to cities, but inducing a trend in the other direction—a program to "bring people from the overcrowded cities back to the country where they will have a better life."

To punctuate his theme, Mr. Nixon said at one point:

"I don't see any smog here."

It is an interesting theme, with some obvious appeal.

It already is possible to spot part of such a trend. Population figures, for instance, indicate many big cities are losing people, or barely holding their own, or gaining very little. (And some local politicians, afraid of losing handouts from Uncle Sam, are screaming "foul" at the Census Bureau.)

Trouble is, the shift seems headed for the suburbs, rather than the country. Agricultural areas continue to lose people. But, at least, in some cases people are fleeing the "overcrowded cities."

It is plain, of course, that life in a city has its drawbacks: Polluted air, traffic congestion, usually a higher cost of living. But a good many people depend for a living on locating their trade or business where there are a lot of other people.

It is plain, of course, that in small communities, the air is better, traffic moderate, living less complex and less expensive. But if you move many more people into a small community it no longer would be small.

Planners have been planning and idealists ideating on this problem for some time. And Mr. Nixon thinks the right government policies and leadership can bring about his "migration reversal."

Maybe so. But people tend to go where they think they can best make a living, or most likely pursue their ambitions. It will require a considerable change in the structure of the country, it would seem, to alter these tendencies on any appreciable scale.

By raising a few questions, we are not trying to be hostile to Mr. Nixon's objective, nor disdainful of his ideas. We simply are trying to contemplate the enormity and complexity of the proposition if it is to be managed on a scale that will do any real good. And by all means, let's hear more, Mr. President.

HERMAN KENIN: A LABOR LEADER WHO WILL BE MISSED

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to pay tribute to Herman D. Kenin, president of the American Federation of Musicians, who died recently. Mr. Kenin grew up in Oregon and, although he lived in Connecticut from 1958 until his death, I know he remained an Oregonian in heart and spirit.

Mr. President, one of Mr. Kenin's journalist friends, Hilmar Grondahl, music editor of the Oregonian, summed up the feelings of many musicians in an article published in the Oregonian on August 2, 1970. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KENIN WON HEARTS OF MUSIC ASSOCIATES

(By Hilmar Grondahl)

Herman Kenin's position as president of the American Federation of Musicians took him away from Portland during his latter years. But his affection for this city endured, and it was his expressed hope to re-establish himself here after retirement.

While he was a Portland resident his participation in civic activities was broad, with particular emphasis on its music. We recall with what energy and enterprise he worked for the reactivation of the Portland Symphony Orchestra in 1947 after its decade of somnolence. The six summers of outdoor concerts by the Stadium Philharmonic were a special project in which his ingenuity and effort were involved.

Those of us who knew him from his young manhood onward were aware of his direct participation in music; as a violinist and a bandleader, as one who made dancing a pleasure at the Multnomah Hotel, who toured and recorded with his ensemble.

His training experience fitted him uniquely not only for his leadership of local 99 of the AFM in Portland, but for the presidency of the 300,000 member international union.

Kenin was diplomatic yet tough minded, realistic yet compassionate, qualities which served admirably in seeking the advancement of union members in an insufficiently-appreciated cultural art. As a musician he was involved with the cultural aspects of music, and as a union leader he knew his concern was needed to bring the musician's compensation in line with the years of required training and his responsibilities as a performer.

It is said that Herman Kenin was unable to complete all of the many projects he had assigned himself and his co-workers. But that he improved the image and status of a great profession in the years available to him, is beyond question.—H.G.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, at the funeral of Herman Kenin on July 24, 1970, his good friend, Walter H. Evans, Jr., a Portland attorney, delivered a moving tribute which capsuled the feelings of all those who knew Mr. Kenin. I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of Mr. Evans be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the eulogy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HERMAN DAVID KENIN

The friends of Herman David Kenin need no reminder of his outstanding qualities as a person, but I have been asked to share some memories with you.

He was born in Vineland, New Jersey, on October 26, 1901, the son of Samuel and Ada Kenin. When he was about eight years of age, the family moved to Portland, where he, his brothers Harry and Frank, and his sisters Fanny and Ida, were graduated from Elliot Grade School, Jefferson High School, and Reed College. Herman was graduated from Northwestern College of Law in 1931.

He married Maxine Bennett, a Portland girl, and they have two children, both boys. He and his family lived in Portland until 1956, when they moved to Los Angeles, and from there to New York City, finally residing in Westport, Connecticut. Herman Kenin died early in the morning of July 21st, 1970.

In 1936, he was elected President of Local 99, the Portland local of the American Federation of Musicians. In 1943, he was appointed to the Federation's International Executive Board, and in 1958 he became its President, a position he held through re-election until his death. While President of the Federation, he was elected a Vice President of the AFL–CIO, a responsible position he also held until his unexpected death this week.

There are those of us who knew Herman as a successful officer in his specialized field of union leadership, as a confidant of national figures, an internationally-recognized, skillful negotiator, and as a seasoned diplomat. The quality of his leadership is evident from the manner in which his union met the challenges of new technologies and not only survived, but grew. The pension plans, the collective-bargaining agreements, the period of unprecedented tranquility and prosperity all demonstrate his success as a gifted leader.

He was the recipient of many high public honors. He was appointed by Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson to national Cultural and Fine Arts Councils. He was named by President Truman as one of the two worker delegates to the International Labor Organizations conference in Geneva, Switzerland. Despite all these and other honors, Herman Kenin retained his approachability . . . he was still Herman Kenin from Portland, Oregon. Appropriately, it was in this city in 1963 that more than 600 friends from all over the United States gathered at an impressive testimonial dinner.

There are those of us who knew him professionally, since his admission as a member of the Oregon State Bar, in September, 1931. We respected his ability, his professional standing, and his unquestioned integrity. We valued his friendship and counsel, whether it was over a cup of coffee at Mannings or by long distance phone from Los Angeles or New York City.

There are those of us who remember Herman as the private citizen, as the family man . . . a devoted son and brother, a warm and loving husband and father, and as a good neighbor in every sense of the word. We recall his kindness, his generosity, his superb ability as a raconteur, with an inexhaustible supply of anecdotes, each precisely suited to the particular occasion.

We remember his warmth, his understanding, his wit, his intelligence, his strong sense of family, and his participation in all forms of good citizenship, whether it was the neighborhood P.T.A., the Portland Symphony Board, or the summer concerts in the park. We shall always recall his love of music, both classical and popular. Herman and his band played at the Indian Grille of the Multnomah Hotel, and before that, at the old Oregon Hotel, with George Olson. He played at the Coconut Grove in the Ambassador Hotel in Los Angeles, and I am sure that some of you will recall that he played at the opening of the Gearhart Hotel in 1926. His name was, and always will be, synonomous with good music.

We remember him, above all, as the devoted brother of Fanny and Frank, the loving husband of Maxine, and the proud, proud father of David and Jim.

Each one of us, by our attendance here, joins in extending love and sympathy to his family, especially to his wife, his sons, his sister, and his brother. Each one of us pays tribute to his life, and recognizes that Portland, and indeed this country, to a measurable degree, is a better place to live because of Herman Kenin.

Herman was a good man, who gave of himself to all who needed his help or counsel. He enjoyed his life . . . he loved people . . . and he took great pride in his heritage. We will miss him.

As we honor his memory today, we say it was a privilege to have known him. . . . to have loved him. These words cannot add to his stature . . . it needs no addition. We are proud to have been friends of Herman Kenin.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial about Herman Kenin, published in the Oregon Journal, an obituary notice from that paper; and an article from the AFL–CIO News of July 25, 1970; be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Oregon Journal, July 23, 1970]

THE FRUITS OF FIDDLING

Herman D. Kenin had one of those mothers who insist that all her children learn music.

The career he started as a boy fiddler in Portland took Kenin all the way to the presidency of the 239,000-member American Fed-

eration of Musicians, the position he held when he died in New York Tuesday. Along the road his music helped him pay his way through Reed College and Northwestern College of Law, and to establish a national reputation as an orchestra leader in the late 1920s and early 1930s.

Kenin always kept his ties to Portland. He was a graduate of the old Eliot School—since replaced—in Albina, and of Jefferson High School, in the days of which survivors endlessly delight in telling of rock fights with the kid gangs from rival schools.

As an official of the Portland Musicians Union he helped establish summer band concerts here and to revive the Portland Symphony Orchestra after World War II. His new job required him to move East when he was named president of the national union in 1958 as the hand-picked successor to the celebrated "czar" James Caesar Petrillo.

No doubt there are boys today whose twiddlings with an electrified guitar will lead them into rewarding careers like Kenin's.

[From the Oregon Journal, July 22, 1970]

UNIONIST KENIN DIES AT 69

NEW YORK.—Herman Kenin, 69, who began his musical career in Portland, Ore., and rose to become president of the American Federation of Musicians, was found dead in his hotel room here Tuesday, apparently victim of a heart attack.

Kenin grew up in Portland and received his law degree from Northwestern College of Law.

While in college, he played the violin in a dance band and later was a member of the George Olsen orchestra. During the big band era of the 1920s and 1930s he headed his own band in Portland and played along the West Coast.

He began the practice of law in Portland in 1931 and was a member of the AFM's Portland Local No. 99. He was elected president of the local in 1936 and headed the union for 20 years, during which the membership climbed from 500 to 1,300.

Kenin succeeded James C. Petrillo, long the AFM's national leader, in 1958.

Kenin was appointed by President Eisenhower to the National Cultural Center Advisory Committee and was reappointed to that position by the late President Kennedy. In 1965, he was appointed by President Johnson to the Fine Arts Council.

Kenin was an advocate of the use of tax money to support the performing arts. He referred to the performing arts as a "cornerstone of our heritage."

Funeral service will be held Friday at 10 a.m. at Holman and Son Funeral Service for Herman Kenin, 68, of Westport, Conn., president of the American Federation of Musicians. He died Monday in Westport.

Mr. Kenin attended Eliot Grade School, Jefferson High School, and Reed College in Portland. He was active in getting outdoor summer operas for Washington Park.

In 1947 he was appointed by President Truman as one of two worker delegates to the International Labor Organization's Conference in Geneva.

He worked with representatives of other countries on problems affecting musicians.

He was instrumental in establishing pension funds for musicians, eliminating cut-rate foreign music in commercial scoring, improving musicians' wage scales and working conditions, setting up scholarships for young musicians, eliminating the 20 per cent cabaret tax, and creating a national endowment for the arts and humanities.

He referred to the performing arts as a "cornerstone of our heritage."

Survivors include his wife, Maxine; two sons, James of Washington, D.C., and David, New York City; a brother, Frank of Portland; and a sister, Mrs. Max (Fannie) Friedman of West Linn.

Interment will be at Neveh Zedek Cemetery in Portland. Remembrances may be made to Reed College.

[From the AFL–CIO News, July 25, 1970]

MUSICIANS' PRESIDENT HERMAN D. KENIN DIES

NEW YORK.—AFL–CIO Vice Pres. Herman D. Kenin, who guided the Musicians to new heights in membership and program, died in his sleep at a hotel here. He was 69 and had been AFM president since 1958.

A message of sympathy from Federation Pres. George Meany and Sec.-Treas. Lane Kirkland expressed "deep sadness . . . at the tragic death of our colleague and warm friend."

His years of service to the AFM, they said, were matched "by his service to the entire trade union movement." The message recalled that "to every assignment he brought calm and thoughtful competence, and deep compassion for his fellow man."

Kenin was "a true trade unionist and a fine gentleman, and we shall miss him," the federation officers said. They conveyed "our sincere regret" to AFM officers and members and the family. Survivors include his wife, Mrs. V. Maxine Kenin, sons David and James, brother Frank K. and sister Fanny Friedman, Portland, Ore.

The family asked that instead of flowers, memorial tributes be sent in Kenin's name to Reed College, Portland, Ore. 97202.

To meet the emergency caused by Kenin's death, Sec.-Treas. Stanley Ballard and the officers called a special board meeting for July 29.

In his lifetime Kenin combined a career as violinist, orchestra leader and practicing attorney to become an influential labor leader. He had been an AFM officer since 1943.

Born in Vineland, N.J., he was the son of a member of the Cigar Makers when it was headed by Sam Gompers. He went to school in Portland, attended Reed College, and in 1930, following three years as a night student at Northwestern College of Law, was admitted to the Oregon bar.

During his college and law school days, Kenin played with the George Olsen Orchestra, then led his own band on hotel, radio, theater and club dates on the West Coast. He practiced law starting in 1931 but kept up his membership in AFM Local 99, and in 1936 was elected its president.

Kenin gave up his law practice at the request of AFM Pres. James C. Petrillo in 1943 to become a board member of the union. He was elected president in 1958 succeeding Petrillo and helped guide the 300,000-member union during its period of greatest growth.

Under his leadership the union became a major force in efforts to establish the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities. Also it won a long battle in Congress to reduce the 20 percent cabaret tax, established pension trust funds for musicians, persuaded television networks to eliminate foreign-produced music from their programing in favor of "live" domestic music, achieved major gains in salaries and conditions for symphony musicians, and set up scholarship and student-aid programs like the world-renowned Congress of Strings.

He was largely responsible for negotiating agreements with the major television networks and film studios, and with recording firms that fortified the role of the musician in those industries.

Kenin's death brought messages of sympathy from several world labor groups. Sec.-Gen. Arturo Jauregui of the Inter-American Regional Organization of Workers—ORIT—cabled "heartfelt condolence on the death of a great leader and devoted trade unionists, also . . . a valued friend."

Kenin played a leading role in founding the Inter-American Federation of Entertainment Workers and the International Secretariat of Entertainment Trade Unions. He was past president and, at his death, treasurer of the AFL–CIO Council for Scientific, Professional & Cultural Employes.

IDAHO UNDERSTANDS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President—

Future historians may look upon the withdrawal of American troops from Cambodia as the end of an *error* as well as an *era*.

That is the opening sentence of an editorial published in Rexburg, Idaho, Standard. The editorial goes on to declare:

This time in history may signify the close of a period of widespread action abroad backed by popular support at home.

The Cooper-Church amendment, which the Senate adopted overwhelmingly on June 30 of this year, is hailed as a symbol of this new mood. The editorial declares:

The amendment aims to restore to Congress, or at any rate to reaffirm, some of its constitutionally delegated power over foreign operations.

In a similar vein, the Idaho Statesman expresses its approval of the President's plan to withdraw 20,000 American troops from South Korea—about 40 percent of those now garrisoned there. The Statesman appropriately asks:

How can we withdraw from Vietnam, if we can't withdraw from Korea?

The President's Korean decision is a welcome one. As far back as April, 1964, I first suggested that troop reductions be made in Korea. In an article written for the Nation, entitled "The Korean Paralysis: Mired Troops and Frozen Policy," I suggested that American foreign policy "tends to maintain fixed positions long after these have ceased to serve our best interests," and cited the stationing of two full combat divisions—52,000 American troops—in South Korea as evidence.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the two newspaper editorials and the Nation article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Rexburg, Idaho, Standard, July 7, 1970]

THE CAMBODIAN CATALYST

Future historians may look upon the withdrawal of American troops from Cambodia as the end of an error as well as an era. For those who contend that the administration was mistaken in undertaking the Cambodian operations, the error is now over; only its long-run consequences remain to be reckoned with

What is clear is that the Cambodian venture—from its swift beginning, followed by unprecedented domestic turmoil—does mark the end of an era: the post-World War II era of Pax Americana and an American big stick policy. The foremost indicator of this is the Cooper-Church amendment, which passed the Senate with a wider margin than had been expected.

The thrust of this amendment is to restore to Congress, or at any rate to reaffirm, some of its constitutionally delegated power over foreign operations. Even if it does not survive the Senate-House conference, it still serves to mark a significant turning point in foreign affairs.

The amendment is not and should not be interpreted as a slap against either President Nixon or the office or powers of the presidency. Rather, it is the result of a process that has been building up over the past decade in reaction to the ever-growing imbalance between presidential and congressional authority. We are witnessing a reversion to a safer point of equilibrium.

It thus appears that future analysts of American foreign policy may view the present moment as signifying the close of a period of widespread action abroad backed by popular support at home. Some now see this as neo-isolationism, but that strikes us as inaccurate. Whatever one calls what is happening, it is evident that the Cambodian operation was only the element that was needed to catalyze a change.

[From the Idaho Statesman, July 17, 1970]

KOREAN TROOPS WITHDRAWALS

If it is still necessary to keep 55,000 U.S. troops in South Korea, how long will it take to withdraw our force from Vietnam? Or, putting it another way, how can we withdraw from Vietnam if we can't withdraw from Korea?

Those questions may have something to do with a decision to withdraw 40 per cent of our troops in South Korea, despite the opposition of the Korean government.

The withdrawal plan lends credibility to President Nixon's promises to Vietnamize the war in Vietnam. South Korea has nearly 200,000 more men under arms than North Korea and has received about a billion dollars worth of U.S. military aid.

Under those circumstances the Koreans ought to be able to accept a larger share of responsibility for their own defense. If the withdrawal of 20,000 U.S. troops from South Korea means the country is in danger, then hopes for successful withdrawal from Vietnam are probably a pipe dream.

A South Korean force of 37,000 has fought well in Vietnam, giving some support to Mr. Nixon's idea of letting Asians do more in the defense of Asia.

Bringing the U.S. troops home should help trim our military costs and ease the foreign exchange problem.

If the North Koreans should renew the conflict the South Koreans could not expect, and shouldn't need, the massive participation of our forces.

To assure that South Korea could not defend itself now would be to write off the entire Nixon concept that it will be possible for Asia nations to provide most of their own defense.

[From the Nation, Apr. 6, 1964]

THE KOREAN PARALYSIS: MIRED TROOPS AND FROZEN POLICY

(By Senator FRANK CHURCH)

American foreign policy tends to maintain fixed positions long after these have ceased to serve our best interests. An example of this rigidity is the continued stationing of two full combat divisions—some 52,000 American troops, including various supporting units—in South Korea.

I neither challenge nor disclaim our basic commitment to defend, by whatever means may be necessary, the integrity of the Republic of Korea. The fixed position to which I refer is not our commitment to defend the country, but the means by which we have chosen to do so. The perpetuation of these means is, I believe, demonstrably unsound, excessively costly and long since unnecessary.

Why does the United States need two full combat divisions in Korea? Since the end of the Korean fighting in 1953, we have given nearly $5 billion dollars in aid to South Korea; more than $2 billion of this aid has been used to equip their army. Today, the ROK army, numbering nearly 600,000 men, is the fourth largest in the entire world! It far outnumbers the entire North Korean armed forces of approximately 350,000 men, and is surpassed only by the United States, the Soviet Union and Communist China. We have made the South Korean Army combat-ready, and equipped it with the most modern weapons; it should, by now, be more than a match for the smaller North Korean force. If it is not, the American people are entitled to know how and where their money has been squandered.

The argument that we must leave 50,000 American sentinels on the front line in Korea to guard against, not a North Korean attack, but the possibility of another invasion by Communist China, is transparently weak. Against an all-out Chinese attack, two divisions of American troops would never suffice. Should Korea be so invaded again, the United States would have to intervene with the whole of her military might. To pretend otherwise is merely to tempt fate.

If another armed challenge of this dimension were to occur in South Korea, We would have to respond with forces now stationed outside that country. And we are prepared to do so. Our armed forces are far stronger and more mobile than in 1950, when the last invasion occurred. Our formidable base and staging area at Okinawa is within easy reach. Moreover, the success of the recent "Operation Big Lift," which flew a whole division from Texas to West Germany, indicates how swiftly we can move our troops from one part of the globe to another. Should a big new invasion ever require it, we could quickly airlift formidable numbers of American soldiers into the Korean peninsula.

The customary retort to these acknowledged facts is that two American divisons must none the less remain in Korea as a psychological deterrent to any future Communist adventures, and to keep the South Koreans reassured of our determination to defend their country. As to the latter, one wonders why further reassurance should be needed after so vast an outpouring of American life and fortune in the Korean War; as to the former, if we accept the argument that our continued presence in Korea is required to make our commitment credible to the potential enemy, then it follows that American forces will have to patrol the 38th Parallel indefinitely—at least until such time as Korea's Communist neighbors either disarm or disappear!

I find neither of these propositions convincing. But, to play it absolutely safe, let us concede that the continued presence of American troops in Korea does offer further proof, to friend and foe alike, of our determination to uphold that country. Does it follow that we must keep two full divisions there? Surely, one regimental combat team would serve the purpose. With our capacity for rapid reinforcement from bases nearby, we can give South Korea the same guarantee of security, with far fewer American troops actually garrisoned there. It doesn't take a whole American Army to provide a "trip-wire."

Withdrawing the remainder of these two divisions to locations from which they could be speedily airborne would also add to our general mobility. Our troops now on the line in Korea can be used only to defend that country. They are dug deeply into the hillsides. Ironically, we have limited their utility by miring them down in a region of the world where, their instant availability for use in a crisis, somewhere else around the run of China, could mean the difference between success and failure.

Moreover, the case against the frozen deployment of two whole divisions in Korea is not limited to the benefits to be derived from a more fluid strategic position. There are pressing financial, as well as sound military reasons for reducing the level of American troops in that country.

The cost of maintaining our military forces abroad is a far greater burden to our balance-of-payments problem than our total outlay each year in foreign aid. For instance, in 1962, our balance-of-payments deficit was $2.18 billion. The drain on the balance from foreign-based military expenditures was more than $3 billion. In 1961, our balance-of-payments deficit was $2.37 billion, while our foreign-based military costs contributing to this deficit exceeded $2.93 billion. In both years, we would have had a balance-of-payments surplus, had it not been for the cost of our garrisons in other countries. Retaining two whole divisions in Korea adds more than $100 million each year to our balance-of-payments deficit.

The United States has sustained a deficit in its balance of payments consistently since 1950. As a result, we have accumulated more than $25 billion in short-term obligations abroad, while our gold reserves have dwindled to less than $16 billion. If we subtract the $12 billion in gold bullion earmarked by law to back the currency in our own country, we now have less than $4 billion in gold reserves with which to redeem our outstanding obligations to foreign creditors. During the past five years, our gold reserves have been diminishing at an alarming rate. We have suffered a gold outflow of more than $7 billion since 1958!

All this is not to say that, wherever our vital interests require it, we should not continue to station American troops in other countries. But it is to say that the size of these garrisons should be reduced, wherever possible, to a prudent minimum.

I submit that a sound assessment of our position in Korea calls for the withdrawal of the bulk of our troops, for the following reasons:

The South Korean Army can repel a North Korean invasion.

An invasion by Communist China would require us to make an effort of an entirely different magnitude than is implied by the two divisions currently quartered in Korea.

A regiment of American combat troops on the front line in Korea would serve just as effectively as a "trip-wire" deterrent to the Communists.

Removing the remaining units from their trenches in Korea would add to the mobility of our military posture in Asia.

A reduction in the number of American troops stationed in Korea would mitigate our serious balance-of-payments problem.

CRASH PRIORITY PROGRAM ON ELIMINATION OF DREAD DISEASES

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, we Americans are a security conscious people. We want to secure peace so we spend billions of dollars on weapons. We want safe streets so we hire more policemen. We want financial security so we invest, save, insure. In many ways our behavior is dominated by fear.

Perhaps no fear is more universal than the fear of disease. Cancer, stroke, heart disease evoke images of suffering and death for us all. Yet, these diseases have become such a fact of life that we can now predict with a high degree of accuracy how many Americans will die of each of these diseases every year.

I have known may of these Americans. My predecessor at Bell & Howell, Joseph H. McNabb, died of cancer. With-

in the past month, I served as pallbearer for his wife and son, both of whom passed on from cancer. Three out of four members of the same family dead from the same disease. This is a tragedy we can prevent in the future only by dedicating ourselves to an effort to eliminate this dread disease.

On August 3, I sponsored, with the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN), a resolution making it the sense of Congress that we adopt a national crash priority program on dread diseases as a beginning for this effort. The resolution stipulates that it is our goal to eliminate these diseases by 1976. What better 200th anniversary present could the Nation give itself than the reassurance that we are free from the fear of cancer, stroke, and heart disease.

A resolution alone will not accomplish this goal. While it will authorize the Surgeon General to report on the funding and extent of programs designed to discover and prevent the causes of these diseases, only additional research and more doctors can eliminate the diseases.

The National Advisory Council on Health Manpower conservatively estimates a shortage of 50,000 doctors. That means that at present we have only about 80 percent of the health manpower we require. Yet, each year, thousands of qualified American college graduates are being turned away from medical school because there is not room for them. Last year alone, 2,000 Americans were studying in foreign medical schools because they could not gain entrance to a school in their own country.

The shortage of doctors is keenly felt in large metropolitan areas where the actual numbers of physicians have declined. For instance, in 1930, Chicago had more than 6,000 doctors practicing in the city, while today there are only about 4,000.

The consequences of doctor and facility shortages were pointed out in a frightening situation earlier this year when Cook County Hospital, in Chicago, the largest public hospital in the country, announced that admissions in all but emergency cases would be closed. An outbreak of winter illnesses, understaffing, and financial problems forced the hospital actually to close its doors during two critical periods.

Each Member of the Senate could undoubtedly point out numerous examples within his own State of how a lack of money, medical manpower, and facilities have resulted in less than adequate health care for our people. Each of these deficiencies, I would propose, stems from a lack of direction in health care and a lack of national resolve that these problems will be eliminated.

We owe to all those who have known the suffering of dread diseases a thorough and serious consideration of the difficulties facing our medical delivery system and the first vital step toward eliminating them.

I believe that the resolution providing for a national crash program on dread diseases is a necesary step. I would urge every Senator to recognize the duty that is ours and the tragic results of our continued inadequate action.

THE ROLE OF VOLUNTARY ASSOCIATIONS IN THE STRUGGLE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, human rights can be achieved only through the determination of many committed individuals. Throughout our history, we can see the fruits of intelligent organization. The women's rights and labor movements have shown skill in the use of grassroots communication with those people who need to get the message and who have the ultimate power of the vote.

That same set of tools are now necessary to educate many segments of America to the need for international human rights covenants. Some people feel a mistrust and fear that come from an easily aroused sense of insecurity over the possible impact of these treaties on American life.

One group of citizens in particular have contributed greatly to the never-ending drive for ratification of the human rights treaties. I speak today of the Ad Hoc Committee on Human Rights and Genocide Treaties. Based in New York City, with local organizations all over the country, the ad hoc committee is not concerned with perpetuating its existence long after a cause is won or lost. They are, rather, an intensely committed group of associations, banded together in this alliance for the specific purpose of using their tools of concern, determination, education, and motivation to put the case for the Genocide Convention and other pending Human Rights Conventions before the American people.

I ask unanimous consent that the names of the participating members of the Ad Hoc Committee on Human Rights and Genocide Treaties be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the names were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Member organizations: American Civil Liberties Union, American Ethical Union, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL–CIO, American Federation of Teachers, AFL–CIO, American Friends Service Committee, American Humanist Association, American Jewish Committee, American Jewish Congress, American Roumanian National Committee, American Veterans Committee, Americans for Democratic Action, B'nai B'rith, Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, AFL–CIO, The Episcopal Church, Farband, Labor Zionist Order, Friends Committee on National Legislation, General Board of Christian Social Concerns, the Methodist Church, Hadassah, the Women's Zionist Organization of America.

Industrial Union Department, AFL–CIO, International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, AFL–CIO, International Rescue Committee, International Union of Electrical Workers, AFL–CIO, Jewish Labor Committee, Jewish War Veterans, League for Industrial Democracy, National Association of Negro Business and Professional Women's Clubs, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, National Board, YWCA, National Catholic Conference for Interracial Justice, National Community Relations Advisory Council, National Conference of Christians and Jews, National Council of Jewish Women, National Spiritual Assembly of the Baha'is of the U.S.

Quaker UN Program, Retail, Wholesale and Department Union, AFL–CIO, Textile Workers Union of America, AFL–CIO, Ukrainian Congress Committee of America, Ukrainian National Association, Union of American Hebrew Congregations, Unitarian-Universalist Association, United Automobile Workers of America, AFL–CIO/United Church of Christ, United World Federalists, Women United for the United Nations Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Workers Defense League, Workmen's Circle, World Jewish Congress, American Section, Advisory Members: Catholic Association for International Peace, Conference of UN Representatives of the Council of Organizations, UNA–USA, National Council of the Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.

WHY DOES NOT THE PUBLIC KNOW?

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, in recent weeks there has been much talk about television and its use for political or partisan purposes.

Such talk has involved the questions of equal time, the fairness doctrine, the right to free time, the moral obligation to sell time, who shall answer the President, who shall speak for the political parties, and other related topics.

Mr. President, events of recent days prove that there is much justification in raising these issues, if the public's right to know is to be assured.

Because, unfortunately, the oldest medium and in some ways the most respected medium, and surely the medium that is most capable of giving us all the news, is not living up to its responsibilities.

I refer, of course, to the newspapers. And I do so most reluctantly. I believe wholeheartedly not only in the freedom of the press, but also in the right of the editor to exercise editorial judgment regarding what is news and what is not news.

Unfortunately, even those things in which we believe most strongly, even those things which we would not change if we could, can sometimes be abused.

I am convinced that the press, at least that segment of it that circulates in Washington, is abusing its rights.

It is doing so by presenting only one side of an argument.

A very important argument—one that involves winning the peace or alternatively, suing for peace at any price.

I am sure most informed residents of the Washington area are aware of the misnamed "end the war amendment," more commonly known as the McGovern-Hatfield amendment. I suspect that most of them know it is designed to force the President to withdraw all American troops from Vietnam before next July 1.

But what they probably do not know is that there is major opposition to this amendment; that many of those who are aware of it think it is ill-conceived; that it is in effect a retreat-and-surrender amendment; and it usurps the prerogatives of the Chief Executive. Some of us also think it could result in a massacre, not only of retreating American

troops, but also of hundreds of thousands of South Vietnamese, whose only crime is that they prefer even an imperfect form of democracy to the totalitarian communism practiced by the North Vietnamese.

Why does not the public know there is opposition to the McGovern-Hatfield amendment, both in this Chamber and outside?

The answer is simple. The media have blacked it out. There have been one or two remarks on radio, but so far as I can tell, there has been nothing on television and even less in the newspapers.

Yet, in the last 2 weeks this has happened: The Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, Mr. Donald Johnson, took exception to the McGovern-Hatfield amendment and those who support it. Not one word of that speech, made in Los Angeles, appeared in the newspapers or the television available to Washington area residents.

A few days later there was a colloquy on the floor of the Senate, during which the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), and other Senators took strong exception to the words of the Veterans' Administrator. Other Senators in the Chamber floor defended him. No word of that debate appeared in the newspapers.

Last Thursday the chairman of a group called "Tell It To Hanoi" held a press conference in Washington. He was flanked by close to 20 leaders of groups that support the President. His purpose was to announce the beginning of a major advertising campaign against the McGovern-Hatfield amendment. Again, not a word in the newspapers or on television, although stories about advertising by the McGovern-Hatfield forces have appeared in the papers.

Finally, on Friday, the junior Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE) held a news conference, at which he announced that he had prepared spots for television and had received free time from many television stations in which to reply to the spots prepared by the McGovern-Hatfield amendment supporters, spots which incidentally received good press and TV coverage.

Again, the press and local TV failed to mention the Senator from Kansas' news conference or to treat his spots as news.

Why?

Mr. President, can all of these events lack newsworthyness? Is opposition to the Hatfield-McGovern amendment not worthy of any mention on television or in the newspapers? I cannot believe that this is the case. If one side of any controversy deserves coverage, then surely both sides should be covered.

Then what is the answer? I cannot believe there is a conspiracy among the liberal reporters and editors of Washington. Although if I charged that that is the case, I might turn this speech into a news story.

But if there is not a conspiracy, what is there? Have all the editors and reporters in Washington who would ordinarily cover these events or bring them to the attention of the public decided that they are not newsworthy?

Or are they consciously and deliberately setting out to help adopt the McGovern-Hatfield amendment by blacking out the opposition to this ill-conceived piece of legislation? Are they afraid to give the people the facts and let them judge for themselves? Have they put theyselves in the business of propagandizing the people in order to attain their own selfish ends?

Mr. President, I do not have the answers to these questions. And if I had to depend on newspapers and on television, I would not even have the facts.

This, Mr. President, brings me back to my original remarks—the importance of insuring fairness in the licensed medium—television—since we cannot do it in the unlicensed medium—the press.

As we all know, the channels available to television are limited in number. They belong to all the people. That is why the people have a right to say how they shall be used. That is why the people have a right to demand that on television and radio all sides of major issues be presented and presented fairly.

That is why all the talk these days about the fairness doctrine, equal time, and similar subjects is so important. I believe it is up to all Members of Congress to make sure that the licensed information medium lives up to its responsibilities to be fair.

The fate of our Nation hinges on an informed electorate. We cannot force the press to keep us informed. We can see to it that radio and television live up to that responsibility.

THE FITZGERALD CASE: 260 DAYS AND STILL NO ACTION FROM THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on November 22, 1969, I wrote to the Justice Department requesting the Attorney General to investigate the intimidation and firing of A. Ernest Fitzgerald. Since that time, 260 days—more than 8 full months—have elapsed and still the Justice Department has taken no action on my request.

Six days after my initial request the Justice Department informed me that they had the case "under review." One month later, I was told that "when all available evidence is reviewed, a definite conclusion will be made as to whether the facts show a violation of the Federal criminal code." Mr. President, I still have not received word of any type of conclusion—definite or indefinite. In fact, I have not received any word at all.

When will the Justice Department act? When will they arrive at a definite conclusion in this case? The time for positive action is long overdue. I shall look forward to a decision by the Department on this case in the very near future.

PETER LISAGOR—EXCEPTIONAL NEWSMAN

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, this week's issue of Time magazine pays a much-deserved tribute to Peter Lisagor, chief of the Washington Bureau of the Chicago Daily News, calling him "the newspaper correspondent conceded by his colleagues to be Washington's all-round best" and "the most popular newsman in town."

Mr. President, having had Pete Lisagor later report accurately in his newspaper what I thought were just casual conversations, I can testify to his reportorial enterprise. Having often been the subject of his stories, I can vouch for his fairness even though it sometimes hurts. And having known him for several years, I can support Time's opinion of his popularity and well understand the reasons for it.

Mr. Lisagor is an exceptional newsman and an extraordinary human being. In order that Senators may come to know him better, I ask unanimous consent that the Time article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PRESS

Washington, D.C., is a city of hustlers and manipulators, full of pitfalls for the journalist, and covered by some of the most experienced reporters in the U.S. It stands to reason that the newspaper correspondent conceded by his colleagues to be Washington's all-round best would be cynical and a bit smug. He isn't. The Chicago *Daily News's* Peter Lisagor, 55, has made his mark by 20 years of hard work and humor, and if he has scooped every competitor and pulled every beard in the capital, he remains the most popular newsman in town.

Laughter is Lisagor's calling card. He has stepped on Khrushchev's foot, fallen asleep in the Taj Mahal and walked head-on into a lamppost (with bloody consequences) while recording the words of Lyndon Johnson. He tells terrible jokes and laughs so hard at them that everyone laughs with him. Still no member of the press corps makes the mistake of writing off "Old Pete" as a buffoon. They all laughed when he foiled security by slipping his rented car, crudely lettered State Department 1-A, into a key position in Krushchev's 1959 motorcade through Des Moines, but the joke was on them. It usually is.

WHISPERS WITH J.F.K.

The lighthearted Lisagor is admired as a great generalist in a field where specialists are taking over. As chief of the *News's* five-member bureau, he practices what he calls "horizontal" journalism—he and his reporters follow their stories wherever they lead rather than sticking to narrow beats, as they might at a large "vertical" bureau. Pete himself covers the White House, foreign policy, Washington politics and whatever captures his fancy. He is reputed to have the widest range of true friends in the Government's employ of any correspondent in D.C. L.B.J. has called him "brilliant." To the consternation of Lisagor's colleagues. John Kennedy used to call him aside for lengthy whispered consultations. J.F.K., a fellow sufferer, was actually asking about Pete's bad back. "I always told the other reporters it was a privileged conversation about Berlin or Cuba or the cold war," Lisagor recalls gleefully, "and that I couldn't divulge any part of it."

Lisagor modestly attributes his popularity to the fact that he works for a provincial paper. None of his sources, he claims, ever see what he writes. But being a "busher" in the bailiwick of the Eastern press giants has had its drawbacks. Lippmann or Reston could get a Cabinet member by phone, but Lisagor once waited weeks trying to see John Foster Dulles. He got an interview immediately when, on the strength of a New York *Times* Sunday Magazine assignment, he identified himself as Mr. Lisagor for the *Times*.

On another occasion, the wire services entirely ignored one of its scoops—the discovery that President Syngman Rhee had refused the offer of Indian troops at the height of the Korean War—until he leaked it to the New York *Herald Tribune*. By 1966, when he beat everyone with the first authentic account of the Jackie Kennedy-William Manchester squabble, A.P. and U.P.I. were finally paying attention.

RON'S BAD NEWS

Outside the profession, much of Lisagor's recognition and prestige is due to his appearances on television, which he pretends to disparage. "I belong to the dirty-fingernail set," he boasts. "Those who work with pencil and notebook, as opposed to the folk heroes on TV. I'm a working stiff, a shoe-leather man." He is embarrassed when little girls recognize him and ask for his autograph. Nevertheless, he does a weekly report for NET and is the most frequent guest journalist on NBC's *Meet the Press*, a program that displays Lisagor's most conspicuous talent: he is far and away the most skillful interrogator in the business. On TV, at press conferences, and at the now-famous breakfasts run by Godfrey Sperling of the *Christian Science Monitor*, he breaks through the reserve of official after official with the wit, insight and irreverence of his questions.

"After a year," he asked an evasive Daniel P. Moynihan, "how does it feel to be the house liberal?" Lisagor had used the approach before. "If you were Secretary of State," he asked Johnson Adviser McGeorge Bundy several years ago, "would you want a McGeorge Bundy in the White House?" And when Nixon Press Secretary Ron Ziegler began a song and dance about how General Lewis Hershey had not actually been canned as Selective Service director but promoted to a higher advisory post, Lisagor stopped the nonsense and broke up the house by asking quietly: "How did he take the bad news, Ron?"

SHORN OF BRITCHES

Those fortunate enough to catch Lisagor in print (his features and weekend columns are syndicated in 90 cities but seldom appear in D.C. or New York) find Pete hanging on no ideological peg. An apolitical anomaly in a highly partisan town, he is praised by Bill Buckley's *National Review* and is quoted by the liberal *New Republic*. "An old editor once told me to walk down the middle of the street and shoot windows out on both sides," he says. "I guess that's about what I try to do." He will agonize for hours over his lead. One colorful effort dramatized L.B.J.'s technique of silencing the G.O.P. by stealing its issues: "There is no other word for it—the Republicans have been held up in broad daylight by a daring political desperado from Texas, Lyndon B. Johnson has shorn them of their britches, in the patois of the Pedernales."

Pete Lisagor's "plain folks" pose is an honest one. He was a 14-year-old orphan when he went to Chicago from the West Virginia coal fields in 1930. He played pro baseball "for $65 a month and hamburgers" in Iowa, until he saved enough money to go to the University of Michigan. With time out for the Army and a Nieman Fellowship at Harvard, he has worked for the *News* almost continually since 1939. In Washington, Old Pete never flaunts his unique eminence, but he obviously enjoys it. When a friend called to ask if a big story had been leaked to him—he had a 24-hour beat on it—he chuckled comfortably and replied: "They don't leak stories to me. I'm just a barefoot boy from over the mountains."

DAN A. KIMBALL

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, this past week America suffered the loss of one of her finest sons, Dan A. Kimball. Dan Kimball died after a full life devoted to his country, and we are the richer for his having been with us these 74 years.

Dan Kimball was born in the Midwest, but was a Californian since childhood, so our State has suffered a special loss in his passing. Dan was a friend to many of us in this Chamber, including myself. He also was a fierce fighter for that in which he believed and his contributions to our Nation's safety as Secretary of the Navy and head of Aerojet-General Corp. were manifold.

About an hour and a half after Dan passed away, a thunderstorm came up rather quickly near the home of one who had known him since childhood, and the remark was made, "there goes Mr. Kimball—fighting his way into heaven." That is the way it was with Dan. This almost involuntary statement was not made in a facetious or disrespectful way. To the contrary, the one who said it did so with tears in his eyes. What was deeply felt was that Dan Kimball would wrestle the Devil and St. Peter both if necessary to accomplish a goal that was right. He was that kind of man.

Dan Kimball stood six-foot-three and weighed more than 200 pounds, but in the hearts of those who knew him he was much bigger. He worked hard for his country with mind and heart and he was very active in the politics of California. Dan and I were on opposite sides of the political fence, but he never fought a political battle in any way other than by the rules of fairness and mutual respect.

Mr. President, we of the Senate, the people of California, and our Nation have lost one of our champions. We have lost a kind friend. We shall miss Dan Kimball, but we are grateful for having been able to walk part of life's way with him.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article published in the Los Angeles Times of July 31, 1970, which details some of the highlights of the career of Dan Kimball, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DAN KIMBALL DIES; EX-NAVY SECRETARY

WASHINGTON.—Dan A. Kimball, 74, former Secretary of the Navy and retired industrialist, died Thursday at Georgetown University Hospital.

Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird said Mr. Kimball's death "marks the loss of an outstanding American.

"His term as secretary of the Navy was marked by significant accomplishments in the maintenance of a strong naval force for this country's defense. His devotion to country and tireless efforts in behalf of it extended beyond his years of government and beyond his activities in defense matters" Laird said in a statement.

Mr. Kimball was a retired president and chairman of Aerojet-General Corp. The company's headquarters in Azusa, Calif., announced his death.

A spokesman for the hospital said Mr. Kimball was admitted Sunday with internal bleeding. The exact cause of death was not determined.

Mr. Kimball was Navy secretary from July, 1951, to January, 1953, under President Truman. He had previously served as assistant secretary and undersecretary of the Navy.

Mr. Kimball had been a long-time manager of western interests of General Tire & Rubber Co., Aerojet's parent company. He retired from Aerojet about a year ago after being "one of the company's leading lights for about a half-century," a spokesman said.

As head of the Aerojet Engineering Corp. for many years, he played a leading part in development of rocket engines for the giant diversified firm.

Mr. Kimball, a high school dropout, was a World War I Army pilot.

Mr. Kimball was a noted philanthropist and was active in California Democratic Party circles for years.

He was born in St. Louis, March 1, 1896, to a pioneer family in the Mississippi-Missouri river valleys.

He left St. Louis public schools to work fulltime and completed his education through correspondence courses.

Mr. Kimball had been a California resident since about 1917 except for time spent in Washington. He served several years ago as a member of the State College Board of Trustees.

EQUAL RIGHTS FOR WOMEN—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TOWER

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I had expected to be in St. Louis, Mo., today to address the convention of the American Bar Association on the subject of equal rights for women. I felt it necessary, however, to cancel that scheduled appearance because of the activity here on the military procurement bill. Since I did not have the opportunity to present my address personally to the American Bar Association, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks I had prepared for delivery there be printed instead in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH BEFORE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION IN ST. LOUIS

THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

(By Senator John Tower)

It is widely thought today among various disaffected elements in our society that our system of government by law and ordered change is not sufficient to meet the challenge of providing social justice for all Americans and that this situation calls for the use of violence to destroy that system. I firmly believe that such a philosophy is not soundly based, and that our system *can* absorb the changing values of the American culture and intellect within reasonable periods of time, at the same time preserving the basic stability and order that are requisite for individuals to function in society in a positive and meaningful manner. I will discuss one such change today which is currently proceeding through the established mechanisms of our governmental system, and, by comparison with similar changes in the past, argue that, if given adequate time and a solid basis in our current cultural and intellectual milieu, such a social change can and will be brought about in an orderly manner.

I refer, of course, to the growing movement for "women's liberation" as embodied in the legal concept of a Constitutional Amendment for Equal Rights. This Amendment, currently in the Senate Judiciary Committee, states that:

Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. Congress and the several states shall have the power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation.

As lawyers, you realize, of course, that the explicit nature of this Amendment is not

actually necessary, since the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments could easily be construed by the Supreme Court to cover state and federal discrimination on the basis of sex. However, this Amendment *can* serve as a source of momentum for the Supreme Court and the lower courts to actually so extend the Fifth and Fourteenth Amendments, should they see fit at a date earlier than the eventual passage and ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment.

The aspect of this Amendment and the "women's liberation" movement that I would especially like to comment on today is that of historical perspective. I believe that the expansion of educational and economic opportunity for women, along with the corresponding assumption of full civil duties and obligation, is a necessary and desirable step in the further extension of the full rights and privileges of citizenship in the United States. At the same time, I would caution that this expansion is, and should be, a dynamic process, based on gradual changes in values of the bulk of the American people and, as such, cannot be suddenly effected simply through amending the Constitution.

The cultural concept of greater equality for women has been developing gradually over the last hundred years, marked fifty years ago by the major legal change in suffrage accomplished by the Nineteenth Amendment. More minor liberalizations of laws, federal and state, have been occurring in the meantime, gradually wearing away the concept of distinction in the rights and privileges of men and women. Greater education and widespread communications facilities have also helped erode the rigid role of women as purely homemakers and child-raisers.

This dynamic social process will ultimately bring about the adoption of an Equal Rights Amendment or a comparable Supreme Court decision, but this will be more of a result of changing cultural values than a cause of this change. Adoption of an Equal Rights Amendment will be a historical marker of sorts and will formally state society's recognition of the full citizenship and rights of women. Yet the important social concepts on which an Amendment will be based will be standing on their own merits, independent of the Amendment. Moreover, they will continue to progress on their own merits.

The nature of the evolution of our Constitutional and common law concepts as the result of the continuing process of cultural and intellectual change is an obvious fact. Yet it may be worthwhile to review some of our history in this regard to put the current women's rights movement in proper perspective.

Let us go back to the *Magna Carta* for a moment. In 1215, the major social concerns of the English people were probably their religion and their property rights.

Hence it is not surprising that the great document that we count as one of the origins of our own Constitutional concepts was primarily concerned with freeing the Church from the King and with clarifying certain property rights of the nobility. The Charter had detailed provisions for the passage of the property at death, the financial obligations of nobles to the King, creditor's rights, the obligations of tenancy, and so on.

But a few sections of the Charter were of deeper significance and initiated the modern tradition of setting down in a declarative document the personal and procedural rights of the people against their government.

One provision signaled the beginning of the English concept of representative government:

No scutage nor aid shall be imposed on our Kingdom, unless by common counsel of our Kingdom. . . .

Various elements of our own Bill of Rights will be recognized in other Magna Carta provisions:

No constable or other bailiff of ours shall requisition corn or other supplies from anyone without immediately paying money therefor, unless the seller voluntarily consents to deferred payment.

No sheriff or bailiff of ours shall take the horses or carts of any freeman for transport duty, against the will of said freeman.

But the Great Charter went deeper than these provisions and is the document it is today because of this one provision:

No freeman shall be taken or imprisoned or desseised or exiled or in any way destroyed, nor will we go upon him nor send upon him, *except by the lawful judgment of his peers and by the law of the land.*

"Except by the lawful judgment of his peers and by the law of the land." I don't think we are overstating the case to say that this is probably the most important and potent phrase in the history of Western civilization. Closely related to its long history of progressively stronger implementation is the development of the great democracies of the world. However, in 1215, this clause did not have nearly the substantive content we ascribe to it today. And, in 1215, this "rule by law" really extended only to the freemen, who were all those above the status of villein. It was not a concept of "people's rights" as we know it today.

However, English intellectual and cultural progress were on the move as Europe progressed out of the Dark Ages, and both the content and application of the clause expanded in conjunction with the growth of a more powerful Parliament, a more competent judicial system, and a profession of law. Over a period of three hundred years, all Englishmen became freemen, and the substance of due process was built up gradually through case law.

We picked up the due process clause in our Constitution over five hundred years later, but even at that late date we had not progressed so far as to extend major personal rights to a whole class of our people, the slaves. Yet we have continuously expanded the meaning and application of this clause and our other Bill of Rights guarantees through the orderly processes of Constitutional amendments, legislation, and case law, to create and protect what we now consider fundamental personal rights for all of our citizens. Who can say that violence is justified as a political tool when the existing system so faithfully and consistently incorporates the changing and increasingly humanitarian values of society into its legal framework without any need for disorder or bloodshed? Changing the laws and policies of our government is a matter of patience and persistent work, not of violence and disorder.

The women's rights movement is at such an advanced level in the general establishment of fundamental rights that it is of minor significance when considered in the context of history and the establishment of major personal rights over the last eight or nine hundred years. American women today have all the major personal rights that were hammered out with great difficulty and sacrifice for all of these hundreds of years, as our political heritage shifted from the rule of man to the rule of law. It is a great tribute to the flexibility and adaptability of our system of government that today we can turn peacefully to the process of fine-tuning our rights and privileges to allow everyone to have a more equal opportunity for educational and economic advantages in our country.

Primary personal legal rights have been largely secured: we are now talking about a relatively minor adjustment in our legal structure to allow better access to schools and jobs for women.

Hence I refer to the need for a little historical perspective in this drive for women's rights. Massive changes in human rights have been going on for hundreds of years, and this latest of human rights movements is actually an outgrowth of the general cultural change in the role of women which has occurred over the last hundred years. Their full access to educational and economic opportunities will come about, largely in this decade, as a result of their process. The feeling that appears to possess some in this movement, as well as other people in other movements, is that there should be instantaneous access to a right or a privilege the moment that a group of people intellectually determine that it should be so. Now, they may very well be right on the merits of the case, as women are at this time, but the bulk of the American people need to appreciate the need for a given type of social reform before it can feasibly be accomplished. Our country is realizing the legitimacy of the claims to fuller women's rights, and the political processes will respond with appropriate action when our culture is sufficiently infused with this new value. This would not appear to be far away, but, as I have been trying to indicate, there is bound to be some time lag between the germination of a concept like this and its acceptance by the bulk of the people—those who will have to accept it before it become institutionalized. I think that if the advocates of human rights causes realise this fact fully, they will be more patient and understanding with the political processes by which we assimilate these cultural changes into our legal system. Women, so far, have generally followed the legal route to reform; I only wish that others bent on reform could similarly appreciate the great value of our system.

But, to turn from history to the more immediately pressing concerns of the women's rights movement, we are effectively talking about legislation under the aegis of the interstate commerce clause.

One of the most significant laws passed in recent years relating to the position of women in the labor force is the Equal Pay Act of 1963, amending the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. It specifically prohibits the employer from discrimination on the basis of sex in payment of wages for equal work on equal jobs in similar working conditions. In 1964, an even more important law dealing with equal employment opportunity was passed—the Civil Rights Act of 1964. Title VII of that Act prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in private employment by industries engaged in interstate commerce. This measure also applies to labor organizations and employment agencies. The Federal Government, through an Executive Order, acted to ban discrimination on the basis of sex in its own employment, employment on federally-assisted construction and employment by Federal contractors and subcontractors. In addition to such federal laws, there are numerous state and local laws banning discrimination by sex. Thirty-five states have enacted equal pay laws; sixteen have adopted fair labor employment laws which specifically relate to women. On paper, these laws appear to give ample guarantee that a woman with the same qualifications as a man will be considered equally with that man for a particular position, will probably receive the same pay as that man would in that job, and would have initially the same chance for advancement.

Now let's look at the facts in this area vital to economic livelihood. There are 31 million women in America's labor force—or 38% of the total number of workers.

This represents an increase during the last few decades and, therefore, a fuller use of our nation's labor potential.

Women over sixteen are concentrated in the field of clerical work. In fact, this constitutes about 34% of the women's working force. Since this field is commonly grouped with white collar jobs, and since white collar work often is more remunerative than blue collar work, the large number of women clerical workers would appear to be in a good economic position. However, the median wage of full-time, year-round workers who are women was $4,789 in 1968, while men in this field were earning $7,351.

Unfortunately, the situation is not improving over time despite the enactment of legislation like the Equal Pay Act and the Civil Rights Act specifically relating to sex discrimination in employment. In 1955 the median salary of full-time, year-round workers was $2,719 for women and $4,252 for men. Women were then receiving 63.9% of what men were earning. In 1968, the median salary for women increased in real terms to $4,457; however, that of men had reached $7,664. In other words, women in 1968 received only 58.2% of what men were earning, speaking in terms of median wage.

One traditional and important job field for women in past years has been teaching; it seems somewhat easier to combine this career with family life. Even here, however, there appears to be bias. The National Education Association found that in 1965–66 the median wage of women who were members of teaching staffs in colleges was less than that of men on all professional levels. In fact, women who were full professors had a median annual salary of $11,649 and men, $12,768.

In overall occupational patterns, the position of women in the labor force has deteriorated in recent years. Since the period before World War II, women have become increasingly concentrated in service trades and clerical work; however, their position in professional and technical work areas has become worse over the years—in fact, it dropped from 45% in 1940 to 38% in 1968. If there were a substantial rationale for such differences in occupations and salary levels, there might be some justification for the existing situation. Instead, more education and more freedom from homemaking tasks indicate the position of women in the labor force should have improved over time.

Also, women have tended to show up as well or better than men in time-on-the-job studies, and their turnover rates are comparable to men's. In fact, women show less tendency to leave jobs as they acquire higher responsibility.

In another important field, we also find evidence which tends to show a biased treatment of the female—education.

Education is a major key to individual success in our society besides being vital to our technological, sociological and psychological progress as a nation. Hearings before the House Special Subcommittee on Education last month indicated that higher levels of previous achievement are required of women in order to gain admission to a college or university. In fact, many schools admit fixed proportions of men and women each year—in favor of men.

The courts have not been of much assistance in solving the discrimination problem in either labor or education. Women's work rights have generally not been considered to be covered under the "equal protection" clause. In *Muller* v. *Oregon*, a leading 1908 Supreme Court case, the Court upheld a limitation on the number of hours a woman could work in a bakery, declaring that sex was a valid basis of classification. Not until passage of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 was this doctrine seriously challenged; however, the EEOC, which has the authority to enforce Title VII of the Act, has not been very successful to date in winning court cases which it has initiated in response to specific complaints. Only recently has the Supreme Court agreed to hear a Title VII case.

The situation is similar in the field of college admissions. As recently as ten years ago, the Supreme Court declined to hear a case in which the Texas Court of Civil Appeals had upheld the exclusion of women from a state college, Texas A&M.

Thus, in labor and education, which are vehicles to economic advancement in our nation, women do not yet have full opportunity—and this inequality has a great deal to do with their sex, rather than their ability and intelligence. Unfortunately, in their civil and political roles also men and women often receive different treatment—a treatment incongruous with the stage of sophistication and civilization achieved by our society. There are still four states which require court approval, sometimes in conjunction with the consent of the husbands, before a woman can go into independent business. In most states, women now serve on juries; however, until 1966, three states would not even allow women to serve on juries. Even today some twenty states and the District of Columbia treat women differently as jurors than men.

Some of this discrimination will no doubt be eliminated by further legislation and more aggressive court action, as the concept of full rights and responsibilities for women continues to gain acceptance in our cultural value system. At the same time, the support for the Amendment will continue to increase and the likelihood of its ultimate passage and ratification within the reasonably near future will improve correspondingly.

It is true that the Equal Rights Amendment may remove some privileges which women previously enjoyed, such as the institution of alimony and ineligibility for the draft. Yet women today seem to be ready to leave behind the special privileges of the past for full economic opportunity in the future and for the sense of pride and integrity that will accompany it. Our system of popular government and its provisions for orderly change will assure them that they will have their full rights in the not too distant future.

This is the strength of our democratic system, and it is because of this strength that there is no need for violent efforts toward change. Some patience is required to allow the system to change. But the system *will* change. It will meet social equality needs, as soon as the majority of the populace realize the need, practice equality and fairness in their personal lives and support legislators and administrators who are willing to seek equality.

In the example of women's rights, I have shown that there is definite room for improvement. The Constitutional amendment to which I earlier referred focuses upon improvement and that is why I am a cosponsor of the resolution calling for the amendment. The resolution will be effective even if it should not achieve Constitutional status because it focuses public attention on existing inequality, and thus encourages more equality in the practical application of our existing Constitutional guarantees,

Change is continually evolving in a nonviolent and responsible manner in our society. As lawyers, you all play a significant role in this evolutionary process. I compliment the legal community on its responsible activities in this regard and implore you to continue to approach social change with determination tempered with reason.

THE ECONOMIC CRISIS FACING THE TEXTILE INDUSTRY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Mr. John K. Cauthen, executive director of the South Carolina Textile Manufacturer's Association, recently testified before a committee of the South Carolina General Assembly.

A report on his testimony written by staff writer Frank Adams, and published in the State newspaper, Columbia, S.C., on July 30, 1970, clearly indicates the crisis the textile industry is facing.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMITTEE HEARS GLOOMY REPORT FROM TEXTILE INDUSTRY

(By Frank Adams)

"We are facing economic disaster in South Carolina if the textile industry continues to decline," John K. Cauthen told a committee Wednesday formed by the South Carolina General Assembly to study the state's textile industry.

The committee was formulated earlier this year in an attempt to alleviate pressing problems of South Carolina's textile industry which has been hit very hard by rising foreign imports into the country.

Bernard F. Burtland, Director of Communications of the Greenville-based Phillips Fibers, told the committee imports of foreign man-made fibers have risen 300 per cent during the first five months of 1970 compared to the identical period in 1969.

"My business is being hurt and hurt badly." Phillips Fibers president and committee member Al J. Head said.

Committee chairman Sen. John D. Long III said the committee was taking a "double-barreled" approach to the mounting textile imports.

While hoping for passage of the Mills bill which will impose textile import quotas, the committee will seek a personal audience with President Richard M. Nixon.

The bill currently faces difficulties as Nixon was vowed to veto the bill because measures for leather import quotas are imposed in addition to textile import quotas. Long said he added that the textile industry lacked the strength in Congress to assure passage of the bill and accepted leather support in hopes of acquiring the necessary votes.

The committee had communicated its desire to meet with Nixon to members of the state's Congressional delegation.

Sen. Strom Thurmond replied that Nixon could not meet with every delegation supporting textile quota restrictions. Thurmond said that the information had been passed to the White House.

Long said the committee is the only one authorized by a state legislature and that Nixon would meet with it if he knew that the committee was formulated to protect the interests of the people of South Carolina.

The committee desires the meeting with the President so that they can document the downward turn of the state's textile industries and the effects upon South Carolina's economy.

"The responsibility of this committee lies not only with textile manufacturers but with the people of South Carolina as the very economy of the state is at stake," committee member Rep. T. W. Edwards Jr. explained.

Edwards said the decline of textiles will be felt not only by the industry but also by the citizens of South Carolina. Every state agency would be affected if taxes from the textile industry were to be reduced, according to Edwards.

"We need to show the President the people and the economy side of this situation, not just the dollars-and-cents side," Edwards said.

Cauthen told the committee that 7,000 workers have joined the state's unemployment rolls this year because of the "disas-

trous" effect foreign textile imports have had on the state's economy. "More and more, gloom is spreading in the textile communities."

Cauthen said he could remember the arrival of the textile industry in the South from New England. "It is not hard to conjecture the move of the textile industry from this country."

Long said that the United States lost a splendid * * * the Japanese to accept voluntary textile quotas. "We gave them Okinawa and asked for nothing in return."

"We must somehow get the ear of the President and ask for temporary limitations applying only to textiles. President Nixon has every legal basis to exercise his emergency powers. His executive action would extricate himself from a political mess because he would grant textiles relief and would not be forced to offend the leather industry by his veto," Long said.

The committee will seek to obtain an audience with the President and voted unanimously to send telegrams to Thurmond and Presidential Counsellor Harry S. Dent seeking their help.

During the meeting three members of the committee telephoned presidential assistant Niles Jackson. Jackson told them they should contact Dent.

Cauthen told the committee that time is essential as textile profits in the state have declined to practically nothing. Many firms have curtailed operations from a six-day basis to a five-day work-week which means that the workers lose 12 hours (with overtime) each week.

These measures result in less state revenues, less construction, less money spent in the state and less money for workers, Edwards said.

South Carolina's present situation was compared to West Virginia, which when faced with the collapse of its coal industry, fell into immediate economic decline. Cauthen said that the federal government is now pouring money into the region through its Appalachian Program. "South Carolina may require an Appalachian Program for itself if the textile industry continues to decline," Cauthen said.

At the next meeting textile manufacturers will be invited to testify about their troubles. Also invited will be representatives from the state unemployment agency and tax agency.

ACTIVITIES OF SUCCESSFUL BUSINESSMEN WHO SEEK TO SAVE OUR COUNTRY

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, Mr. William H. Jones, a Washington Post staff writer, has written an excellent article on the activities of successful businessmen who are seeking to save our country, especially our private enterprise system, from the disaster threatened by the war in Asia.

Led by the energetic and dedicated Harold Willens, of California, these businessmen are taking their civic duties seriously, and all of us should encourage them in their efforts.

Mr. Willens and Henry E. Niles, of Baltimore, are devoting their time and efforts to help to get our country back on a course of commonsense.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Businessman Opens Doors To Sell 'Peace' Candidates," published in the Washington Post of Sunday, August 9, 1970, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSINESSMAN OPENS DOORS TO SELL "PEACE" CANDIDATES

(By William H. Jones)

If, in the next few weeks, your mail brings a request for cash contributions to the campaigns of 8 or 10 U.S. Senators who oppose the war in Vietnam, your correspondent is likely to be California businessman Harold Willens

Willens has created a "Task Force/Peace Chest" designed to concentrate on keeping the anti-war spokesmen in the Senate. "This is no year," says Willens, "to pour money and energy into contests between two good men, either of whom would effectively carry the peace banner. At a time like this, it matters little that one good anti-war candidate may be slightly more 'pure' than the other."

This Willens venture, backed as well by a number of California businessmen, is only the newest facet of Willens' long campaign to change the attitudes of the American business structure on the issues of war and peace.

Willens' list of candidates for election or re-election to the Senate includes Quentin Burdick, N.D.; Rev. Joseph Duffy, Conn.; Albert Gore, Tenn.; Phil Hart, Mich.; Vance Hartke, Ind.; Phil Hoff, Vt.; Joe Josephson and Wendell P. Kay, Ala.; Frank Moss, Utah; Adlai Stevenson III, Ill.; John Tunney, Calif.; Harrison Williams, N.J., and Joseph Montoya, N.M.

Says Willens: "One of our last hopes is the business community . . . the odds are long . . . we have no choice but to try."

A resident of Los Angeles, a Marine captain during World War II and a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of the University of California, Willens has made it as a businessman on two fronts: he has been president, since 1949, of Factory Equipment Supply Corp., Los Angeles, and is an owner-developer of commercial property in Southern California along Wilshire Boulevard. He had invested in the property before going to war and Wilshire subsequently became one of Los Angeles' main thoroughfares.

Since 1967, however, Willens has had little time for his business interests. His whole life now is devoted—he candidly admits he can afford such devotion—to ending the war in Vietnam, preventing future Vietnams, and trying to convince top business executives that they have a responsibility to speak their minds in opposition to government war policies.

Willens describes himself as "the old pro" among businessmen, speaking publicly "first against the Vietnam war and then against the American militarism which guarantees other Vietnams."

With Henry E. Niles, former board chairman of the Baltimore Life Insurance Co., Willens founded in the 1967 the group, Business Executives Move for Vietnam Peace (BEM).

As Willens describes it, BEM saw the Vietnam war in "its true light: a mistake of historical magnitude, a military blunder and political scandal, as damaging to the economy as it was proving to be to our international standing. We decided not to leave protest to the pickets."

An additional organization was formed in 1969 because "it was plain that additional and longer-range programs to arrest American militarism were needed," says Willens. It was called Businessmen's Educational Fund (BEF) and Willens is now its chairman.

At the core of the businessmen's educational effort is the view that a whole new idea of corporate responsibility needs to be established; through this new channel of business activity, company executives should strive for "more relevant" national policies and priorities, he says.

Willens believes a truly responsible American business leader must "crash the facade of corporate cowardice" and introduce "free-swinging self-honesty into the political scene . . . businessmen can't hide inside the economy."

"Corporate responsibility is not a public relations game any more," he continues. "It must become a social creature." In the past, he notes, businessmen embraced corporate responsibility "only when the company's welfare seemed threatened by aroused public opinion."

Even now, Willens calls out to the practical sense of businessmen in urging them to take part in the debates over war and national priorities. No businessman would continue operations in the wake of a failure in his firm similar to the national failure in Southeast Asia, he says; no businessman wants "erosion" of the Bill of Rights or "Rebellion in the Cities"; the next generation is "taking careful note" of what business does and what it doesn't do.

The warning is clear: either businessmen change their ways or the disaffection of young people will ultimately spell doom for their companies.

"These sober young people," Willens wrote recently, "are not to be dismissed as innocent idealists. On the contrary, they see clearly what their elders do not, that inaction is itself a form of action, and that silence in the face of enormities amounts to tacit approval."

The Willens idea of corporate responsibility, however, is not a widely accepted concept. Critics of mixing business and social responsibility have argued that in a free enterprise atmosphere it's only wishful thinking to try for goals other than those related to improving shareholders' profits.

Said Kurt Bloch, associate editor of Barron's, the business weekly published by Dow Jones & Co., Inc., in a recent exchange with Willens: "Most businessmen, we suspect, simply are not capable of being both 'socially responsible' and 'capable managers.'"

Willens had submitted an essay on his "corporate responsibility" theory, but Bloch replied that Barron's "will not be responsible for spreading the message of BEM . . . social responsibility clearly demands that he who favors to practice it, analyze the results of what action he favors, i.e., distinguish between purposes and consequences. I fail to see that you or BEM live up to that responsibility."

Throughout the world of big business Willens and his associates in BEM and BEF have hit similar stone walls of public opposition (or indifference), although Willens claims that in private many of the nation's leading corporate executives despise what America has done in Southeast Asia and want to reorder national priorities. Some big businessmen, Willens adds, secretly have been giving funds to support his groups.

Businessmen avoid involvement on the "truly momentous issues of our day," Willens says, for several reasons: (1) a "lack of practice in speaking out boldly on matters that do not directly affect one's business"; (2) stockholders or customers might be offended; (3) the "chronic American aversion" to boat-rocking; (4) fear of what will be said in the locker room at the club.

"Perhaps it was foolish for a few worried businessmen to believe that something significant could be done toward turning the country around," Willens says. "But I think that the failure rests far less in holding to such a conviction than in a failure of nerve on the part of businessmen."

Until several months ago, Willens lamented the fact that not one chief executive of any corporation among Fortune magazine's top-listed American firms had spoken out publicly against the war. "It is, in all candor, a record of failure," said Willens.

BEF and BEM membership includes prominent businessmen, to be sure, but they are with relatively small concerns—such as Gordon B. Sherman, president of Midas International Corp.; Alfred P. Slaner, president of Kayser-Roth Corp.; Max Palevsky, president of Xerox Data Systems, Inc. and Joseph E. McDowell, board chairman of Servomatron Corp.

But just as Willens was looking back on the three years "since I shifted my money-earning activities into neutral and went into the anti-war business; a kind of anniversary," some blue chip ice was broken by the board chairman of the Bank of America, No. 1 on Fortune's list of the biggest 50 commercial banks.

In testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on April 25, Louis B. Lundborg said that regardless of who was responsible for the Vietnam war, "the rest of us have gone along pretty supinely. . . . If anyone is to blame, it is people like me for not speaking up and not speaking out sooner—for not asking, 'What goes on here?'"

Said Willens: "We have been waiting a long time for Mr. Lundborg and his colleagues in the top tier of the corporate hierarchy to speak out." It wasn't long before a handful of giant company executives followed with their first public statements of war opposition.

In early June, Thomas J. Watson Jr., board chairman of International Business Machines Corp., told the Foreign Relations Committee that Vietnam presented the "major obstacle" to the nation's economic health and had threatened "irreparable" damage to the country's social fabric.

Some 48 hours later Charles B. McCoy, president of E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co., Inc., told an industry meeting that the war "is tearing at the whole fabric of our social and political and economic life . . . Major domestic needs are not getting the attention they should have . . ."

Willens has found these public statements, and such events as the recent gathering on Capitol Hill of corporate officers to lobby against the war, as slight rays of hope. "How do we know how many Lundborgs there are?" he asked recently.

To find out, the BEF is continuing its drive to expand membership and raise funds. From an original 15 members (who put up a minimum of $25,000 each) the BEF has grown to more than 400 (all must contribute $100 or more).

Willens nurtures the hope that President Nixon will take into consideration the growing outspokenness of American businessmen on the war issue, and the potential of an executive suite revolt of proportions similar to what's happened on college campuses.

At the same time, Willens and his colleagues appear to be resigned to a belief that such a corporate uprising is not a realistic goal.

NO ONE CAN EVER WIN

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, one of the most perceptive articles of our generation was published last Thursday in the Boston Globe. Written by Mrs. Marian Cannon Schlesinger, and entitled "A 1945 Memory—and the Lesson," it defines with clarity and poignancy the central fact and lesson of our age.

We have lived so long with nuclear threats and theories that most of us have almost forgotten how we felt when it all began. It does us good, sometimes, to recall that simpler age when, no matter what happened, we could say "life must go on"—and we knew it would.

Nuclear power, as Mrs. Schlesinger points out, has changed all that. We are now responsible not only for our own lives, but for the lives of all mankind. Our science and our technology have forced us to face the central fact of maturity—that in our relations with other people there is no winning or losing in any absolute sense. The "victor" must heed the needs of the vanquished; the strong must help the weak.

Nuclear power, if we can refrain from using it for self-destruction, may yet lead us into a new and more relevant morality. That is the central theme of this thoughtful article. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A 1945 MEMORY—AND THE LESSON

(By Marian Cannon Schlesinger)

It was one of those deceptively soft, warm days in August in New Hampshire, when it seemed as through summer might go on forever in spite of the warning signs: wispy fog in the valley in the early morning, the sumac slightly reddened, and the rash of goldenrod already beginning to spread across the fields and along the stone walls.

I can remember the feeling of the pine needles under my bare feet as I walked to the mail box, hoping for a letter from Europe. It had rained the night before and it was damp under the pines that lined the road. There was a smell of freshly washed leaves and grass in the air, which was utterly still, except for the hum of bumblebees in a patch of blackberry bushes.

I remember it so vividly, I suppose, because it was the last time I would ever see or feel it like that again for a long time if, indeed, ever again. For, in the New York Herald-Tribune, in screaming headlines, was announced the dropping of the atomic bomb on Hiroshima.

One read it in dazzled, uncomprehending wonder at the magnitude of the scientific daring and accomplishment, in sickening horror at the enormity of the slaughter, and relief at the shortening of the agonizing war, and then slowly, like the great expanding mushroom of the bomb itself, one was flooded with the realization that one's life and everything one cared about on earth had changed irrevocably and forever.

In that searing flash, the past, the present and the future were revealed as in a dream and one knew that the world had been totally transformed. For, in the hands of man were the tools, not only of his own total destruction, but of all living things and matter as well as the planet itself.

I can remember being overwhelmed by a sense of bottomless desolation, of incredible intensity and poignancy. With the dropping of the bomb, history was rendered meaningless; all art and literature, all human learning, all that enhanced our lives, nature itself, were as dust and ashes. For history and human culture are premised on the simple, fundamental fact that man goes on living without fear of absolute extermination.

One realized in a single nightmarish moment how fragile were all the assumptions by which one lived; the inevitability of the seasons, the flight of birds in spring, the turning of leaves in autumn, even the blades of grass poking up between the cracks in a city sidewalk in the heat of summer, all the signs by which we mark off the days and years of our lives; above all, the presumption of perpetual life on earth no matter how we misused and abused the gifts of nature. We took it for granted that it would go on forever. And now man and his institutions were exposed in all their profound vulnerability and mortality.

Suddenly we were no safer than a colony of ants under the shadow of a giant hobnailed boot which could crush and annihilate us at any moment. And like the ants, programed by nature to go through certain unchanging motions, we too were pursuing the age old patterns of human activity in the context of expectations which no longer existed. For the past had become irrelevant, human knowledge pointless, human striving ridiculous. The unknown is known, and all is desolation!

Such were the thoughts which overwhelmed one's mind. We knew then that we were alive only on sufferance. Those of us who experienced the first awful insight lived with it at the top of our consciousness for a long time. We were obsessed and could think of nothing else. But no one could exist at such an unbearable pitch and after a time we chose to muffle the fact in our day to day discourse, slowly papering it over, encapsulating it in some secret recess of our subconscious. People seldom speak of atomic holocaust today, but it is THE BASIC FACT of our age.

I think it is the reason why youth today feels the futility of learning, the hopelessness of art, the transience of human relationships.

They have never lived in a world in which absolute doom has not been an ever possible fate. And they sense as well as their elders that all that has gone before is in final essence, meaningless, as a guide to their lives.

They know how implausible the concept of limited war, is like children playing toy soldiers in a grown-up world totally menaced by hydrogen bombs. All the wornout 19th century shibboleths by which the nations of the world have been carrying on their mutual affairs of war and peace in these last decades ludicrous in the face of this appalling incubus. The old power alignments and the old power thinking are archaic when tomorrow we could blow the world to bits and in the process be blown to bits ourselves. No one ever wins in an atomic world!

Is this not the lesson and the opportunity of the late 20th Century? Is this not the moment for men to put away childish things, stop playing childish games and move beyond adolescence into adulthood? For truly mature people know and accept the truth that no one, in the larger sense, can indeed ever win. It does not mean that one is necessarily immobilized as a result. One is, in fact, freed by the knowledge. For winning is a childish concept, best restricted to games and footraces.

Perhaps we are being propelled willy-nilly by the horror of the atomic threat into a new adulthood and collective responsibility which nothing else in the history of this fated planet could have brought to pass. Perhaps, but the signs are not encouraging! If not, we will no doubt be just another burned out star observed a billion light years from now in some unknown universe.

FARM SUBSIDY PAYMENTS IN OREGON

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, in a recent statement, I placed in the RECORD some statistics regarding the payment of Federal agricultural subsidies in 1969. The statistics pointed to the fact that a small number of farmers in cotton, wheat, and feed grains are receiving a great amount of the total subsidy payments.

I have just received some statistics compiled by the Agricultural Department to supplement my earlier report. These statistics show that a very high percentage of the recipients of subsidy

payments in Oregon are receiving less than $500. It is interesting to note that 52.5 percent of all payees receive less than $500 in payments. These payments, however, amount to only 6 percent of the total amount of subsidy money paid. At the same time, 7.3 percent of all payees received over $5,000, but this group collected 50.5 percent of the total amount paid to all payees.

I ask unanimous consent that these statistics be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statistics were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE—AGRICULTURAL STABILIZATION AND CONSERVATION SERVICE, FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF ALL ASCS PRODUCER PAYMENTS EXCLUDING PRICE SUPPORT LOANS FOR CALENDAR YEAR 1969

OREGON

Range of total payments		Number of payees	Percent distribution	Total amount dollars	Percent distribution
From	Through				
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Less than	$100.00	3,422	21.77	146,884	0.62
$100	$199.99	1,792	11.40	261,095	1.10
$200	$499.99	3,049	19.40	1,016,080	4.28
$500	$699.99	1,198	7.62	714,078	3.01
$700	$999.99	1,254	7.98	1,050,599	4.43
$1,000	$1,999.99	2,077	13.22	2,942,582	12.41
$2,000	$2,999.99	881	5.61	2,150,054	9.07
$3,000	$3,999.99	522	3.32	1,813,950	7.65
$4,000	$4,999.99	370	2.35	1,663,165	7.01
$5,000	$7,499.99	505	3.21	3,078,974	12.98
$7,500	$9,999.99	245	1.56	2,113,624	8.91
$10,000	$14,999.99	232	1.48	2,792,350	11.77
$15,000	$19,999.99	80	0.51	1,370,770	5.78
$20,000	$24,999.99	43	0.27	959,547	4.05
$25,000	$49,999.99	40	0.25	1,262,449	5.32
$50,000	$99,999.99	6	0.05	381,102	1.61
Total		15,716	100.00	23,717,303	100.00

Note.—The above statistics show the number of farmers in Oregon receiving over $20,000 in subsidy payments to be 89. This figure is slightly different from an earlier report which shows the same category to be 86. The difference stems from the fact that the 86 comes from a State report and the 89 is a sum of the county reports. (Bi-county farmers result in the higher figure in the county report.)

THE JUNK MERCHANTS

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, we are all becoming more aware of the pressing drug problem facing the Nation and in fact plaguing much of the world at an ever-increasing rate. It is of the utmost importance that we have knowledge of the situation—a knowledge based on concrete facts that can be used by the United States and other nations in a united effort against this booming industry which is baffling our law-enforcement efforts and corrupting our youth.

We do not have to go very far to see the impact of illegal drug distribution. It is becoming increasingly more visible and alarming. A recent series of articles entitled "The Junk Merchants," written by John Hughes, and published in the Christian Science Monitor gives a clear picture of the scope and the complexity of drug operations on the international level. The illegal nature of the problem and the difficulty in obtaining facts make this series of particular importance. It is my hope that through such thorough studies we will be more prepared to recommend action and to support the international efforts which are presently being initiated at the United Nations and in various countries.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the articles be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WORLD "JUNK" TRAFFIC: "WE ARE DEALING WITH AN EPIDEMIC"

BEIRUT, LEBANON.—During the past few months enough heroin has been smuggled into the United States to supply 150 million individual shots for addicts. In other words, enough for all the young people in the U.S. between the ages of 15 and 24 to have at least four "fixes." Staff correspondent John Hughes has followed the narcotics trails round the world. In the first of 10 reports he spells out the international drug situation.

A five-month investigation by this newspaper into the international narcotics traffic reveals that illicit drugs are swirling like a floodtide down the clandestine channels that lead to the addict user.

To the United States, the principal consuming country, the flow is massive, and increasing.

True, seizures are up. Heroin seizures by American customs agents have increased 1,200 percent over the past five years.

The Nixon administration is devoting major effort to disrupting the traffic. At home and abroad, American narcotics agents are doing a yeoman job. Whether shooting it out with opium traffickers in Turkey, or penetrating the heroin factories of Marseille, France, they are often men of remarkable courage, working undercover for long periods at considerable risk.

But the market for narcotics has expanded phenomenally, too. Some believe it has doubled in the past six months. It now caters to 11- and 12-year-olds. President Nixon says 180,000 Americans are addicted to heroin. Each requires several "fixes" a day of the white powder that has brought death to hundreds and so-called "living death" to thousands more.

So far as "soft" drugs are concerned, more than 6 million Americans are using marijuana, according to a United States congressional committee of inquiry.

FLOW INCREASED

Ironically, increased governmental attention to the drug traffic has boosted the current flow. Traffickers fear that traditional sources and channels may be sealed off. So they have been moving large consignments while they can.

Narcotics agents believe 3,500 kilos of heroin have been hastily funneled down the pipeline from Turkey to the United States in the past few months. When diluted, that is enough to supply more than 150 million individual shots of heroin to addicts.

Turkey is the largest grower of illegal opium. France is the major converter of opium into heroin. The process is dominated by a tough Corsican underworld ring operating in Marseille. From these two countries originates 80 percent of the heroin used in the United States. Much of the balance comes from Mexico. Two other countries with booming opium production—Iran and Afghanistan—are likely to cause trouble.

But even if production could be wiped out overnight, enough has been stockpiled to meet world demand for several years. Buried in remote areas of Turkey are several hundred tons of opium. It is guarded by fierce hill folk for whom defiance of authority is practically a point of honor. They can dispose of their caches at leisure. Neither opium, nor morphine (its next stage), nor heroin (the end product) deteriorates with age.

The United Nations says the drug traffic is snowballing and that it is "imperatively urgent" to find ways to cope with it.

A top American narcotics agent puts it more bluntly. "We're dealing," he says, "with an epidemic."

The United Nations estimates illegal production of opium at 1,200 tons a year. Many experts find that calculation conservative. As for marijuana, it grows untended like a weed in dozens of countries.

Last year a startled London housewife found two stands of it growing 6 feet high in her back garden. In New Orleans, agents picked up a college professor and his wife found growing 260 marijuana plants. Across the Mexican border alone, authorities believe, some 1,000 tons of marijuana flow into the United States each year.

For the past several months I have been exploring the pipelines down which this illegal traffic flows and the men who control them. In the course of a round-the-world trip I found that with no especial entrée to underworld circles it was possible, with time and money, to buy every major illegal drug.

In Afghanistan, Pakistan, and Thailand, I came easily to the point of purchase for opium. In Laos I could have bought it by the small planeload.

Sometimes there were difficulties when sellers suspected me of being an undercover narcotics agent or a police officer. But with only a little more effort, I could have bought opium in India, Turkey, and Mexico. In Hong Kong I need walk but a few steps from my office to get the distinctive scent of smoking opium from the neighborhood vendor.

In Beirut a Western diplomat offered me introductions to cocaine sellers in a number of nightclubs.

Second-grade heroin in small doses was easily obtained in Mexico and Hong Kong. But in Marseille I could have bought top-grade heroin by the kilo (2.2 pound). It would have taken an advance payment of $3,000 and several days isolation in a hotel room while the sellers checked me out. If they were satisfied, I could have been reasonably sure of emerging with a kilo of pure heroin. So skillful and careful are the traffickers, however, that the transaction would have been completed without my ever meeting the deliverer.

The movement of heroin from southern France to the United States was once domi-

nated by the American Mafia. But now the Corsican heroin manufacturers have so much to sell that they meet all the Mafia's requirements and have plenty to spare. So in addition, they sell to Cuban, American Negro, and Puerto Rican buying rings who have newly set up shop around Marseille, as well as to "independent" purchasers.

As for hashish and marijuana, I could have bought this as easily as toothpaste or candy throughout much of Asia, the Middle East, and parts of Mexico. In Afghanistan, hashish sellers distribute pamphlets advertising their own special brands. Hospitable policemen offer foreign hippies a puff of "hash." In Nepal, hashish comes cheaper than tobacco. In Pakistan, a police officer opposed to the narcotics traffic told me he had sold a kilo of hashish to make money for his son's birthday present.

CHILDREN ACCOSTED

For the new synthetic drugs—the amphetamines, the barbiturates, the hallucinogens—the trail started no farther than the beach in front of my home in Hong Kong. There the pushers are trying to proposition American children from the international school nearby. American schools in Bangkok, Thailand and Ankara, Turkey, have encountered similar problems.

One finding of this Monitor survey is that in addition to the traffic in cultivated drugs, there is a sharp upsurge in the movement of the synthetics. Pioneered in the United States, they are flowing in particular across the borders of Western Europe.

A leading Italian psychologist says 30 percent of young people between 14 and 22 in Rome are using some kind of drug. Use of stimulants is so serious in Sweden that the Swedish Government is in the forefront of a campaign for strict new international controls. Deaths from heroin use have startled France.

Even the Soviet Union has admitted some "thefts of narcotic drugs from pharmacies and hospitals." The Soviets say illicit traffic poses "no problems" in their country. Other sources say Soviet officials are quietly concerned about the smuggled inflow of drugs from the West.

Pep pills are in vogue with some Czechoslovakian youths. The Prague weekly Kvety says drug addiction in the capital is reaching alarming proportions. Some addicts have been getting high on cactus extract stolen from Prague botanical gardens.

There may be one positive aspect to this. European governments, which until now have paid only lip service to drug abuse and traffic, are beginning to take it more seriously.

Though it is relatively easy to buy illegal narcotics, smuggling them across international borders, and particularly into the United States, is a much more hazardous business.

In countries like Turkey and Lebanon, the narcotic seller is often an informer, too, particularly upon small-time or amateur traffickers. Having made the sale, he tells the police. For this service, he gets immunity prosecution. But the buyer is picked up.

In some countries, the police go out of their way to arrest foreigners. This help builds their case that foreigners, not local citizens, are responsible for the narcotics traffic.

Several hundred Americans have had tormented personal experience of this. They are serving long sentences for narcotics offenses in such hellholes as Sands prison, just outside Beirut.

Crammed 40 to 50 in a cell, the prisoners have one hole in the floor for a toilet, one faucet for a shower. Many have suffered the humiliation of violent homosexual assault. A fortunate few have bribed their way into mental institutions, where treatment is better.

Despite the hazards, the profits from drug smuggling are immense. If transported successfully to the United States and "cut" into 45,000 packets for individual users, a kilo of heroin that costs a few thousand dollars in Marseille sells for more than a quarter of a million dollars.

With this kind of money to be made, involvement in the narcotics traffic extends into the most pseudo-respectable circles and into the highest ranks of a number of governments.

In Lebanon, a leading politician is one of the laregst owners of hashish-producing land.

The uncle of one Middle Eastern monarch reputedly controls the transportation of narcotics through his country.

The sister of another head of state is persistently linked to the operation of a morphine-producing factory.

In one Asian country, an American diplomat told me:

"We want the drug traffic out of here stopped. But we have a problem. If American narcotics agents start nosing around here too closely, they're going to uncover some links to pretty high places."

In Laos the Army is involved in the opium business, and Lao Air Force planes transport opium.

In Thailand the massive outflow of narcotics could hardly take place without collaboration at fairly high levels. In the past, involvement in the drug traffic has extended into the Cabinet. It may still today.

AMBASSADOR ARRESTED

The diplomatic bag, immune from customs scrutiny, is an ideal vehicle for narcotics traffic. A number of Latin-American diplomats have been caught moving narcotics, including ambassadors from Mexico, Guatemala, and Uruguay.

This year Italian police arrested a Pakistani ambassador on narcotics charges. Other diplomats are being watched. Personnel of a number of international agencies with diplomatic privileges, particularly in Southeast Asia, are under suspicion.

In Lebanon, the traveler in trouble with the law who needs new documents can visit the ambassador of one Central-American country. No questions are asked. The fee for a brand-new passport of that country is $1,000 in cash. One recent purchaser was an LSD chemist on the run from British police. He used his new passport to travel to North America.

Money, however, is not always the reason for involvement in the drug traffic. Sometimes the motive is political or ideological.

Western agents, for instance, believe the Israeli intelligence service permits Arab smugglers to move shipments of narcotics across Israeli-held territory. The smugglers are Bedouin tribesmen. In return for the transit route, they give the Israelis military information about Arab positions.

There is also narcotics-smuggling across the Arab-Israeli border for straight gain. The hashish that visiting Jewish hippies buy in Israel comes from Lebanon.

In Laos, some of the main growers of illegal opium are tough mountain tribesmen upon whom the American Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) relies heavily in the campaign against the Communists. Opium is the principal cash crop in the non-Communist part of the country. Clearly, the CIA is cognizant of, if not party to, the extensive movement of opium out of Laos.

One charter pilot told me that "friendly" opium shipments get special CIA clearance and monitoring on their flights southward out of the country. The same source alleged two or three flights without this "protection" crashed under mysterious circumstances.

Communist intelligence agents are similarly involved with the use and transportation of narcotics.

Soviet agents posing as newsmen in India are known to have made use of narcotics in the course of their intelligence work. In the no-holds-barred world of espionage, it is a logical instrument.

The Soviets accuse the Chinese Communists of manufacturing narcotics and unloading them on the world market with political design. The Chinese undoubtedly do manufacture drugs. But there is no evidence that they are employing them abroad on such a massive scale, for instance, as did the Japanese prior to their invasion of China in the 1930's. Before their military onslaught, the Japanese poured in opium to sap Chinese resistance.

SANCTUARIES PROVIDED

For drug smugglers from Turkey and the Middle East, Communist countries on the road route to Western Europe are a sanctuary. Opium shipments are stored there, road trailers dropped off or switched, and truck registration papers and license plates changed.

A café in Sofia, Bulgaria, is the known haunt of Arab smugglers. Yet rarely do the Communists interfere with narcotics shipments from Middle Eastern countries for whose friendship they are anxious.

Whatever their motivation, the merchants engaged in this multimillion-dollar "junk," or narcotics, business resort to the most bizarre, the most extreme, the most ingenious methods to get their wares through.

Along the Turkish-Syrian border, the authorities have strung barbed wire and planted minefields. But the smugglers moving convoys of raw opium snip the wire and drive herds of goats ahead of them to explode the mines.

Camels carry opium in metal cylinders in their stomachs. One cheerful Afghan showed me how to slit the skin of a sheep, slip a wad of opium in, and sew the skin up again before herding the shaggy animal across the border into Iran.

From Laos, charter pilots air-drop opium in watertight bags in the Gulf of Siam. Deep-sea fishing boats from Thailand pick it up, sail to Hong Kong, then sink it in shallow water off the coast. Chinese fishing junks trawl for it later and quietly run it ashore.

HIDING PLACES ARE MANY

Narcotics are smuggled in hollowed-out books, in scuba tanks, and molded into chessboards. They are disguised as lemons, and hidden in pierced watermelons, and sealed in cans of peaches, coffee, and olive oil. They are carried in dolls, and toy horses, and even in babies' diapers.

Women couriers conceal them in girdles and brassieres. California customs agents caught one "pregnant" woman coming off a President liner with 40 pounds of narcotics in a false stomach. In Turkey, police found a "hunchback" with nine pounds of narcotics to his "hump."

From Colombia, one smuggler tried to ship 95 pounds of marijuana into the United States in a crate full of boa constrictors.

Others have tried molding narcotics as rosary beads.

But still favorite hiding places for traffickers are the false-bottomed suitcase and the concealed compartment in a truck or automobile. A surprisingly large amount of narcotics travels through the international mail labeled as innocent gifts. In one big haul in Hong Kong, narcotics were packed as insulation in the walls of a shipment of refrigerators.

One more interesting fact about the major criminals behind the narcotics traffic: Rarely do they use drugs themselves. They know better.

INTERNATIONAL "MERCHANDISE"

Narcotics: Opium, which when processed becomes morphine, and finally heroin ("junk," "H," "horse").

From cannabis comes marijuana ("pot," "grass," "weed") and its stronger strain, hashish. Though pharmacologically a hallucinogenic drug, marijuana is regulated in the same way as a narcotic.

Similarly cocaine, though technically a stimulant, is considered for law-enforcement purposes a narcotic.

Amphetamines: Stimulants, usually pills, also known as "bennies" and "pep pills." Taken to stave off fatigue and sleepiness. Also by teen-agers to boost energy and "nerve."

Barbiturates: Sedatives, usually prescribed by medical practitioners to calm, tranquilize, and induce sleep. Also known as "goof balls" and "barbs." One of the most frequently used agents for suicide in the Western world.

Hallucinogens: Usually LSD ("acid") or similar synthetic drugs, but also mescaline and peyote (from cactus) and psilocybin (from mushrooms).

TURKEY PRINCIPAL U.S. SOURCE: LEGAL OPIUM PRODUCTION SPAWNS ILLEGAL TRAFFICKING

(By John Hughes)

ISTANBUL.—American tourists breathlessly pounding the Mediterranean circuit probably give little thought to the ownership of the pleasant hotel near Istanbul's Taxim Square where many of them stay.

Undoubtedly, they would be startled to learn that it is owned by one of Turkey's major traffickers in narcotics and built with the proceeds of the heroin trade to the United States.

Besides the hotel business, Turkey's "junk," or narcotics, merchants are involved in a shipping company, a trucking firm, an export-import agency, and a string of other lawful enterprises.

The names of the top 9 or 10 men behind the Turkish narcotics racket are known to American, Turkish, and other narcotics agents. But there is little hope of catching them. Aloof behind a facade of respectability, they are protected by bodyguards from their competitors and by clever attorneys from the law. They are rich. And they are powerful.

This is the organizational, and money, end of the business which makes Turkey one of the world's principal suppliers of illegal opium, and thus the origin of some 80 percent of heroin used in the United States.

"BIG NAMES" NEVER CAUGHT

Like major traffickers everywhere, the big names in the Turkish narcotics business are never caught in possession of their merchandise, never tainted with the smell, like fresh-cut hay, of newly gathered opium.

They are the wheeler-dealers who finance, buy, sell, and arrange transit out of the country. It is the middle-men, the small-fry couriers, the growers, who run the risk.

Each year on the eve of the opium-planting season, the men who mastermind the Turkish narcotics business dispatch their "commission" men to the growing areas. The bright lights of Istanbul are put behind. The city's skyline, with its soaring spires and minarets and Islamic domes of exquisite contour, recede beyond the Bosporus.

The "commission" men head out across Anatolia toward southern Turkey into some of the most wild and craggy country in the world. Mountain streams twist and turn through the terrain in frenzy, rushing through gullies and leaping down into gorges. Goat tracks snake upward to peaks which afford smugglers total vantage and total surprise.

PEOPLE HIGHLY SUSPICIOUS

The Turks who live here are jealous of their independence and suspicious of intruders. Says one law enforcement officer:

"They come out with their hunting dogs snarling and their guns blazing. Later, they ask questions."

Provinces like these—Afyon, Usak, Konya, Denizli—are the heart of the opium country. "Afyon" in fact means "opium." Here the "commission" men, renewing their long-standing contacts, set their quotas for the amount of illegal opium they will buy, and that therefore the farmer must grow, in the coming year.

Usually this illegal quota is a percentage diverted from the crop which the farmer grows quite lawfully for the government. Some 110,000 farmers grow opium in Turkey, which is a major producer for medicinal purposes, as well as the foremost illegal source of narcotics for the American market.

Turkey's legitimate opium production has been running at more than 100 tons a year. But the farmer in legal production plants a few more hectares of opium for his private use.

His legal output he must sell to the government. The price he gets is around $10 a kilo. For whatever he can divert and sell to the illegal buyers from Istanbul, he gets around $30 a kilo.

Opium production is supposed to be controlled by Toprak, the Turkish Government Land Office. Farmers are licensed and in theory must hand over their entire crop to the state buying organization. But in practice there is little policing. The growing areas are remote from central authority. The Toprak agent on the scene may be paid to keep quiet about illicit production. If he reports evasion, he may be killed.

Turkish policemen are vulnerable. A city cop earns about $40 a month. That is somewhat less than the earnings on an energetic shoeshine boy hustling tourists. A police captain with long service may make $100 a month.

In the countryside, some of the gendarmerie earn 36 cents a month. Often they are assigned to their own villages. And as one lawman says, "they're unlikely to turn in their own fathers and brothers."

HARVEST LOOSELY SUPERVISED

There are brave and honest policemen in Turkey. But they are short of equipment to hunt down illegal opium-growers and smugglers. This shortage the United States now is beginning to remedy. Until the United States started distributing new Smith and Wesson .38's, a Turkish policeman could not be sure that his ancient revolver would not explode in his hand when fired.

Thus it is that when the Turkish opium farmer harvests his crop, about this time of year, he does so with little supervision from the government.

The poppy plants have grown to their full height and flowered in delicate shades of mauve and pink. Soon after the petals fall, the farmer and his family move in, carefully slitting the pods of the poppies which are left behind.

Out through the incision oozes a milky liquid. This is opium. For a few hours it is allowed to harden. During this time it turns dark brown. Then, from each pod, it is scraped off and kneaded into a ball until the farmer has collected a lump several pounds in weight.

In this manner begins the long journey which terminates with the injection of heroin into the veins of the quivering, shaking "junkie" in New York, or one of a dozen other American cities.

Legally grown opium is turned in to the government buying station. But for illegal opium, the next step is delivery of the agreed quotas to the "commission" men from Istanbul.

At a quiet meeting place, usually at night, they take it over and make payment. Everyone is armed, everyone suspicious. This is the time for a doublecross, or an ambuish by narcotics agents who have penetrated the organization. When agents do spring a trap, the firefight is usually furious.

NEXT STEP THE BORDER

If the transaction goes through without incident, the opium moves by truck or van on the next stage of its journey out of the country.

Traditionally, the opium smugglers' route has been to Kilis, in Gaziantep Province, on Turkey's border with Syria. Specialists there move the loads—as much as a man or mule can comfortably carry—across into Syria. It is a dangerous business, because both governments have strung the border with barbed wire, sewn it with mines, and dotted it with machine-gun posts.

But some border guards can be bribed, and even the honest ones cannot be everywhere at once. The smugglers know the best times and places to cross. They evade patrols, snip the wire, and drive sheep, goats, or other animals ahead of them to clear a path through the minefields.

Once into Syria, the opium is handed over either to an agent of the Istanbul drug merchants, or an agent of a new ring which has brought the shipment. In a primitive laboratory or at a well-guarded camp, remote in the hills, the opium is converted into morphine.

It is a simple chemical process. In a series of steps the morphine content is boiled, filtered, and precipitated out of the opium. About 10 parts opium made one part of morphine base. In the Middle East it is shipped onward as yellowish powder, in plastic bags. In Asia, the morphine is packed into rectangular blocks.

Besides being much smaller to carry and conceal, the morphine base now is more valuable. Ten kilos of opium at $30 a kilo are worth $300 in Turkey. Converted into a kilo of morphine, they are worth $500. Delivered to Marseille to the Corsican narcotics ring which will convert it to heroin, the same kilo of morphine doubles its value to $1,000.

But getting it there taxes the drug smugglers' ingenuity. After conversion to morphine base in Syria, the traditional route has been down into Lebanon. There the morphine is smuggled aboard ships bound for Marseille, France, or other convenient ports in the western Mediterranean. There has also been some conversion from morphine to heroin in Lebanon itself.

But Lebanese authorities, stung by international criticism, have lately cracked down on the morphine traffic.

SMUGGLING MORE DIFFICULT

Captain Antoine Saadi, chief of the Lebanese police narcotics bureau, says Lebanon's own heroin factories have been put out of business. Only one heroin chemist is still at large. He is Omar Makkouk, hiding across the Syrian border. Though an elderly man, he is renowned throughout the international underworld for the quality of his heroin.

Last year, Lebanese police seized couriers carrying 10 kilos of Makkouk's heroin. But 49 kilos of the batch had already gone through undetected, via Amsterdam and Curacao, to Miami.

Though the flow of hashish is still rampant through Lebanon, the crackdown on morphine and heroin has caused traffickers to develop alternative routes for these "hard" drugs. The morphine laboratories still operate in Syria, but now once opium has been converted to morphine the morphine is often smuggled back into Turkey for movement to France by road or sea. Lebanon is considered risky.

Recently one Lebanese trafficker made

plans for processing morphine with maximum security. The laboratory equipment was sealed in watertight containers and sunk at sea. It was to be brought up and used only when a shipment came in from Syria, and then submerged again. But his Syrian supplier balked.

"Bring morphine into Lebanon these days!" said the supplier. "You must be crazy."

With their penchant for trade and finance, the Lebanese still act as brokers and financiers in the narcotics traffic. They bring buyers and sellers together. They underwrite shipments themselves. Occasionally they slip. One, caught in France last year, got five years in jail and a fine of $200,000.

But the Turks have recently been developing and managing their own transportation routes. Many tons of Turkish opium flow eastward into Iran. But to the west, and in the heroin-hungry market of the United States, lies the big money.

SHIPS HARD TO SEARCH

Ships are still especially good bets for smuggling narcotics. They have thousands of hiding places. Two Turkish vessels, the Karadeniz and the Akdaniz which regularly cruise westward through the Mediterranean, are held suspect by narcotics agents.

Agents caught two French traffickers redhanded with 86 kilos of morphine as they tried to get it ashore from the Karadeniz in Marseille. Recently, agents seized 125 kilos from the Akdaniz. But she carried 400 kilos more which the agents did not get. This was dropped overboard and retrieved by scuba divers in the employ of narcotics merchants.

Many narcotics shipments now travel by road from Turkey to Western Europe. One advantage for the smugglers is that part of the route lies through Communist countries where Western narcotics agents find it difficult to operate. Agents may have a narcotics shipment under surveillance as it enters Bulgaria from Turkey. But they lose it until it emerges in a non-Communist country at the other end of Europe.

Thus traffickers sometimes send a truck through with two trailers. One is "clean" (without narcotics), the other "dirty" (carrying morphine). In one or other of the Communist countries, the "dirty" trailer is dropped off.

TRUCKS WELL DISGUISED

The traffickers wait to see if the truck with the "clean" trailer gets "hit" (thoroughly searched) at a Western European customs post. If not, it means narcotics agents are unaware of the shipment. So the second, "dirty" trailer is sent through on another truck.

Besides dropping off shipments for storage in Communist countries, traffickers also use the opportunity to do paint jobs and switch license plates and registration papers. Thus agents may have complete details of a truck with narcotics aboard when it enters Bulgaria. But when it emerges in Italy or Germany, it may have different drivers, different papers and be a different color.

Turkey's smugglers have developed specialists who concentrate on various parts of vehicles. Some split gasoline tanks on cars and trucks and fit secret compartments almost impossible to find even with steel probes. Others suspend "traps" from various parts of a chassis. Still other build undetectable boxes into drivers' cabs.

In one case, American and French agents seized a truck carrying watermelons from Turkey to France. They slashed open every watermelon—and found nothing. Then agents ran tape measures over the inside and outside of the truck. They came up with an abnormal discrepancy. Then they ripped open the built-in compartment which hid 525 kilos of opium and 54 kilos of morphine.

A large migrant Turkish community in Western Europe also offers traffickers an opportunity.

More than 200,000 Turks work in West Germany. They travel back and forth to their homeland. As they do, some of them smuggle narcotics. Out of Turkey they carry morphine. Back to Turkey they smuggle weapons. These are high-priced and in big demand in a gun-conscious country. A Smith and Wesson revolver worth $80 in the United States sells for $400 in Turkey.

With the production and smuggling of narcotics so widespread and blatant, what is the Turkish Government doing to cut back traffic?

In 1967 the Turks announced they would get out of the opium business altogether by the crop of 1970–71. This seemed to mean that they would reduce the areas of legal opium cultivation until by 1971 nothing would be left.

From 21 opium-growing provinces in 1967 they did cut back to 18 provinces in 1968, 11 provinces in 1969, and 9 this year. The target for next year is 7 provinces.

FARMERS NOT LIGHTLY ALIENATED

Then the big question is: What happens after that? In theory the legal opium crop should have been eliminated. In practice it looks unlikely that it will be. While legal production continues, illegal production appears inevitable.

In an obvious attempt to jog the Turks along, United States narcotics chief John E. Ingersoll issued some sharp comments at a press conference earlier this year. Director of the Justice Department's Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, Mr. Ingersoll charged that provinces to which opium production had been limited were in fact the most productive.

He said efforts to wipe out opium production had become bogged down in Turkish politics.

Mr. Ingersoll's remarks needed little interpretation here in Turkey. The hard-core, opium-growing provinces are of considerable political significance to the government of Premier Suleyman Demirel and his ruling Justice Party. Turkish opium farmers number some 110,000. No government lightly alienates them.

Further, Mr. Ingersoll's criticism came in the midst of a government crisis. Right-wing rebels in the Justice Party were challenging Premier Demirel's authority. Obviously no government was anxious at that particular juncture to press such a manifestly unpopular issue as elimination of the opium crop.

There was in Mr. Ingersoll's comment, however, a phrase which stirred some Turks.

UNITED STATES SENDING AID

"We're asking a great deal of them [the Turks]," said Mr. Ingersoll. "But they've got the courage to do it." That touched a chord in a nation with martial leanings, where bravery and honor are highly prized.

With the political crisis behind him, Premier Demirel now has the opportunity to show how serious he is about taking Turkey out of the opium business.

The United States is giving him help. About $1 million of a $3 million American loan for opium-eradication has already been advanced. Half the money goes on a program to substitute other crops for opium. The other half is spent on boosting the anti-narcotics effort of the Turkish police.

The Turkish national police force has assigned 420 men to a new narcotics bureau, and specially trained 330 gendarmes in narcotics work. The United States has helped with training and equipment. Washington has supplied police cars, new weapons, and a spotter plane from which police will be able to detect illegal opium plots.

This program is about one-third operational. As the Turks implement it successfully, additional equipment and funds will be doled out.

Some observers think the Turks are tackling the difficult opium problem about as speedily as they can, and that the government's intentions are good. Others are impatient.

One thing seems clear. Even if legal production should be eliminated, there will still be illegal growers ready to take high risks for high profits. Says one American narcotics expert:

"Even if we knock out most of Turkey's opium production, the traffickers will still be in business somehow."

MARSEILLE—HUB OF HEROIN INDUSTRY: RISKS GREATER BUT PROFITS FATTER

(By John Hughes)

MARSEILLE, FRANCE.—As chill night turned to dank dawn, the narcotics agents worked their way through the French woods.

To ensure total surprise, they had left their cars several miles away.

Now, through high-powered glasses, they had under observation the isolated villa which was their target.

Inside the house they could see three men working amid all the paraphernalia of a chemical laboratory: gas burners, glass flasks and tubes, suction pumps, scales, vials of chemicals.

The men wore white coats and rubber gloves. One thing more showed they were no ordinary chemists. Each of them wore a gas mask. It was to protect them from the fumes and effect of their product: heroin.

For their highly profitable, but illegal activity, the heroin chemists had chosen their site well. Only 30 miles from the big French seaport of Marseille, the village of Notre Dame des Anges is nevertheless off the beaten track. The villa the heroin chemists selected there was on a hill, reached by a country road along which only one or two cars traveled each day.

Even so the heroin chemists were extra-cautious. Even now as the French and American agents positioned themselves, a rare car passed by. Immediately the chemists stopped work. One came outside to check. Reassured, they continued.

POLICE RAIDS CURBED

Carefully, the narcotics agents checked their time. (French law bars police raids on a man's home between 9 o'clock at night and 6 o'clock in the morning.) Then they rushed the villa.

The three chemists caught now are serving lengthy prison sentences. Their heroin was seized and is one batch which will never be pumped into the veins of American addicts.

This recent seizure is one of the brighter chapters in the story of the war against the international "junk," or narcotics, merchants. Another heroin laboratory was put out of business about the same time. In this case, the illegal chemists were more brazen. They were working from a three-story house in the suburbs of Marseille itself.

Hidden behind high walls, this was a house particularly difficult for surveillance. But narcotics agents caught the heroin manufacturers in the act there, too. These chemists also are serving long prison terms.

Successful though these operations were, they but scratched the surface of a highly organized crime ring which makes Marseille the center of the heroin-manufacturing industry. Eighty percent of the heroin used by addicts in the United States is produced in and around Marseille from morphine and opium which originate in Turkey.

Controlling the ring are Corsican criminals of cunning and ruthlessness. Says one crack American agent, grudgingly:

"I guess they have to be rated the most adept criminals in the world."

INFORMATION IS THE KEY

The Corsicans who mastermind this ugly traffic in Marseille are tight-knit. Information is the key to successful antinarcotics operations, but from the Corsicans it is difficult to acquire. A non-Corsican has little hope of penetrating the organization.

For a Corsican to inform on his own gang members there is little inducement, but great peril. The money narcotics agents offer in return for information is insignificant compared with the money a gang member makes from trafficking. And when a Corsican is caught informing, gang retribution is instant and final.

In one of the raids mentioned earlier, one gang member had the misfortune to be absent from the heroin laboratory when narcotics agents smashed in. His body was found next day with six bullets in it. He had been murdered by his fellow gangsters because they suspected him of having tipped off the agents, and then evaded arrest. He was not, in fact, the informant.

When information is forthcoming from within the ring it is usually from a gang member jealous over a stolen woman, or disaffected over some other affront, and bent on personal revenge.

OPPORTUNITIES ABOUND

It is not difficult to see why Marseille has become the hub of the heroin-manufacturing industry. Even without the Corsican underworld community, it is a city renowned for its tough and bawdy waterfront dives where any criminal transaction is easily arranged.

It is a sprawling port, cluttered with miles of gray dericks and cranes, which afford unlimited opportunity for smuggling. Ocean-going ships of every kind, and from every country, load and unload here. In and out of the old harbor there are hundreds of motor cruisers, yachts, and fishing boats with a pattern of movement through coastal waters impossible to track.

Under cover of darkness it is easy to take delivery of a shipment of yellow morphine hidden aboard a ship just in from Turkey, or to stash a parcel of heroin aboard one bound for Mexico, Canada, or the United States. A gentle splash, as a waterproof bundle is dropped over a ship's side, or a thud as a package is thrown from a dark spot over the port fence, and the job is done.

Marseille also is an easy delivery point for smugglers who move shipments of narcotics overland from Turkey. It is linked to the road network which laces the French Riviera. A truck or car carrying hidden morphine merges easily with the traffic surging across southern France.

An old World War II resistance center, Marseille is full of hiding places, criss-crossed by drains and sewers. During the war, resistance fighters led allied agents through this underground network and whisked German prisoners and bodies away through it. Today these tunnels serve the junk merchants who use them to move narcotics and the materials necessary to process heroin.

For security, supplies are dispersed and brought together only for the actual conversion. Once delivered in Marseille, morphine is cached in one spot. The laboratory is somewhere else. Acetic anhydride acid, needed in substantial quantities to make heroin, is stored elsewhere. Finished heroin is quickly moved out to yet another hiding place.

Conversion of morphine into heroin is much more sophisticated than the rough-and-ready process by which opium is turned into morphine. The heroin process demands chemical skills and is dangerous.

The chemists risk addiction through fumes and powdered heroin particles in the air. This is why they wear masks. Beyond this, a slip can cause fatal explosion.

But if the risks are high, so are the profits.

The Corsicans who run the business find little difficulty in acquiring chemists, either from their own ranks, or hired from outside, to undertake the illicit operation.

To elude detection, the heroin merchants have developed many techniques. One clue to the existence of a heroin laboratory is the vast amount of electric power it uses, far more than would be normal in an ordinary household.

So the heroin chemists tap the main power lines, stealing their electricity from the city. They are careful to pass a normal amount of electricity through the meter in their premises. Police checking consumption thus find no unusual telltale usage.

WATER WASTE WATCHED

Another giveaway is water waste from the heroin laboratories. The chemists cannot dump it into city sewers for fear police will detect, and trace, the large amount of acetic anhydride acid in it. For every kilo of heroin produced, the chemists must use two kilos of acid. Their usual disposal method is to run it off, via long hoses, onto waste ground or, in the case of a country villa, down the side of a hill or mountain.

Police also try to keep an eye on unusually large purchases of acetic anhydride. But the acid is bought for many legitimate purposes. It is used by fertilizer and plastics manufacturers. In the United States its sale is legal. Its purchase specifically for heroin manufacture is difficult to trace.

With money and organization and ruthlessness on their side, the Corsicans are formidable foes. In challenging them, the French police clearly face some genuine problems. But in the view of many, the French Government's efforts to eliminate the Marseille heroin business has till recently lacked application and serious effort.

The French narcotics bureau is understaffed and ill-equipped. For its whole operation in southern France it has relied on 11 agents with three cars between them. Some are deskbound. Manpower available for surveillance and detection of narcotics traffickers has thus been negligible. In the French capital itself there have been hardly a dozen narcotics agents at work.

Lately there have been indications that Paris is stirring on the narcotics problem.

In part this is due to unfavorable international publicity about France's role in heroin production. In part it is due to sudden French recognition that heroin addiction is not exclusively a foreign, and specifically American, problem. Last year two French teen-agers from middle-class families died on the Riviera from overdoses of heroin.

BUREAU BOLSTERED

With the resulting hullabaloo, and encouragement from Washington, the French have announced they will boost their antinarcotics effort. A new chief has taken over the narcotics bureau in Marseille. New agents are promised.

Throughout the country some 350 narcotics specialists are supposed to have been assigned. But these "specialists" are regular policemen who have been given short courses in narcotics work. If, in the course of their duties, they run across a narcotics case, they are better equipped to investigate it. They are not, however, narcotics experts in the true sense, devoting their full time to narcotics work.

The real question now is whether the French are prepared to devote more than lip service to the elimination of the narcotics traffic. At least six illicit heroin factories are believed to be still in operation in the vicinity of Marseille. Experts concede there could be double that number.

Though Marseille's Corsican underworld runs the heroin racket, Corsicans are not basically in the business of transporting narcotics to the United States. They prefer to produce and sell. Principal buyer is the American Mafia which also masterminds organized smuggling of narcotics into the United States.

U.S. OFFICIAL COMMENTS

Says John T. Cusack, chief of the American antinarcotics network in Europe: "We're up against a hard-core, well-entrenched, affluent, powerful criminal element."

Based in Paris, as European regional director of the United States Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs Mr. Cusack is widely credited with having masterminded the American role in persuading the Turkish Government to cut back on opium production.

Besides the Mafia, other buying rings have set up shop in southern France. They include Cubans, Puerto Rican, and Negros, and "independent" buyers who run their own transit routes. When the Corsicans arrange delivery of heroin in the United States, rather than France, the price is much higher.

Mafia narcotics-smuggling routes run via Canada and Mexico to the United States, and directly through American East Coast ports.

But there are many variations. Some air shipments are routed from France to the Netherlands or Switzerland, then to the Caribbean, and into the States through Florida. Sometimes narcotics couriers stop off in the Republic of Ireland. An Irish aircraft landing at Boston or New York tends to get more cursory examination than one coming in from France.

One heroin-smuggling ring used a Trans World Airlines route from West Germany to Kansas City, Mo. The couriers carried their narcotics in flight bags. Shortly before arrival in New York they hid their packages in the aircraft's toilet. Then they went through New York customs confidently.

DOMESTIC FLIGHT TAKEN

After clearing customs and reboarding the aircraft, they retrieved their heroin from the toilet. From Kansas City they took a domestic flight back to New York, delivering their wares with little risk.

Their method was discovered when the TWA flight developed engine trouble on one occasion in New York, and the company ordered a plane change. The couriers panicked, tried to get their heroin off the discarded aircraft, and were caught red-handed by customs agents.

Another smuggling route is from Europe over the pole to the American West Coast, then by domestic flight back to New York.

There are 390 ports of entry in the United States. Through them pass 220 million travelers each year. Clearly, the smugglers' chances of getting at least some of their merchandise through are good. The standard yardstick custom agents use is that they seize about one-tenth of the contraband funneling into their country.

To move heroin into the United States, the junk merchants use scores of couriers who carry packets taped to their legs, or concealed in special vests, bags, or false-bottomed suitcases. For the junk merchants it is a gamble, but one loaded with the odds in their favor. They can afford to lose a large number of couriers and still make vast profits out of the shipments that get through.

OPERATORS PAY NO TAXES

Those that are lost are written off to operating costs in a business in which the operators pay no taxes anyway. Arrest of a

courier rarely imperils the big-time criminals behind the traffic. Most couriers are given only the skimpiest information of the operation they are involved in, and have little to pass on to custom and narcotics agents.

In one case, all eight couriers involved in a shipment of heroin were picked up by American narcotics agents. None could pinpoint the supplier or the addressee.

In another case a narcotics courier facing an Italian murder charge was desperate to cooperate with narcotics agents in a bid to prevent his arraignment in an Italian court. But he had no information of value. All he could reveal was that he had been given the narcotics to carry, in a room of Rome's Excelsior Hotel, by a man he had never seen before and whose name he did not know.

As couriers, the traffickers recruit seamen, airline crew members (one Alitalia steward had direct links to the Mafiosi of Brooklyn), respectable-looking business executives, and even diplomats. The latter are especially useful. Their luggage is usually scrutiny free when it goes through customs.

One courier ring smuggling heroin into New York via the West Coast from Hong Kong included three former Australian police officers. Even a former "playmate" from Playboy magazine is languishing in a Greek jail for carrying narcotics.

SURVEILLANCE PURSUED

While transporting heroin, couriers are often under surveillance by other members of the underworld network. If a courier is "busted" (arrested), the junk merchants are usually aware of it immediately. If the courier agrees to lead government agents to his contact, by the time they get there the trail is cold.

Aside from their own Sicilian dialect, Mafia junk merchants use a jargon almost incomprehensive to outsiders and eavesdropping narcotics agents.

Says one Mafia member to another, in a long-distance call from New York to Sicily: "I need a dozen white shirts. Tell Toto everything's taken care of on the mountain." Translated, that means: "Ship a dozen kilos of heroin. Tell our Corsican supplier in Marseille that I've deposited the cash for them in the usual numbered Swiss bank account."

The American Mafia lean heavily on blood ties in their native Sicily for logistical support in Europe. Thus some heroin shipments are backtracked from France to Italy, and then moved out to the United States.

Experts say actual production of heroin in Italy now is rare. For helping stop Italian production they give credit to former American Ambassador Clare Booth Luce. They also credit Italian authorities for cracking down on known Mafia members with sentences of "obligatory sojourn" in remote areas. Under this system, a suspect is removed from big-city contact and required to report daily at the police station in his area.

Even so, the Mafiosi are wily, and the movement of narcotics in and out of Italy continues.

HONEYMOON IN SICILY

In one case, an American of Sicilian origin carried a large heroin consignment for his family without ever knowing it. His father, a prominent New York Mafia member, sent him back to Sicily for his honeymoon. With the bridal couple went a handsome new American car.

After a few days a relative in Sicily insisted on removing the car to get it washed and serviced.

Overnight, Mafia members took the car apart and fitted it with secret compartments full of heroin. Unknowing, the son shipped his car back to the States, passing uneventfully through customs.

A little later, his father asked to borrow the car. The heroin was recovered by the American Mafia, the car returned, and the innocent son took up his business unaware that for the price of a honeymoon to Sicily, the Mafia had imported a massive shipment of heroin.

Other bulk shipments come by diverse routes. French and American agents broke one ring airfreighting heroin from Paris to New York hidden in electronic oscilloscopes. Some heroin travels southward to Spain from Marseilles before being moved on to the United States. One big haul was made in a shipment of canned fish imported from Spain by a Whitestone, N.Y., dealer.

MAFIA "SCATTERS SHOT"

Earlier this year, American custom agents made the largest seizure of hashish in the history of the service at Boston's Logan Airport. Inspectors found 600 pounds of hashish in false bottoms of crates of musical instruments from India. This was a spot check, without any advance information from agents abroad.

Although the Mafia scatter their shot with couriers on planes, cars are much favored for smuggling narcotics. Thousands of them are brought in and out of the United States each year. Though some are searched, the United States is wooing foreign tourists, and custom agents cannot tear every visitor's car apart.

The advantage to the Mafia is that a car can transport a much larger heroin shipment than can be concealed by a courier. One Volkswagen 1300 carried 54 kilos of heroin concealed in its door panels and in special compartments under its seats—in other words, a shipment about the size of a small man.

If agents seize an auto shipment, the loss to the Mafia is much greater than loss of a two or three-kilo packet strapped to a courier's leg. But the Mafia can afford to lose several carloads and still make money on the one that gets through.

From one French Citroen, agents extracted 112 kilos of heroin. That was a major haul. But the same car had successfully carried heroin shipments for five previous years.

With bigger shipments, the risks are greater, but the profits are fatter. Such are the odds that keep the junk traffic flowing out of Marseilles.

IRAN'S STRICT DRUG CONTROLS: GOOD INTENTIONS NO BARRIER TO TRAFFICKERS

(By John Hughes)

TEHRAN, IRAN.—As the first light of day streaked the Persian sky, the prisoners were led out. There were 10 of them: an Army captain, two lieutenants, seven civilians. Grim faced, they took their last look at the soft hills around them, still swathed in morning mist.

The firing squad was drawn up. At a sharp order, the soldiers leveled their rifles. Another order, and the shots rang out.

The first traffickers to face punishment under Iran's tough new laws against narcotics smuggling had been executed.

Under this law, anyone in Iran caught carrying more than two kilos of opium, or more than 10 grams of heroin, morphine, or cocaine, is subject to capital punishment.

The soldiers had been stopped with a massive load of opium—272 kilos—hidden in their Army jeep. Then they tried to shoot it out with gendarmes, who arrested them.

Since the execution of this first group of offenders, the Iranian Government has had more than two dozen narcotics traffickers shot. More cases are pending.

Says a Foreign Ministry official: "We are very serious about this. We're going to execute every one of them we catch. We've caught a woman smuggler. And we've caught foreigners. They'll all get the same treatment. It's a matter of life and death."

The severity of the punishment underlines the Iranian Government's intention, since it passed its new laws last year, to deal harshly with narcotics traffickers.

Yet ironically, Iran is one of the countries international experts are most concerned about as they ponder sources of illegal drugs in the years ahead. For hand in hand with its new crackdown on smuggling, the government authorized peasants to start growing opium after a 13-year ban. This apparently anomalous decision could lead to massive production again in a country which was once among the world's leading growers and exporters of opium.

The green light has been given only for legal opium production. This is opium which will be sold to the state, to be used for Iran's own registered addicts and utlimately for export for medicinal purposes.

But, critics argue, there is always leakage from legalized production. The United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs says it is "very disturbed" about the Iranian decision, which it terms a "sharp disappointment."

Harry J. Anslinger, a former chief of the American Bureau of Narcotics, is similarly outspoken. He says that Iran has a "moral obligation" not to produce opium. He describes the Iranian decision to resume as the "greatest blow to narcotics control" he has ever known. This regret is echoed by Jean Nepote, chief of Interpol, the international police organization. He terms the Iranian action a "retrogressive step."

Mr. Anslinger declares bluntly Iran's good name has been "put in jeopardy" by its decision to grow opinion again. To this international criticism, Iranians are highly sensitive. They argue they are taking careful measures to control production. Only government-licensed farmers will be allowed to grow opinion. Police will supervise the harvesting. The entire crop will be sold to a state-run monopoly.

For illicit cultivation or withholding, the government will impose strict penalties. And as it has already shown, it will take extreme action against illegal traffickers.

Foreign critics, however, argue that despite Iran's good intentions, a substantial amount will seep away onto the illegal market. Turkey has a similar system of controls on its licit opium production—yet Turkey is a major source of illegal opium. Any increase in opium production anywhere, say narcotics agents, spells more trouble for them.

So far there is little evidence that the newly grown opium in Iran is finding its way in quantity onto the international market. But as yet the crop is small.

Last year the government authorized opium growing on only 4,200 hectares. The result was about nine tons of opium. This year the government authorized an additional 6,000 hectares. With 10,000 hectares under opium this nation is already back to almost half the acreage it had under opium in the boom years of the 1950's. On that acreage Iran was producing between 900 and 1,200 tons of opium a year.

Beyond the prospect of new Iranian opium seeping onto the illegal market, there is another, and ominous, aspect.

The Iranian crop presumably will make surplus about 300 tons of opium a year which has been flooding into Iran from its neighboring countries of Turkey on the one side and Afghanistan on the other. If the Iranian market dries up, here is another 300 tons of opium each year available to international buyers at cut-rate prices.

It was pique with its neighbors, particularly Turkey, that motivated Iran's deci-

sion to get into the opium business again. Prior to 1955, Iran was a major producer, with 25,000 hectares under opium poppy cultivation. In its last year of cultivation—1955—Iran produced 1,180 tons of opium. Legally, and for medicinal purposes, it exported about 100 tons a year.

The opium business was profitable for some. Several wealthy landowners made $50,000 a year from it. But it was degradation and hopelessness for many thousands more. Iran had a staggering opium addiction problem of its own. According to the Iranian Medical Association, some 1.5 million Iranians (in a population which then stood around 20 million) were addicts.

Outraged and concerned, Shah Mohammad Reza Pahlavi in 1955 banned opium production outright. His decision won worldwide acclaim. In Iran it cut back addiction. The Iranian Medical Association says that, though the population had increased, the number of drug addicts has dropped from 1.5 million to half a million.

But 500,000 addicts still need a lot of opium. And tragically, there has been a substantial shift to heroin, made in illegal laboratories from illegally imported opium.

The smug and conscienceless exploiters of this situation have been the Turkish and Afghan junk merchants who have poured their opium into Iran, even as Iran outlawed its own production. Flocks of sheep, with opium blocks sewn into their skin, have been herded across Iran's borders. Wild Afghan horsemen have come whooping over with opium-filled saddlebags. Whole convoys of pack animals have been led across in darkness.

Of course, Iranians are in the business, too. In 1968, 15 illegal heroin laboratories were destroyed. Many more went undiscovered. The ownership of some is said to extend into the highest ranks of the Shah's government.

But the police are active in combating the narcotics traffic. Even prior to the country's tough new narcotics laws, they were picking up some 18,000 people a year for drug operations. In 1968 they seized 3,600 kilos of opium, and in the first half of last year alone, 8,840 kilos. There are wild gun battles as Iranian gendarmes tangle with lawless smugglers trying to shoot their way across the country's borders with loads of opium. In some, Iranian law officers have been killed.

It is this smuggling from Turkey and Afghanistan, and a real loss to Iran in hard cash, that caused the exasperated Shah to rescind his ban on opium production last year. One Foreign Office official, Undersecretary Fereydoun Hoveyda, calculated that illicit purchase of Turkish and Afghan opium lost Iran $10 million a year in foreign exchange. Prior to the 1955 ban, Iran had been earning $40 million from opium. Dr. M. H. Sahez-Zamain, chief of the Iranian Mental Health Commission, sets the loss higher at $15 million a year.

One problem: The smugglers demand payment in gold. Thus the smuggling of opium has generated another smuggling racket, gold. The buyer must get gold to get opium.

"We have," says another Foreign Office official, "paid a very high price for banning opium production. But our neighbors simply replaced us in the world market. Now we've started again. But we give this undertaking: The day others stop producing, we will."

The Iranian newspaper Kayhan reflects official thinking. Says the newspaper editorially:

"Iran has waited 13 years, during which international agencies and neighboring countries have done nothing to desist. Iran has lost a substantial market for medicinal opium. It loses millions of dollars in gold, which leaves the country to pay for illegally imported opium. And drug addicts have turned to heroin."

The newspaper approves of renewed Iranian production, with strict controls over growing, collection, marketing, and export. "We will cease," says Kayhan, "when our neighbors do so."

That prospect is not likely. The Turkish Government is on record with its intention to get out of the opium business, but illegal production in Turkey will certainly continue.

The capacity of the Afghan Government to curb opium production and smuggling is limited. Even given the will, the Kabul government is powerless to enforce such a decision throughout great swaths of the country where wild tribesmen reign independent.

So Iranian production will continue and increase, and with it a mounting opportunity for diversion to the illegal market.

If a halt to production is unlikely, one way to keep the crop down would be to reduce the number of Iran's addicts, and therefore the demand. But despite brave words, Iran's addiction problem looks like one of some duration.

The government has allocated $8 million for the treatment of young addicts. Dr. H. A. Azarakhch, one of the country's leading narcotics experts and a delegate to the United Nations Commission on Narcotic Drugs, says 10 percent of all hospital beds are reserved for addicts.

Even so, Seyd Mohammad Tabatabai, secretary-general of the Iranian Medical Association, estimates that with existing facilities it would take 104 years to wipe out drug addiction in Iran. He thinks much more urgent measures are required. He suggests the government should use the money it will make from opium sales to finance addiction treatment centers.

The government certainly appears eager to reduce the number of addicts. Only people over 60 years of age, and those considered to have a medical need, are permitted to buy opium, at 23 cents a gram, on a quota basis from government-licensed shops. Their registration, which has been taking place this year, is a pitiful business.

One 65-year-old woman staged a sit-in at a registration center because clerks refused to issue her an opium permit without a photo. "I'm a servant," she cried. "I can't work without eating opium every morning."

An elderly man said he had been an addict for 45 years. "I have smoked opium," he said, "since I was 20. And I'll do it until I die."

With others, the government is taking a tougher line. Addicts in government service have been given a deadline to break the habit. A government official who remains on narcotics stands to lose his job. He may also lose his property and lands.

The result is that many Iranian drug users are hiding their addiction. They are not registering as addicts for fear of government retaliation. By March of this year, only 32,000 addicts had appeared for registration throughout the entire country. Dr. Azarakhch thinks the figure may go as high as 100,000.

Even so, that would leave another 400,000 Iranians who until recently were drug addicts. Either they have suddenly cured their problem or, more likely, they are acquiring drugs illegally.

Thus the prospect for a curb on opium production in Iran is not bright.

Some foreign observers hold that the Iranian Government has not thoroughly considered the implications of its decision. For instance, the government talks of exporting opium for medicinal purposes. This presumably means selling it at around $10 a kilo. Yet the cost of opium to the Iranian Government is much higher than that.

According to Dr. Azarakhch, the government is currently paying opium farmers about $90 a kilo for opium latex which is still impure, with about 30 percent moisture in it. On this basis, export is a money-losing venture.

Some of these foreign observers feel that if a graceful opportunity afforded itself, the Iranian Government would even now opt out of the opium business again. But with the acreage under opium doubling up each year, Iran is heading fast into big-time production.

The somber prospect is that the international traffickers will get their claws deep in the country's opium business before the Shah can get his country out of it.

OMINOUS TREND: YOUNG PEOPLE ON "POT TRAIL" GRADUATE TO NARCOTICS SMUGGLING

(By John Hughes)

KABUL, AFGHANISTAN.—All along the "pot trail" the story is the same.

From Istanbul an American girl mails her friends a few hashish-plant leaves "for a joke." Turkish authorities do not find it so funny. They jail her for three years for narcotics possession, with another 10 years for exporting.

A Peace Corps worker saves a Norwegian hippie's life. The Norwegian tried to jump off a building while on a "trip."

An American dope addict goes on a shooting spree, killing three Turkish policemen and wounding seven other people before he is himself shot and killed.

In Thailand a young American, already jailed on a narcotics offense, seriously mutilates himself with a razor blade while on a "trip." Thai authorities give him medical treatment, but resist American Embassy pleas for his release.

Into the American Embassy in Afghanistan staggers a young girl. Her mind is "blown" by drugs. She is pregnant. She has been used as a prostitute for months. In response to the embassy's cabled appeal for help, her parents disown her.

STORY GROWS COMPLICATED

The length of the "pot trail" is littered with tragedies such as these. They are by no means unrepresentative. All are traceable to narcotics.

Drug usage by these youthful wanderers through Asia and the Middle East is often tragic enough. But the story does not end there. A new and more serious factor is the extent to which many are trafficking in narcotics across international borders.

Some have been recruited by big-time narcotics merchants to smuggle drugs into the United States on a professional basis. One such team of couriers is working for a narcotics ring on the American West Coast. They carry round-the-world tickets. They stay at luxury hotels like the Intercontinental in Karachi. If caught, bail and legal defense are quickly forthcoming. They keep quiet. They do not tell the name of their employer.

At present, hashish is the main merchandise they carry. Derived from the resin of the cannabis plant and with much more "kick" than marijuana, it fetches hefty prices on the American market.

Earlier this year, American customs agents made one of their biggest hashish hauls ever at Boston's Logan Airport. Ripping into wooden crates of musical instruments airfreighted from India, they found false bottoms filled with 600 pounds of hashish. Smart follow-up work by Indian customs officials and police uncovered another 745 pounds in New Delhi, ready for shipment.

The focus of this series is mainly on "hard"

drugs like heroin. But the booming hashish trade is ominous. Hashish users are formerly marijuana smokers seeking a stronger "kick." When hashish begins to pall, it is to the "hard" drugs that the confirmed user must next look.

BIG-TIME PROSPECTS LOOM

If the demand for opium increases, or traditional sources are pinched off, experts foresee Afghanistan leaping into the big-time illicit narcotics business.

Technically illegal in Afghanistan, opium production is rife, particularly in such provinces as Badakhshan, Herat, and Nanghar. Already, perhaps 150 tons a year is smuggled over the border into Iran. Across Afghanistan's border with Pakistan, wild Pathan tribesmen roam with contemptuous disregard for authority, running opium, guns, gold, transistor radios, and whatever else makes money.

If the demand for Afghan opium (and its end product, heroin) grows in the West, the channels for smuggling already are being established. The hippie hashish couriers are paving the way.

The International Narcotics Control Board of the United Nations says it is "much disquieted" by the opium situation in Afghanistan. The Afghan Government admits that illicit production is beyond its control. But, says Foreign Ministry spokesman Amanulah Hasrat, "We don't have the equipment for detection and control. We need help, and we've appealed to the United Nations."

If opium production is to be wiped out in Afghanistan, the whole economy needs a sharp uplift. So far, there is no sign of the kind of broad, foreign-aided program that would make that possible.

The "pot trail" begins in Europe and winds down through the lands where drugs are cheap and easy to come by: Turkey, Lebanon, Iran, Afghanistan. Kabul, the Afghan capital and a haven for drug users, is known as the "Big K."

The trail continues through the Khyber Pass to Pakistan and on through India to Nepal, another pothead paradise. For some, the trail goes even farther, to Thailand and Laos.

EASY PROFITS TEMPTING

Surging back and forth along this trail, on foot, hitchhiking, or by train or rickety bus, are thousands of young people from Europe and the United States. Some are students, seeing the world during vacation time. Others are hippies, beaded flower children, and dropouts from society, with no plans to go home. Not all are potheads.

But users and nonusers alike are tempted by the quick profits to be made from smuggling a kilo or two of drugs from a country where the supply is great to one where demand is high.

They move through countries where, despite official tut-tutting, the attitude toward narcotics is largely permissive. Drugs come easier than chewing gum.

Outside the Afghan capital of Kabul, the opium poppy sprouts in valleys almost within eyesight of government ministries. In adjacent Pakistan, children buy opium both from government-licensed dealers and illegal merchants.

Government spokesmen argue that drug taking is alien to local culture and has been stimulated by the inflow of Western hippies. Says one Pakistani official: "We are still modernizing ourselves. Alcohol and narcotics are equally taboo in our society."

Nevertheless some government officials in Pakistan themselves smoke hashish. So do Army generals in Afghanistan. Technically illegal, hashish is nevertheless readily available. At one party in the Pakistani capital of Islamabad, the host sent out for a kilo. The price: $15.

Hashish (known as "charas" in India and Pakistan) is the more potent product of the cannabis plant, derived from the resin. But the milder cannabis leaf ("bhang") is not controlled. Ground up with almond and pistachio, and diluted with milk, it is guzzled by the gallon.

TRUCK DRIVERS INVOLVED

Pakistani truck drivers are usually good for a couple of lumps of hashish. Their transport network makes it easy for them to move it from one end of the country to the other. They also use it themselves. One explained:

"The only way we can make any money is by driving round the clock. We use hashish to stay awake at night."

Hospitable policemen in both Afghanistan and Pakistan sometimes offer hippies a joint of "hash."

With this lax approach to drug use, some hippies have scented easy money for little risk. A couple of kilos of hashish, bought cheaply in Pakistan or Afghanistan, may fetch enough in the United States to support them for a couple of years. Some students have sought to finance their college studies with the profits from hashish smuggling.

GROUND RULES VARY

In many cases, the risk is greater than they imagined. Some countries are easy-going on drug users but throw the book at traffickers. Some countries still give a wrist slap for narcotics offenses. But others like Iran have introduced capital punishment—and apply it.

Some governments are particularly rough on foreigners. They go looking for them to show that foreigners, and not local citizens, are responsible for their narcotics problem. Often the pusher who sells drugs to the foreigner tips off the police.

In Pakistan—a good source of hashish—penalties for trafficking are still light. Karachi's police chief, Deputy Inspector General Mahommed Yusuf Orakzai, says he thinks they should be tougher. But at present, an offender spends only a few months in jail.

In Afghanistan, the foreigner caught trafficking by customs officers may simply be given a scare, then get sent on his way. Some hippies found with drugs at Kabul Airport have got off with a night at the police station, seizure of their baggage, and expulsion on the next plane.

The story is much different in Turkey, Lebanon, and other countries where a foreigner may get 10 years to life imprisonment for trafficking in narcotics.

More than 400 Americans are currently in foreign jails for narcotics offenses. The conditions are often indescribable. Cells are overcrowded, filthy, ridden with rats. Food is foul. Homosexual assault is common. Parole and remission of sentence are rare. Says one observer in Lebanon:

"In this country they don't give prisoners time off for good behavior. They give them more time for bad behavior."

Foreign embassies can do little when their citizens fall foul of the narcotics laws in such countries. Though harassed by influential parents, congressmen, and senators, American consular officials explain that there is little alternative but for American youths to serve their sentences.

SPREADING THE WORD

What some governments are trying to do is drive home in advance to young travelers the omnious consequence of drug smuggling. In British and American embassies, notices warn visitors of the penalties. Visitors collecting mail are given similar information slips. In some countries there now are warning boards at the borders.

Last year the American consul general in Istanbul devised a plan to warn American hippies that Istanbul was not a "friendly and congenial place" for drug users and traffickers.

A retired Peace Corps worker circulated in hippie haunts explaining legal risks and penalties. He probably saved a number of Americans from being arrested. The American embassy in Spain sent one of its officers on a similar educational tour of hippie-frequented areas.

With many hippies, the narcotics smuggling is relatively small-scale stuff.

In Pakistan, hashish comes in a sole-shaped pack about half an inch thick. The hippie tries to get through customs hiding a kilo for himself, and perhaps a kilo or two to sell.

Methods are amateur. Many hide hashish in their portable transistor radios. But the word has gone out to customs officers. Now that is often the first place they look.

Many hippies travel barefoot, or in sandals. One with boots may have his heels full of hashish.

Others roll hashish in their prayer beads. Or stuff it in the back of picture frames.

One Dutch hippie in Afghanistan was even caught with a plaster cast on his foot full of hashish.

PROS ENLARGE SHIPMENTS

As the professionals take over, the shipments get bigger. Recently Pakistani police found 160 pounds of hashish stuffed in a leather Oriental cushion, consigned as part of a furniture shipment. Other shipments range up to 60 or 70 kilos.

A bomb scare at Beirut Airport cost one syndicate two suitcases full of hashish. Carried by a girl courier en route to Geneva from Kabul, the bags were held by Lebanese airport officials for additional excess baggage charges.

Then a bomb scare triggered a luggage search. Police found no bombs—but did get the hashish.

Here and there, the professionals lose a shipment. But there are loopholes and contradictions enough in the narcotics laws of different countries for them to weave their way through. Professional traffickers are usually better able to exploit these than the amateur, hippie smuggler caught with a kilo or two of hash.

India, for example, has been complimented on its opium-control system. Some 170,000 Indian farmers grow opium legally, according to D. P. Anand, chairman of the Central Board of Exise. They sell it to the state, which makes $10 million a year shipping it abroad for legitimate, medical purposes. For higher yields per acre, the farmers get more money. This incentive system has apparently done much to curb illicit diversion.

Foreign law-enforcement officers are enthusiastic about the thoroughness of Indian police on major antinarcotic investigations.

Yet hashish flows like a tidal race through India from neighboring Nepal. From the seaport of Calcutta it is shipped clandestinely to destinations all over the world. The Indian Government makes representations to Nepal.

But these are muted because India's relations with Nepal are delicate and nurtured. Just the other side of Nepal lies Communist China. It too is wooing the border-straddling country.

SUNFLOWERS SUBSTITUTED

In Lebanon, authorities have cut back heroin production. In hopes of eradicating cannabis production of hashish, the government has substituted sunflowers. Their seeds, for vegetable oil, fetch good prices. Lebanon has won international plaudits for its enterprise.

Mahmoud el-Banna, director general of the internal-security force, says he hopes cannabis will be completely wiped out by next year. But influential Lebanese politicians are substantial landowners in the cannabis-growing area around Baalbek.

Sunflowers are certainly being grown—but in between them are rows of cannabis. Some experts say this year's cannabis crop is a bumper one.

In countries like Pakistan and Afghanistan the narcotics trafficker who gets caught serves only a short sentence, perhaps only pays a fine, before he is back in illegal business. One American found smuggling out two kilos of hashish in his shoes was told by Pakistani customs officers: "Next time, don't carry so much."

Without tighter laws and stiffer sentences, the narcotics flow out of this part of the world seems destined to continue and probably grow.

THAILAND: "FOUR-LANE" DRUG HIGHWAY

(By John Hughes)

BANGKOK, THAILAND.—Opium pours through Thailand. It is grown in unreachable and little-controlled areas of Burma, Laos, and Yunnan province in Communist China. Some also is grown in Thailand. In these countries narcotics trafficking involves people in high places.

For the junk merchants of Southeast Asia, Thailand is the corridor through which their illegal merchandise must pass to Hong Kong and the lucrative markets of America.

But to many, Thailand seems less a corridor than a four-lane highway down which narcotics shipments roll with ease.

Of course, there are tolls. The police must be paid off. Experts in the business say the going price is $5 per kilo of opium at each of five checkpoints between the opium-growing borderlands of the north and the capital city of Bangkok. But $25 a kilo in payoffs is small enough overhead in a business where the profit rolls in by hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Some Thai officials are clearly in this business up to their elbows. One recent incident illustrates the point.

Thai residents of a Bangkok suburb noted suspicious activity at a godown (warehouse) in their neighborhood. A helicopter kept fluttering down. There was furtive unloading. They told the police and the police, suspecting an illegal liquor racket, raided the warehouse. Instead of liquor, they found it stocked with fresh opium.

The embarrassing point of the story is that in Thailand only the border police and the Army operate helicopters.

In earlier years, the opium traffic in Thailand was practically a monopoly of the police. Involvement in the trade extended into the Cabinet. Just where it stops today is difficult to state. Says one Thai official warningly: "There's a line above which you cannot investigate the business."

Publicly the government has set itself against the opium traffic. Thailand has 200,000 drug addicts of its own. Heroin addiction is increasing sharply, particularly among young Thais. This government is, as a United Nations report puts it, "alive to the problem."

It has cut back imports of acetic anhydride, a necessary agent for processing heroin. An Anti-Narcotic Drugs Association has been set up to combat addiction. There are drug seizures by the Thai police. But the UN report concludes gloomily that the "situation has not materially improved" in recent years and has even been "exacerbated."

THAI OUTPUT RATED LOW

The Thais argue that their country is a transit route for illicit narcotics and that their neighbors are much bigger opium producers than they are.

The argument is valid. Of the 400 to 600 tons of opium which comes out of Southeast Asia each year, Burma and Laos grow the bulk. Thailand produces only between 15 and 50 tons. In Burma the government is incapable of halting production, while in Laos the Army is engaged in the opium traffic and the Air Force helps transport the crop.

For much of this production, Thailand is the conduit. Some Thais are profiting handsomely from the passage of opium through their country. Law-enforcement officers elsewhere in Asia are divided as to how much more the Thai Government could do to pinch off the traffic. Some credit Thai authorities with increased effort.

Others are harsher in their judgments. Says the narcotics chief of one Southeast Asian country:

"There are only three main routes running down Thailand. If they really wanted to, the Thais could stop a lot more narcotics."

So far as the United States is concerned, Southeast Asia till now has been a minor producer for the American heroin market. Eighty percent of American heroin originates in Turkey. Perhaps another 15 percent comes from Mexico. Experts calculate that the remaining 5 percent comes from Southeast Asia.

Now some think they may have underestimated the Southeast Asian figure.

One obvious danger: as American pressure cuts back production in countries like Turkey and Mexico, the demand for opium and heroin out of Thailand will grow. The morphine content of Southeast Asian opium is lower than that of Turkish. But the price is competitive with the European product.

International narcotics rings are already buying export-quality heroin in Bangkok at $2,250 a kilo for shipment to the United States. Once there, its wholesale value jumps to more than $10,000 a kilo. By the time it is "cut," or diluted, with milk, sugar, and quinine, it will fetch $225,000 in individual shots.

The opium road in Southeast Asia begins in rugged hill country where four countries converge: Thailand, Laos, Burma, and Communist China. Borders are ill defined. Across them roam the Meos and the Yaos in Laos and Thailand, the Karens and the Shans from Burma.

They practice primitive slash-and-burn agriculture. They know little about the glittering world of Bangkok, let alone the junkie's way of life in New York City.

What they do know is that for growing opium poppies they can get the old Burmese silver coins which represent affluence in their society.

The opium seeds are planted in August. They need little weeding or care. By December or January the plant has grown to about 4 feet. The poppy flowers. The pink, white, and mauve petals fall.

BURMA IS TOP PRODUCER

Then the remaining pods are slit, not horizontally as in Turkey, but vertically with a three-pronged knife. The resin which oozes out is allowed to harden overnight. Next morning it is scraped off.

Most of the crop comes from Burma. The Burmese Government talks bravely of stamping out the production. The problem is that the opium grows in tribal areas over which the Rangoon government has little control. Tribesmen in northeast Burma move their opium crop out over jungle trails directly into Laos and Thailand.

If their government in Rangoon poses no threat, there are nevertheless other hazards along the route.

This is wild and lawless country. The opium moves in caravans of 50 to a 100 ponies and is worth a great deal. There is the danger of attack and hijacking by rival groups. Thus the caravans go heavily armed and protected, with escorts carrying machine guns and sometimes mortars.

Dominating the protection business are Chinese Nationalist soldiers left over from the war with the Communists.

They hire out units 100- to 200-strong to guard the opium caravans winding their way into Thailand. They bring forceful persuasion to bear on opium runners who try to do without their services.

A few years ago small-scale warfare broke out between the Chinese and tribesmen over opium dues. Casualties were heavy. Fighting spilled into Laos and ended only after air strikes by T-28's of the Lao Air Force.

The Laotians are not entirely disinterested parties. They, too, are deeply engaged in the opium business. Their hill tribes have long grown the opium poppy and continue to do so. At about 180 tons a year, it is the poverty-stricken country's best export.

One problem is that the tribesmen who grow it in the non-Communist part of Laos are some of the most effective resistance fighters against North Vietnamese and Pathet Lao troops in the Communist-held areas. These tribesmen are the special allies of the United States Central Intelligence Agency. Clearly the CIA is not eager to alienate them by demanding they stop growing the opium, which has become part of their tribal culture and livelihood.

MOVEMENT BY MILITARY

The Lao Army is deep in the money-spinning opium business, and Lao Air Force planes transport opium. Some private pilots say the Air Force's opium runs are made with CIA "protection."

During this year's Communist offensive, the military cut back on its opium activities. The main reason was not, according to one well-placed source, because they were preoccupied with the Communists. It was concern lest a wave of newspaper correspondents, in town for the crisis, got wind of the opium operations.

The Communists in Laos must be beset by a similar situation. Tribesmen in their areas are of the same culture and inclination as those in the non-Communist regions. It is difficult to imagine the Communists have persuaded them to abandon the opium poppy.

The same problem presumably challenges the Chinese Communists in their province of Yunnan.

In Peking, the Communist regime has imposed stiff penalties for drug usage and illegal production. But that Peking can effectively police the opium growers of Yunnan seems doubtful. There must also be substantial authorized production for the medicinal needs of more than 700 million Chinese. This affords the opportunity for diversion to illegal use. Thus China undoubtedly makes its contribution to the illegal narcotics traffic.

But there is no evidence of a massive and calculated campaign by Peking to flood non-Communist countries with debilitating narcotics. Some Westerners have charged the Chinese with just such a plan. But interviews with hundreds of narcotics experts in the past five months have failed to produce the proof.

Says one non-American expert: "With their U–2's, their satellites, the Americans would soon have evidence of any large-scale opium production in China. Presumably they would be happy to make it public. Certainly, drugs come out of China. But there's no proof the Peking regime is organizing it all."

Thus the opium comes down the trails through Burma and Laos. Some bypasses Thailand. It is flown out of Laos by pilots of fortune of various nationalities operating a fictitious airline called "Air Opium." Some cargoes are dropped in watertight bags in the Gulf of Siam and picked up by rendezvousing ships. Others are flown into Vietnam. Opium worth $100 a kilo in Bangkok sells for three times the price in Saigon.

But the bulk of the opium heads on into Thailand. The town of Tak is a main collection center. Other shipments funnel into Chiang Rai and Chiang Mai. After that the destination is Bangkok, or sometimes on down the Malaysian Peninsula. Small boats operating from islands off Malaysia move the cargoes onward from there.

Some opium is packaged specifically for smoking. Addicts in Southeast Asia have favorite brands, like Lucky and OK. A packet of Lucky brand I handled was colorfully labeled, with its own promotional advertising in Chinese.

CONVERSION INTO MORPHINE

Part of the opium crop is converted into morphine base at crude laboratories in northern Thailand. Then, about a tenth the weight of the original opinion, it moves on in yellow block form bearing the "999" stamp distinctive to morphine from the Southeast Asia region.

In Bangkok's twin city of Thonburi is hidden a clandestine laboratory which converts morphine to heroin. Local addicts buy red or purple, or No. 3, heroin, about 60 to 70 percent pure. White, or No. 4, heroin is purer and of export grade. This is destined for the American market.

White heroin is smuggled to the United States by couriers on commercial or military flights. Purple heroin, morphine, and opium destined for such local markets as Hong Kong travels by sea. Usually it goes on deep-sea trawlers from a fishing port near Bangkok.

How to reduce the traffic?

A decision by Lao atuhorities to get out of the opium business would help. More vigorous action by the Thai Government against traffickers would contribute.

A United Nations survey recommends upgrading the living standards of the hill tribes and substituting cash crops like peas, tobacco, tea, and coffee for opium. But this is a long-term program and would cost millions. With present uncertainties in Indo-China, great areas of opium-growing country would remain unreachable.

For the moment, eradiction seems unattainable. Hope must be placed on seizures by Asian narcotics officers and on American narcotics agents assigned to such cities as Bangkok, Singapore, Saigon, and Hong Kong to gather and coordinate intelligence on traffickers. The other part of the solution lies in the education and reform of drug-users themselves.

But that is another story.

HONG KONG'S THRIVING OPIUM TRAFFIC: FOCAL POINT FOR FAR EAST NARCOTICS

(By John Hughes)

HONG KONG.—Sleet slashes down. Wind whips the wave tops into frenzied spray. On the heaving waters of the South China Sea, the government launch rolls, tosses, pitches, and shakes itself free of the sea with a series of tormented shudders.

In the wheelhouse, the Preventive Service officers, clinging to handgrips, can barely see the outlines of Hong Kong island behind them. But for the moment their interest does not lie landward. It is concentrated on the deep-sea trawler wallowing several hundred yards ahead.

The trawler is from Thailand. It carries an illicit cargo of opium and morphine. But it is steaming carefully outside Hong Kong's territorial waters. It will continue to do so as long as the Preventive Service launch is on scene. On its present course, the trawler cannot be searched by Hong Kong authorities.

Eventually, out of sheer exhaustion on part of the crew and for want of fuel and supplies, the Preventive Service launch will have to head for home.

Then the trawler will make its bid. The tactics vary.

The Thai vessel may rendezvous at sea with a Hong Kong fishing junk owned or chartered by narcotics traffickers. More than 10,000 such junks move constantly through Hong Kong's coastal waters.

The trawler may run its cargo ashore on one of the more than 200 small islands lying within the Hong Kong territory. Later, from a deserted beach, the shipment will be picked up by a local fishing boat.

Or the trawler may simply dump its illegal cargo at a prearranged spot in about 10 fathoms of water. The cargo will be sealed in water tight drums, weighing about 80 pounds apiece. Linked by strong rope or cable, they will lie hidden on the seabed.

After the trawler has gone, a Hong Kong junk will grapple for them, haul them in, and carry them into port.

Whichever plan is used, the junk making the final run into Hong Kong harbor will probably carry the narcotics slung beneath its hull. If the junk is challenged by a cruising Preventive Service launch, the ropes holding the cargo will be slashed. The compromising evidence will sink to the seabed, and the junk crew will be "clean."

SETTING ROMANTICIZED

Such are the frustrations confronting Preventive Service (customs) officers and detectives of the Royal Hong Kong Police Narcotics Bureau as they seek to stem the massive flow of illegal drugs into Hong Kong.

Perched on the rim of Communist China, Hong Kong has long been romanticized as the setting for all kinds of mysterious Oriental pursuits. Its narrow, winding streets are supposed to harbor espionage agents of many countries, smugglers, convicts-on-the-run, and kings and queens of vice. Some of the stories are true, some less accurate.

What is only too tragically correct, however, is that Hong Kong has been nurtured on the opium trade and is still today a focal point for the flow of narcotics throughout the Far East.

Its own addicts (80,000 in a population of 4 million) give Hong Kong one of the highest narcotics addiction rates in the world. To satisfy these alone, traffickers smuggle in each year more than 10 tons of opium and four tons of heroin (or the morphine base to make it).

But drugs are also transshipped through Hong Kong to other destinations in Asia, and to the profitable markets of the United States and Canadian west coasts. Couriers in one ring smuggling heroin from Hong Kong to the United States were former Austrialian policemen. The ring was cracked by Hong Kong detectives and American narcotics agents.

For the international trafficker, Hong Kong has a number of attractions. Six thousand oceangoing ships pass through its cluttered harbor each year. Dozens of planes land and take off each day from Kai Tak Airport. A free port, which must trade to live, it surges with merchandise. A hub of air and sea traffic in the Far East, it hosts thousands visiting tourists and businessmen each year.

All this activity is good cover for drug traffickers. Beyond this, Hong Kong is a free-currency area where foreign moneys are changed and transferred with ease. Payment for drugs can be switched to any currency and deposited with discretion at one of a string of Hong Kong banks.

DETECTION RISKED

The disadvantage of moving drugs through Hong Kong, rather than bypassing it, is that the shipment may be detected by local officials. The risk exists, but the odds are in the traffickers' favor.

Police seize only a fraction of what comes in. Last year, they seized neary $7 million worth of illegal narcotics in the colony. For them it was a particularly good year. Yet Hong Kong's addicts alone consumed an estimated $38 million worth of narcotics last year.

Nobody knows how much went out undetected and on to other markets. The flow from Southeast Asia across the Pacific to the United States is minor compared with American imports from Europe and the Near East.

But if the narcotics routes from Turkey and France to the United States are pinched off, the Asian traffic will pick up speed and volume.

Since early last century, Hong Kong has been deeply involved in the opium traffic.

Opium had been used in China for many years. But with the opening of the sea routes, European traders began delivering it by the shipload to the Chinese. The British dominated the profitable trade, selling to a ring of Chinese merchants in the port of Canton, north of Hong Kong.

When Chinese authorities tried to suppress the trade, violence led to the first Opium War. It ended with the treaty of Nanking in 1842, under which Britain got legal posession of Hong Kong.

Despite official British disapproval of the traffic thereafter, Hong Kong flourished as a center of the opium trade. Warehouses were built to house the opium crop imported from India. At one time 80 opium-carrying clipper ships were operating from the colony.

REFUGEES SWARM IN

With the colony's economy initially dependent on the opium business, it is hardly surprising that addiction to opium over the years has become widespread, although its sale has been illegal since 1946.

With the fall of China to the Communists, refugees from the mainland swamped the colony. Many found themselves helpless, and eventually hopeless, in an overcrowded and fiercely competitive society. They turned to narcotics for escape.

On hand, too, were drug traffickers eager to lead them beyond opium to more powerful narcotics like heroin. Refugees from China included heroin chemists from cities such as Shanghai. After fleeing the mainland, they simply set up shop again in Hong Kong.

Today, three-quarters of Hong Kong's narcotics addicts have forsaken opium for heroin. Usually they take red, or purple, heroin, which is 60 to 70 percent pure. Unlike high-grade white heroin, which is exported and injected into the addict's vein, red heroin is smoked in a method called "chasing the dragon."

With a base powder, usually barbitone, the heroin is heated on a piece of tinfoil. Then the addict inhales the fumes through a tube of rolled paper the size of a drinking straw. The mixture rolls back and forth on the foil. The fumes waver in the air as the addict chases them. Hence the name: "chasing the dragon."

NARCOTICS USE SPREADS

The problem now is that narcotics are no longer confined to the broken, the disillusioned, the coolie who sees little ahead but a decade of ricksha-pulling.

Ten percent of Hong Kong's addicts are under 19 years old. Some are affluent and educated. Expensive high schools, particularly those catering to children of wealthy Chinese families and the foreign community in Hong Kong, are concerned about circulation of amphetamines, barbiturates, and hallucinogenic drugs.

Today the addict is to be found not only in the clandestine opium "divans," or smoking places, but also in the discotheques and bars frequented by the swinging teen-age set.

Longtime Hong Kong residents sometimes suggest that behind this massive narcotics business is a "Mr. Big," a Chinese millionaire master criminal who controls the whole

Oriental drug network. "Mr. Big," it is suggested, hides behind a facade of respectability, living in spendor in a mansion high on Hong Kong's exclusive "Peak."

Veteran antinarcotics officers discount the theory. Superintendent G. J. Riddell of the police narcotics bureau says:

"There is no reason to believe one particular individual controls the traffic. There are many organizations in the field. They are well organized, efficiently run, and their members work under a strict code of discipline."

Narcotics officers have their own list of suspected narcotics bosses. Many of these "bosses" live high, with no visible income. The income comes, of course, from drug trafficking. But the bosses are cautious and do not incriminate themselves. Meantime, the police watch and wait.

Says one veteran police officer: "If there were a 'Mr. Big' in Hong Kong, there would be no need for the police to take care of him. The narcotics gangs are pretty rough boys. His rivals would take care of him for us."

ROUTES IDENTIFIED

Prominent in the narcotics business are the Chiu Chau. These are tough Chinese from the Swatow area of Fukien. They are conveniently spread throughout Thailand as well as Hong Kong. They have a built-in network for transporting opium and morphine from Thailand for consumption and transshipment in Hong Kong.

Experts in Hong Kong find little evidence that narcotics enter the colony directly from Communist China. Though some opium is probably grown in China's Yunnan Province, main source in Southeast Asia is the border area where Burma, Thailand, Laos, and China converge. Transit routes thereafter run through Thailand and the Malaysian peninsula to ports from which the illegal produce can be exported.

The cargo is usually opium, or morphine base for conversion into heroin in illicit Hong Kong laboratories.

Most make the journey by sea. Couriers on commercial airlines can carry only small amounts. Bulk drops by air off Hong Kong pose problems for the traffickers because the colony's radar tracks unidentified aircraft within a 200-mile radius.

Sea shipments vary. Freighters are full of hiding places. Seamen hide narcotics in tanks and hatches, steam pipes, and hollowed-out capstans.

Freighter cargoes offer the opportunity for smuggling bigger loads, but this requires more extensive organization, sometimes involving the establishment of dummy corporations and importing companies.

SHIPMENT SUSPECTED

Two of the biggest narcotics hauls ever made in Hong Kong were seized from just such cargoes.

Government agents became suspicious of a shipment of refrigerators from Malaysia. Ripping into them, they uncovered 1¼ tons of opium and morphine. In a separate cargo of bamboo poles, police found 3,000 pounds of opium.

With 6,000 ships calling at Hong Kong each year, the 200-man Preventive Service clearly faces a mammoth task spot checking ships. They have little hope of detecting anything but a percentage of narcotics on the water. But they devote special attention to vessels coming from "black" ports—ports like Bangkok and Singapore which are traditional shipment points for drugs.

Preventive Service officials also have developed a small but comprehensive research section which closely follows the pattern of trade through Hong Kong. They obtain cargo manifests in advance of a ship's arrival. They check out the shipper and the importer. They keep a tally on world prices. If movement of a particular consignment does not seem economic, or if the companies involved with it are suspect, the cargo gets special scrutiny.

Preventive Service officers say that by these methods they have reduced drug smuggling aboard oceangoing ships entering Hong Kong harbor.

"What we've done," say one, "is force the narcotics traffickers onto the beaches. They don't get as much in through the port now."

Whatever the merit of this claim, the most favored method of smuggling now is by trawler from Thailand. By one of the methods detailed earlier the trawler transfers its cargo in waters off Hong Kong and does not itself enter port.

Unless the Thais themselves crack down harder on their own traffickers, the key to drug smuggling at the Hong Kong end is the Hong Kong-based fishing boat. With thousands of these chugging through coastal waters each day, random checks turn up little.

What the police need is information. For leads on delivery times, rendezvous points, and transshipment arrangements, the narcotics bureau pays well. But the traffickers' security precautions are tight. A boatman hired to bring in a drug shipment will get little chance to tip off the police. If his bosses suspect him of informing, his body will be washed up one day on one of Hong Kong's outlying beaches.

REDUCTION OUTLOOK SLIM

Prospects of substantially reducing the drug traffic into and through Hong Kong do not look good. Some accuse the British colonial government of paying only lip service to solving the problem. A semiofficial survey last year revealed widespread public cynicism about the government's determination. Of the people questioned 86 percent believed the government could stop drug trafficking if it really wanted to.

Within the police narcotics bureau there are officers who feel it is the "poor relation" of the force. For the task set it, the Preventive Service works with slender resources.

Meanwhile, there are critics who believe much tougher action is required against convicted traffickers. The colony's leading newspaper, the South China Morning Post, earlier this year stated:

"There are maximum fines of $100,000 Hong Kong [$16,666 U.S.] and prison terms of 15 years. . . . But it is not just the scale of fines, but the level of fines imposed by the courts that will impress."

The newspaper was irate over the sentencing of a 22-year-old man for possession of narcotics. The evidence was discovered in his pocket by the parents of a 14-year-old girl found under the influence of drugs. The man got a fine of just $250 Hong Kong ($41 U.S.).

That kind of sentencing seems hardly likely to wipe out a narcotics business that in Hong Kong alone brings traffickers some $38 million a year.

UN HAS LITTLE POWER TO CURB TRAFFICKING: ONUS FOR ANTINARCOTIC ACTION RESTS ON INDIVIDUAL GOVERNMENTS

(By John Hughes)

GENEVA.—At first glimpse, Geneva seems far removed from the sordid world of the drug trafficker.

It is a city with all the well-ordered stability of the Swiss.

Parks are trim. Streets are spotless. Traffic flows without a hitch along the shores of Lac Léman. Officials are polite, hotel service impeccable.

Geneva's busy burghers are steeped in the traditions of industry, economy, propriety, and can hardly, one imagines, provide the local police force with much in the way of electrifying crime or midnight shenanigans.

Occasionally some African delegate to the United Nations swirls through town in a blaze of golden kente cloth. Or there is the flash of exotic Oriental silk on some Asian emissary to one or other of the international conferences to which Geneva plays host.

Yet this peaceful city is in one sense the headquarters of the international effort to cut back the world's narcotics traffic. The action takes place at the European headquarters of the United Nations, on the outskirts of the city.

LEGAL PRODUCTION TABULATED

This is the home of the UN's Commission on Narcotic Drugs, and of the International Narcotics Control Board. The commission is the UN's watchdog on narcotics. It drafts international treaties on narcotics and oversees their application. The International Control Board monitors legal production for medicinal purposes.

As the basis for their operations, the two agencies draw on a string of international conventions and agreements over the years, consolidated in the 1961 Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs. This agreement limits narcotics to medical and scientific use. It provides international supervision over production, trade, and possession.

Countries which legally produce raw narcotics are obliged to keep the control board informed of estimated production and stockpiles. The board also keeps close tabs on legal requirements throughout the world. When production exceeds demand, the board is supposed to negotiate cutbacks with the producing countries involved.

Valuable though all this may be, it does nothing to touch the vast illegal narcotics production. This production, according to the International Control Board, is "extensive and prolific" and "constitutes an enormous reserve."

Thus the UN assessment is gloomy.

Many narcotics-growing areas are remote and beyond the reach of their respective governments. In some countries, such as Laos, Burma, and Thailand, opium is the growers' livelihood, their sole cash crop.

A problem of this scale and intricacy, says the control board, will not yield to "peremptory treatment." It is too much to expect that progress toward its solution can be other than "very gradual indeed."

All this makes an early start more imperative. Both UN agencies involved in the antinarcotics campaign have repeatedly called on governments to tackle a problem which "year by year becomes more imperatively urgent."

Herein lies the rub. Though the UN agencies may have done good work, they are themselves toothless and without real power. The UN is no more than a collection of diverse governments. Upon the sincerity and energy of those individual governments depends the vigor with which the campaign against illegal production and trafficking is prosecuted.

USEFUL MACHINERY

Over the years the UN agencies have built up some useful antinarcotics machinery. UN laboratories at Geneva undertake important research. By analysis, chemists can detect which country, and sometimes which region, a specific shipment of narcotics came from.

Experts and chemists from different countries are brought to Geneva for periods of specialized training. The UN itself assigns experts in various phases of narcotics control to countries which welcome them.

The UN agencies are also able to exert pressure in their various reports. A country which does well in limiting narcotics production gets a public bouquet. Lebanon's attempts to replace hashish-producing cannabis with sunflowers has drawn warm com-

ment. India has been complimented for its incentive system of licensing under which its 170,000 opium farmers get higher rates for higher yields turned over to the state.

By contrast, the UN agencies have been thoroughly put out with Iran for resuming legal opium-production after banning it for 13 years. The International Narcotics Control Board called the decision a "sharp disappointment."

Afghanistan is another country rebuked. The control board says it is "much disquieted" by the extensive flow of illegal opium out of that country.

Nevertheless, diplomatic delicacies make the finger-pointing necessarily cautious.

As their weapons, the UN agencies have persuasion of member governments, publicity for defaulters, support and encouragement for countries making special efforts. These are slender weapons. If governments choose to ignore the UN's exhortations and injunctions, there is little in the way of UN muscle to make them comply.

The UN's own reports are littered with complaints from the Secretariat about governments which have failed to submit statistics on narcotics production, or whose reports are inadequate.

The control board reports bleakly that it is without information from Communist China (which creates a "lacuna of great importance") and North Vietnam. Some governments are late sending in their required reports. Others "fail for no apparent reason to reply, perhaps for several months, to requests from the board."

The control system, it warns, can only succeed "if all national administrations can be brought to a reasonable standard of efficiency and recognize that wholehearted participation is an obligation which they owe to others."

Despite cajoling, nudging, and judicious snapping, by the UN, it is thus upon individual governments that the responsibility for cutting back narcotics production primarily falls. Only one, that of the United States, has the inclination and the finance to send narcotics agents of its own beyond its own borders.

American agents are stationed in such cities as Paris, Marseilles, Rome, Istanbul, Beirut, Bangkok, Hong Kong, and Mexico City. In many other countries, the tendency is to dismiss the narcotics traffic as an "American problem." The argument is that as most illegal drugs are consumed in the United States, it is the responsibility of the United States, not the producing country, to halt the flow.

This attitude changes sharply when addiction figures soar at home. A number of West European countries now are taking much keener interest in the problem, following the discovery of a burgeoning addiction problem within their own borders.

TROUBLE IN SWEDEN

One country particularly afflicted by the use of synthetic drugs, especially the amphetamines, is Sweden. Swedish officials have reported to the UN Commission on Narcotic Drugs that a "grave situation" has been created in their country. Thousands of young Swedes are dissolving amphetamine tablets in water and taking them by intravenous injection. This, say the Swedes, has created "acute health problems."

According to the official Swedish report, the effect among many users has been one of "hyperactivity which was almost maniac, accompanied by feelings of omnipotence, and lack of judgment."

The Swedish report described users as becoming aggressive, roaming the streets, driving dangerously, causing accidents, and even attacking peaceful pedestrians.

Sweden has thus been one of the most vigorous proponents of a new international treaty to control the so-called psychotropic drugs—LSD, the amphetamines, and barbiturates. If enacted, this would place them under similar international control to that presently applied to opium and other "hard" drugs.

The UN Commission on Narcotic Drugs hammered out a draft treaty in Geneva early this year. This has been passed to the UN's Economic and Social Council. Next step would be a conference, early next year, to adopt the treaty. It could be in force within a year or two.

One controversial aspect is likely to be the control over barbiturates, or sleeping pills. Some countries with major pharmaceutical industries—the United States among them—are ready to argue that less stringent controls should be applied to barbiturates than to amphetamines and the hallucinogenic drugs like LSD.

Such measures as the new treaty on psychotropic drugs underline the constructive aspects of the UN role. But the UN can only draft the laws and guidelines. It has no power at its disposal to enforce them.

There is little prospect of the UN's becoming its own policeman of the international narcotics traffic. That puts the ball right back in the laps of individual governments.

U.S. AND MEXICO FIGHT TRAFFICKERS: OPERATION NOW UNDERWAY

(By John Hughes)

MEXICO CITY.—In the communications center, warning lights flicker. Electronics sensors, sown along the border, have detected infiltration across an isolated sector.

At the same time, a blip shows up on the edge of a radar screen. It is an unidentified aircraft coming in fast and low in the darkness. Buttons are punched. Telephones jangle. Messages are flashed to the Air Intelligence Center. A helicopter is sent clattering into the air to check the ground probe. A pursuit plane is launched to try to force down the incoming aircraft.

Vietnam? Not at all. All this is happening on the American side of the Mexican-United States border. The infiltrators are not North Vietnamese guerrillas, but Mexican "burros," or smugglers, trying to make it into the United States with an illicit load of narcotics.

The plane, chartered by narcotics traffickers and flown by an American mercenary, is trying to evade the border patrol's radar net. If it succeeds, it will put down at a remote airstrip with a full load of smuggled drugs for American addicts.

RUNNING FIGHT WAGED

Incursions like these are routine today along the United States' 1,800-mile border with Mexico. U.S. customs officers, border guards, and narcotics agents are waging a running war against traffickers intent on maintaining a massive illegal flow of drugs across America's southern border.

The contest is mostly uneven. Despite heightened effort and tightened security, the lawmen are spread thin. Wild terrain favors the smugglers. Much of the time it is the smugglers who win.

American and Mexican authorities seize some shipments and their increased effort has forced traffickers to vary their methods. As the heat is put on land and air routes across the border, there are indications that traffickers are making greater use of the sea-lanes.

Thousands of pleasure and fishing boats operate in the coastal waters off Southern California and in the Gulf of Mexico. Besides fish and weekend sailors, some carry narcotics.

One boat owner on the Mexican side of the border was propositioned recently by a California syndicate to run five tons of marijuana up the coast.

But for every shipmen. detected, many more get through. Across the Mexican border, narcotics flow into the United States like water through a broad-gauged sieve.

Fifteen percent of all heroin used in the United States comes from Mexico. All of Texas and California are served from Mexico. In the Mexican states of Sonaloa, Durango, Sonora, Nayarit, and Chihuahua, some 2,000 peasants grow opium illegally.

Converted into heroin in clandestine laboratories, it is smuggled across the border at such crossing points as San Ysidro, Calexico, Nogales, El Paso, Eagle Pass, and Laredo. From the American border towns it is quickly moved on to San Diego, Los Angeles, Denver, Phoenix, Albuquerque, Houston, Fort Worth, and Dallas.

Mexico is also a transshipment point for heroin from France en route to the United States. European heroin comes in by sea through the eastern part of Veracruz, or by air through Mexico City. Then it is smuggled north and on to cities on the U.S. Eastern seaboard, usually New York.

Mexico supplies most marijuana, or "pot," used in the United States.

Marijuana grows everywhere in Mexico, but particularly in the states of Guerrero, Jalisco, Sinaloa, and Tamaulipas. More potent than American-grown marijuana, it finds a ready market. Some experts say as much as 1,000 tons a year floods across the border.

A presidential task force concluded recently that the "ready availability" of Mexican marijuana has "significantly affected the increase in drug abuse" in the United States.

Major road route for narcotics on the Mexican side of the border is via Route 15 to Santa Ana in the state of Sonora. Then the traffic moves on up Route 15 to Nogales or via Route 2 western Arizona and California.

DISTRIBUTION SKETCHED

In the United States, San Diego and Los Angeles have become marijuana distribution points for the rest of the country.

Mexico is also a transit point for cocaine shipments to the United States from Latin America, primarily Bolivia and Peru. Also in the narcotics package moved across the border are amphetamines and barbiturates. Sometimes these are produced in Mexico itself. Ironically, some are made in the United States. Exported legally to Mexico, they are being illegally smuggled back into the United States for use by addicts.

Despite increased vigilance by law-enforcement officers, narcotics traffickers are still moving most of their merchandise over land routes into the United States.

Much travels blatantly by car through regular checkpoints on main highways across the border.

THE JUNK MERCHANTS—INTERNATIONAL NARCOTICS TRAFFIC

Thousands of American tourists and thousands of Mexican workers cross the border each day. They are impossible to screen.

Says one top narcotics agent:

"You can't search every truck and car. What you need is inside information about a specific shipment. Without it, a lot obviously gets through."

Thus the innocent-looking weekend camper, the visitor to a Mexican bullfight, the serviceman heading for Tijuana could each carry a couple of kilos of heroin back to the United States, or even a trunkload of marijuana.

Other loads are carried across the border on foot by Mexican "burros," or smugglers. They choose remote, unfenced sectors and slip through under the cover of darkness. These, however, are lowly couriers considered expendable by the big-time traffickers. They have little inside knowledge of the organizations for which they work. Their capture

rarely imperils the major racketeers.

The traffickers have a much heavier investment in drug cargoes slipped across the border by private aircraft. These planes are generally rented or leased in the United States and flown to makeshift airstrips in Mexico to pick up shipments of narcotics.

Their pilots weave their way through mountain passes, or fly low at night, in an effort to evade detection. Once back in the United States, they land on highways, or at little-used country airports, or air-drop their cargoes at prearranged points.

The U.S. Immigration and Customs services operate a number of aircraft along the lengthy border, but most are for observation, and only a few have pursuit capability. However, dossiers on suspect pilots are continually updated at the Air Intelligence Center in Yuma, Ariz., where files are kept on more than 73,000 private aircraft and pilots.

RESOURCES CALLED INADEQUATE

Now there is a new factor. This is the prospect of increased smuggling through coastal waters. Thousands of pleasure boats clutter harbors in southern California. They are difficult to police and slip back and forth between Mexico and their home ports with little hindrance.

Alarmed by the drug flow from Mexico, the Nixon administration last year launched a campaign to cut back the traffic. A top-level task force presented President Nixon with a somber report, Narcotics smuggling across the Mexican border, it warned, was "increasing at an alarming rate." The problem, it said, was becoming "more serious and of greater magnitude."

Despite American encouragement, declared the task force's report bluntly, Mexican resources and effort "continue to be inadequate in the face of the problem."

The task force made several recommendations for increased security and surveillance along the U.S.-Mexican border. Soon after, the United States Government launched Operation Intercept, a much-publicized experiment in which travelers to the United States from Mexico were subjected to intensified search at the border. Cars were stacked up for hours on end. Normal traffic was disrupted.

The experiment was short lived. Clearly no professional traffickers sent shipments through the checkpoints when they were under such close scrutiny.

But the object of Operation Intercept was not so much to arrest drug-smuggling amateurs, as to jog the Mexican Government itself into action. In this respect, it succeeded.

Operation Intercept was quickly superseded by Operation Cooperation. The United States and Mexican Governments agreed on a bilateral program to cut back the drug traffic. Government liaison at high level has continued since.

While the United States has tightened security on its side of the border, the Mexicans have pledge to hunt traffickers on their side and step up campaigns to eliminate their opium and marijuana crops.

Since the agreement, Mexican police have publicized a number of seizures. Public bonfires of captured marijuana have been ostensibly lit. Mexican Attorney-General Julio Sanchez Vargas said recently 165 tons of marijuana have been confiscated since the start of Operation Cooperation.

Mexican police smashed a heroin ring in Tijuana and put a heroin laboratory out of business.

The Mexican Army has launched drives, with up to 10,000 soldiers sweeping through the mountains in search of illicit marijuana and opium planations. Planes have dropped leaflets to farmers in remote areas, warning them to get out of the narcotics business.

LONG STRUGGLE SEEN

The United States is making available aircraft, sensing devices, and various other kinds of equipment to help the Mexicans in their drive.

All this is welcome progress. But the flow of drugs across the border has to date shown no appreciable decline.

Experts believe Mexico faces a long, hard struggle against the narcotics producers and traffickers. Despite the penalties, marijuana and opium are cash crops for Mexican peasants hard put to make ends meet.

One problem is the slender size of the police force dealing with narcotics offenders in Mexico. Enforcement of federal narcotics laws is the responsibility of the Federal Judicial Police, or Federales. These number some 250 men, and only a handful of these are on narcotics duty. Local police forces sometimes refuse to cooperate with the Federales on narcotics cases.

As with many poor countries, there is the problem of corruption among the police. Some policemen, though ill paid, wear well-cut suits and own luxurious houses which clearly could not have been financed on their official salaries.

Says one high-placed Mexican: "If you've got money in this country, you can carry on any racket. And if you get caught, you can get off. It depends who you know, and how much you pay."

Another problem is political uncertainty which is hindering implementation of the antinarcotics program. In January, Luis Echeverra is expected to become Mexico's new president. But in the meantime there is hesitation in government circles about launching Mexico on a program which could undergo major revision and change in January.

Personnel trained now might well be replaced early next year by other appointees. The program's direction and emphasis could shift.

Despite Mexico's declared good intentions, factors such as these make experts skeptical of any dramatic cutback in the flow of drugs across the United States's southern border.

REFORM OF ADDICT WILL CURB TRAFFICKING: "SOLUTION TO HIS PROBLEM MUST BE A METAPHYSICAL ONE"

(By John Hughes)

WASHINGTON.—In the course of this series I have talked with hundreds of people deeply involved with the international narcotics traffic.

On the one hand there have been pushers, junkies, Mafia types. On the other there have been undercover narcotics agents, doctors, police chiefs, government officials.

The interview which stands out above all others, however, is one which took place on a spring day in the Swiss city of Geneva, the United Nations European headquarters.

A senior international civil servant, with long experience in the narcotics field, was analyzing the problem.

"In the long run," he said reflectively, "the solution must be worked out on the metaphysical level. Programs to cut back the flow of drugs are important. Those of us involved in them are fascinated by the technique. But this is basically cops-and-robbers stuff.

"It all ends up with the user, the addict. The solution to his problem must be a metaphysical one. He has to work out the riddle: what is man? And can he find himself through drugs?

"The drug is no more than a placebo. Medical experiments show you can get the same effect on a user by injecting ordinary water. What the addict is seeking is escape, and the ultimate escape into oblivion is suicide. Many of them attempt this. But clearly, it's not the answer."

CRUX OF PROBLEM INDICATED

Five months of investigation into the narcotics traffic around the world lead one to a similar conclusion: that the crux of the problem is the education and regeneration of the actual user—and perhaps, too, of the society which contributes to his degradation.

At the other end of the pipeline, much more can be done to eliminate the sources of narcotics. More can be done, too, to disrupt the traffic en route to major consuming areas like the United States and Western Europe.

But if one looks to these two aspects alone, the prospect of substantially reducing, let alone eliminating, drug addiction is dismal. As long as there is a market, the junk merchants will somehow get some of their high-paying "merchandise" through.

The gloomiest of those in the antinarcotics business argue that without reform of the addict, successful disruption of the narcotics traffic would create crisis in such countries as the United States. Says one:

"We'll get drugstores held up, and doctors and hospitals will be robbed as addicts try to get their hands on anything they can."

Whether or not this picture is overdrawn, elimination of the illegal inflow of narcotic drugs seems hardly an early prospect.

Opium is still pouring out of Turkey, the main source of naturally produced narcotics for the American and West European markets. Despite government promises to get out of the business, Turkey still produces opium legally for medical needs. Along with this goes a massive flow of illegally grown opium, which the government has proved unable to halt.

Turkish politics complicates the issue. Prime Minister Suleyman Demirel is under public fire. He needs all the support he can get, and he is unlikely to alienate 110,000 Turkish opium farmers just at this moment by banning their principal crop.

France, whose clandestine laboratories around Marseille turn opium and morphine into heroin for the American market, is the other big offender. The French have promised a more vigorous drive against narcotics traffickers, but the resources and manpower of their police narcotics squads are slender. Promises have yet to become reality.

OTHER COUNTRIES INVOLVED

While 80 percent of heroin used in the United States comes from Turkey and France, Mexico cuts itself a substantial 15 percent share of the American heroin market.

The Mexican Government, too, has pledged itself to eliminate opium crops and cut back the narcotics flow into the United States. But these good intentions are snarled in a web of bureaucracy, lethargy, and corruption. So far there has been no significant decline in drug traffic across the border.

Should these traditional sources be eliminated, growers and traffickers have stockpiled enough narcotics to keep the existing market supplied for several years.

New sources beyond this are not difficult to pinpoint. The flow of opium out of Afghanistan is practically uncontrolled and could be expanded.

Iran, once one of the world's major opium producers, is back in the legal business after banning opium production for 13 years. Despite harsh penalties for trafficking, legal production will probably mean some diversion to the illegal market.

Beyond this are the opium-growing lands of Burma, Laos, and Thailand. American syndicates are already showing interest in this Southeast Asian source.

As for cannabis, the plant which provides

marijuana and hashish, this sprouts like a weed in countries throughout the world.

Against this background, top narcotics agents are cautious in their claims for the future. Not a single one I have talked to speaks of total eradication. Says one agent:

"The best we can hope for is to disrupt the traffic, to keep the producers and the traffickers off balance. The rest of the job has to be done at home."

CROSS SECTION OF EXPERT OPINION

This is not to say that disrupting the traffic is not important. Here, extracted from a cross section of expert opinion, are some moves that might help:

1. A bigger role for the United Nations. Member nations are never likely to give the UN a policeman's assignment, with UN narcotics agents deployed operationally. But the UN could do more to replace opium with better, cash-paying crops.

Afghanistan says it would welcome UN help—although it is reluctant to make any contribution of its own. One way to reduce opium growing in backward countries is to uplift the economy in general. The UN could assist.

This involves a great deal of money, and thus a far deeper commitment on the part of member nations to narcotics eradication. It is also a long-term project.

2. More pressure on major offending countries. Some of this could come from the UN. Says one narcotics expert:

"If the UN had been tougher about Turkey earlier, we would be further ahead than we are today."

Most of the pressure now comes from the United States. John E. Ingersoll, the dynamic director of the United States Justice Department's Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, has spoken out publicly and bluntly about Turkey's performance. Those around him believe he will not stop there. Says a U.S. narcotics agent:

"The time has come to stop being nice guys around the world. This problem is too serious."

But though President Nixon is personally enthusiastic about the antinarcotics campaign, other U.S. Government agencies have differing priorities.

Turkey may be the source of murderous heroin, but it plays a key role in NATO. It has a strategic position in the eastern Mediterranean at a time when Soviet influence and military power in the area are expanding fast. The State Department does not want the present Turkish administration ruffled.

DEVELOPMENT LOAN AUTHORIZED?

Therefore the White House has just reportedly authorized a new $40 million development loan to Turkey. Narcotics officials would like to see that kind of money used to exert leverage on the Turks to hasten their exit from the opium business.

More overt pressure from countries other than the United States might also help. But these have so far tended to dismiss the narcotics traffic as primarily an American problem. This may change. Some of these countries now have discovered they too have serious addiction problems.

3. Strengthening of antinarcotics agencies. In the United States this is being done, largely as the result of public concern over the narcotics problem.

At a time when other departments are fighting for funds, the Bureau of Narcotics budget is booming. This year it is $27 million compared with $18 million last year. The bureau has 835 agents in the field, and between 50 and 60 in Washington.

Earlier this month, the bureau chalked up a major success with nationwide raids against a ring of narcotics wholesalers. Federal agents arrested some 130 people and seized substantial quantities of heroin and cocaine.

But even when funds are on hand, it takes time to train good new agents, and more time for them to become experienced. One possible shortcut: more office staff and backup personnel for agents in the field who complain they spend too much time at their desks.

The Treasury Department's Bureau of Customs also got an additional $8,750,000 this year for antinarcotics works. As a result, it is boosting its personnel by 879.

Though some other countries are spending more than previously on antinarcotics work, none is putting this kind of effort into the task.

PROMISING DEVICES PRODUCED

4. Research. So far the scientists have made no dramatic breakthroughs with equipment that might eliminate the narcotics traffic. But they should go on trying.

The Vietnam war has produced several promising devices, notably ground sensors to monitor movement across remote borders, as well as "sensing," or "sniffing" devices to detect opium and marijuana growth from the air.

The Atomic Energy Commission is working on a portable atomic camera to pinpoint narcotics shipments hidden in cargoes and suitcases.

Research is under way to trace chemical waste from clandestine heroin factories.

Most of all this is still in the experimental stage. Best results so far have come from the old-fashioned police dog, specially trained to sniff out narcotics.

5. Stiffer legislation and court action. This is a tricky area. Almost without exception, narcotics officers feel restricted and on the defensive when they go into court these days. Almost unanimously they want tougher legislation against narcotics offenders. If they do not have the "no-knock" provision when raiding suspect narcotic dives, for example, they contend traffickers can always get rid of drugs (usually down the toilet) before opening up to lawmen.

Narcotics agants are frustrated, for instance, when a San Bernardino, Calif., judge throws out a case in which they discovered heroin being smuggled in a baby's diapers. The judge ruled the search unconstitutional because the nine-month-old baby did not consent to the search.

CLEANUP OF CRIMINALS ORDERED

Agents complain that some judges undermine their work. Last fall President Nixon ordered a cleanup of criminals in the Washington area. The Bureau of Narcotics moved in crack agents, expended considerable time and money, and brought 42 alleged traffickers to court. Today 38 of them are out on bond. Those who are traffickers are presumably back pushing drugs.

The problem, of course, is that the desire for tougher action against narcotics offenders runs slap into the opposition of groups and individuals sensitive to any diminution of civil liberties.

Even so, the trend in a number of countries is toward tougher penalties for traffickers, with greater leniency for drug users. This is the pattern of new legislation in Britain, where drug addiction has suddenly emerged as a major problem.

Some lawmen, like Paris-based Interpol chief Jean Népote, want improved extradiction procedures for traffickers. Mr. Népote favors more severe penalties for traffickers. He would like to see them punished not only for narcotics crimes in the country of arrest, but also for offenses committed previously in other countries.

If these suggestions proved acceptable and desirable, and could be implemented, they still, however, would not touch the problem of the addict's own reform.

Is the addict "sick" or a "criminal"? How best can he be reached? Young dabblers in narcotics, particularly those on "soft" drugs like marijuana, are often "turned off" by drug-education lectures that "preach."

What role can reformed addicts play in getting through to potential addicts? How about pop disc jockeys? Some radio programs, both commercial and underground, have encouraged drug taking. Now a number of disc jockeys are working with narcotics officials to combat this trend.

What can industry and business do? They should be concerned. According to the Research Institute of America, leading American companies now consider drug taking by employees a serious problem.

Along the international narcotics trail, brave young agents can work long and difficult hours, sometimes putting their lives on the line, to brake the traffic.

But their dedication is meaningless unless questions like these are answered at home.

THE PENN CENTRAL CRISIS

Mr. HART. Mr. President, many people today are pondering the Penn Central crisis and asking: "Why?"

That is good—if this interest will not be limited to mere morbid curiosity or fodder for academic theses.

Penn Central's demise is not merely a happening. It is a symptom. There are lessons to be learned that go far beyond the rise and fall of one railroad.

These lessons bear on the effectiveness—or even need of—Government regulation, on the basic philosophy of our transportation system and more importantly, on the structure of our economy.

Perhaps the best lesson we could learn is that disasters of this type are not inevitable—but that more may occur unless we act.

I am hopeful we will learn, as the Penn Central demonstrates, what happens when warning signs are not heeded.

In 1962 the late Senator Estes Kefauver, with several cosponsors, proposed a railroad merger moratorium bill, S. 3097. This bill would have amended section 7 of the Clayton Act to prohibit the ICC from approving mergers creating railroads with combined assets over $200,000,000 unless the firm acquired was in bankruptcy or receivership. Hearings were held in 1962 by the Antitrust Subcommittee and a report was issued in 1963.

The report and the expert witnesses who appeared before the subcommittee were remarkably accurate in predicting what happen if the then-pending merger proposals in the railroad industry were permitted. One proposed merger dwelt upon was Penn Central.

Evidence suggested that substantial diseconomies arise in the railroad industry as a direct effect of increasing scales of size. The reason, according to Prof. Kent T. Healy of Yale University, is the nature of the industry. To quote him:

The Railroad industry is one producing service, not goods. The quality is not as rigorously controllable through material inspection and rejection techniques as in manufacturing output. Larger organizations

"by more layers in the vertical and vastly wider spread in the horizontal lines of authority and communications introduce frictions and inertia that make slower responses, less sense of urgency and responsibility, less individual initiative, and more of what are known as bureaucratic tendencies." For a railroad which is performing a service, the delays cannot be shunted off and the human aspects of performance are an integral part of the performance. (Committee Rep., Pp 55–56)

Prof. John R. Meyer of Harvard University raised some highly significant points which may go a long way to explain why the merged Penn Central has proved to be much less than the sum of its parts. Professor Meyer said:

[I]t can be wondered whether many of the merger proposals now extant in the railroad industry do not attempt to deal with symptoms rather than causes of railroad ailments. A great deal of wishful thinking would appear to exist in both transportation and financial circles on the beneficial effects that might be achieved by mergers. For example, the view seems to be widely held, at least for public consumption, that mergers are an automatic and simple road to the achievement of lower costs. This is not at all obvious.

Professor Meyer went on to describe the managerial and cost problems that would arise as the result of huge transportation mergers:

If there is a single truism that holds for transportation mergers, it would appear to be that the managerial problem faced by a consolidated firm after merger almost invariably will be greater than the sum of the individual managerial problems faced by the separate firms before merger. In short, a very large interaction effect exists: different managerial teams must be reconciled and fitted together; seniority and other prerogatives of the different labor groups must be adjusted to one another, etc. Indeed, it is difficult to see how any cost economics will be achieved if presently unwieldy and large enterprises are merged into even larger and more unwieldy operations.

It is at least somewhat relevant that a considerable body of evidence has accumulated recently to the effect that very large transportation firms tend to be less efficient than their smaller competitors, particularly if the large firms have some protected market and earnings. The costs incurred at a specific level of output seem to be quite similar for small and medium-sized firms in most sectors of transportation; however, when the cost of output relationships defined by the experience of these medium-sized firms is extrapolated to the two or three largest firms engaged in the same type of transportation activity, the largest firms (with the notable exception of those that are facing extensive competition from other carriers within their own modes) almost invariably incur higher costs per unit of output than that forecasted by the cost—output relationships for the medium-sized firms. Field surveys, and other direct checks on the operations of larger transportation firms, strongly suggest that their relatively poor cost performance is attributable to three factors:

(a) Difficulty in controlling large organizations.

(b) A tendency in large firms not confronted with any serious intramodel competition for costs to rise to the level permitted by current gross earnings; and,

(c) A reluctance or inability on the part of larger firms to reduce excess capacity or, alternatively, in sectors of transportation still undergoing growth, a greater willingness or ability to undertake the financing of capacity expansion far ahead of immediate needs. (Hearings p. 26)

The report and much of the testimony, particularly that of Professors Healy and Meyer as well as Professors William M. Leonard of Hofstra and James C. Nelson of Washington State University, read like the scenario of the Penn Central from merger to financial and management breakdown. Diseconomies of scale caused by sheer size and bureaucracy, made the merged Penn Central a "heck of a way to run a railroad."

Implicit in the conclusion of the subcommittee report is the assumption that bigness in the railroad industry is economically bad. While all of us are fond of the cliche, "bigness is not necessarily bad," it is important to understand that the converse is equally true that "bigness is not necessarily good." Yet, this is the standard that Congress has adopted for railroad mergers—that bigness is to be encouraged even though several experts have stated that there is a direct correlation between size and diseconomies. This is the standard that Congress has adopted even though there is mounting evidence that economic concentration can have dire economic, political, and social consequences.

The Supreme Court found in *County of Marin* v. *United States*, 356 U.S. 412, 78 Sup. Ct. 880, 2 L. Ed 2d 879 (1958):

The Congressional purpose in the sweeping revision of Section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act in 1940 . . . was to facilitate merger and consolidation in the national transportation system. The very language of the amended "unification section" expresses clearly the desire of the Congress that the industry proceed toward an integrated national transportation system through substantial corporate simplification.

That standard is found in section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act, 49 U.S.C., section 5. Section 5, paragraph 2 of the act authorizes the ICC to approve railroad mergers and acquisitions it finds "will be consistent with the public interest." Inter Alia, the Commission is directed to "give weight" to: First, the effect of the proposed transaction upon adequate transportation service; second, the effect upon the "public interest" of including or failing to include other railroads in the region; third, the total fixed charges resulting from the proposed transaction; and, fourth, the interest of the carrier employees affected.

In addition, the Supreme Court has held the ICC must also give weight to the merger's effect upon competition. *United States* v. *ICC*, 90 Sup. Ct. 708, 719 (1970). The mix of these standards is left up to the ICC and, as the most recent litigation in the field has demonstrated—United States against ICC—there is no legal standard by which a court can adequately evaluate whether the ICC has applied an appropriate standard—or a consistent standard. Of even greater import is the fact that nowhere is the ICC bound to investigate the relationship between diseconomies and size. Nor is it bound to establish any size beyond which railroad mergers should be banned because of the adverse consequences of sheer concentration. In effect, the ICC has been approving giant rail combinations without adequate and objectively obtained measurements of predicted economic efficiencies or diseefficiencies. The courts have been sanctioning the action of the ICC since there is no legal standard for judicial review of such mergers. And, Congress has been left holding the bag when promised efficiencies turn into monumental bankruptcy cases that only provides long term unemployment insurance for lawyers and pleas for Government subsidies.

In addition, approval of the Penn-Central merger, coupled with the 1967 relaxation of the Pennsylvania Corp. law, allowed Penn Central to reorganize in 1968 so that assets could be controlled by a holding company and the company could leap on the conglomerate bankwagon. The Penn Central management candidly pointed out an additional advantage of reorganization in its 1969 notice of annual meeting:

The issuance of securities by a railroad requires the prior approval of the Interstate Commerce Commission. Due to the restrictions applicable to the issuance of securities by a railroad for non-railroad purposes, it would be difficult for the Penn-Central to carry out a diversification program by issuance of its securities. Even if the Interstate Commerce Commission asserts jurisdiction over any phase of the transaction contemplated by the Plan . . . the proposed holding company would not be a railroad subject to restriction applicable to the issue of securities for non-railroad purposes.—Penn Central Company, Notice of Annual Meeting and Election, P. 5 (April 10, 1969).

I objected to this kind of a maneuver in 1968 when an attempt was made to amend section 19a of the Interstate Commerce Act in order to relax the railroad industry's reporting of financial information. Senators MAGNUSON, HARTKE, and I filed individual views urging the Senate to reject a bill which would have minimized financial reporting to the ICC by "runaway railroad conglomerates"—Senate Report 1373, page 15, 90th Congress, 2d session. After cataloging the diversification program of a number of roads—including the Penn Central—we observed:

The rail conglomerate situation raises at least two serious issues. First, under what circumstances should a regulated industry such as the railroads be permitted to evolve into large conglomerates? Second, if railroads are permitted to become conglomerates, what controls should be imposed to prevent rail revenues and earnings from being drained out of the rail industry to the disadvantage of the public? (S. Rep. 1373, P. 16.)

The ICC was seeking approval of that bill. Consequently, Penn Central had little to fear from the ICC in 1969 when the railroad reorganized into a holding company to escape reporting requirements.

Fears which provoked our opposition to the relaxed reporting requirements were not unfounded. There is a long history of railroad reorganizations in order to drain a going company of its assets, restructure the railroad company on a sea of water stock, and then spirit the

valuable assets out of sight and reach of innocent creditors and shareholders when the inevitable bankruptcy reorganization takes place.

Is the Penn Central such a case? It seems reasonable to ask that Congress, the ICC and the bankruptcy court look long and hard. The maneuver of forming a holding company in 1969 to escape ICC regulation, the alleged insider trading by 15 executives reported by the Wall Street Journal of July 14, 1970, the interlocks between the Penn Central board and major eastern industrial and financial concerns, the surprisingly large amounts of credit extended by certain banks, and the use of railroad properties to secure loans all seem sufficient smoke to keep the Congress, the SEC, the ICC, the Justice Department, and the bankruptcy court at work for years.

Is all this a price of bigness? Is all this a cost of unchecked conglomerate growth? Is this a risk of unchecked and uncontrolled mergers fostered and blessed by public regulatory bodies which have lost sight of the public interest? Must we endure the inefficiencies of such economic concentration and aid and abet the opportunity to harm the innocent investor and creditor—and, then be asked to foot the bill for the results of such schemes?

If the public is to be spared the economic, fiscal, and social crises of great railroad reorganizations; if the Congress is to be spared the agony of ad hoc solutions to economic failure in the transportation field; if the investors and employees of railroads are to be spared the anxiety of financial crises in their company; and if the courts are to be spared the lifelong task of rehabilitating and reorganizing complex and giant railroad enterprises, it is time we began listening to the evidence provided by the experts. It is time to reexamine the basic assumption that economies of scale are realized by the creation of large, regional, or national railroads. It is time to check conglomerate growth of large carriers which may jeopardize the lifeline of the whole region of the Nation which they serve. Penn Central's financial and managerial anguish presents the opportunity for a perfect case-study of whether this was a merger-induced crisis. Witnesses before the Senate Antitrust Subcommittee in 1962 predicted the events of 1970. The warning in 1963 of Senator Kefauver and the majority was that it was then time to "stop, look, and listen" on railroad mergers—hearings, page 8. How sad it was not heeded.

If anything meaningful is to be generated by the current crises of the Penn-Central, I recommend these steps for Congress, the executive branch, and the ICC:

First. The ICC immediately suspend all railroad merger proceedings except in cases of extreme financial emergency.

Second. The ICC and the executive branch immediately begin studies of the optimum size of railroads vis-a-vis economic efficiency and the political and social well-being of the public.

Third. The ICC examine the advisability of recommending to the bankruptcy court dissolution of the merger as a long-term solution to the plight of the Penn Central.

Fourth. The committees of Congress investigating the Penn Central should consider inviting witnesses such as Professors Healy, Leonard, Meyer, and Nelson who can examine the relationship of the merger to the financial and management crisis of the Penn Central.

Fifth. The Senate and House consider the passage of railroad merger moratorium legislation which would prohibit rail mergers for a specified term so that the lessons learned from the Penn Central fiasco may be expressed in appropriate legislative changes.

Sixth. The Senate and the House should consider amendments to section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act which would require the Commission to give greater weight to interrail competition; intermodal competition, and the relationship of firm size to economic and management efficiencies. Section 5 of the Interstate Commerce Act is in need of serious revision requiring the Commission to make specific findings on measurable legal standards that reflect the economic realities of the transportation industry and the crying need for competition in transportation.

Seventh. Congress should explore seriously the advisability of preventing carriers, rail and otherwise, from evolving into conglomerate enterprises or from being taken over by conglomerate enterprises. Such legislation might take the form of an amendment to section 5(2)(c) of the Interstate Commerce Act—49 U.S.C., section 5(2)(c)—and closely regulate or prohibit conglomerate acquisitions of or by carriers.

Eighth. In no case should a regulated carrier escape full disclosure of its relationship to and the assets of acquiring or acquired noncarrier lines of business. As indicated earlier, historical evidence indicates that the potential for abuse because of the conglomerate interests of carriers or the owners of carriers, justified severe regulation. In order to curb the potential for this type of abuse, Congress should seriously consider amending section 19a of the Interstate Commerce Act, and require full disclosure of all investments and financial transactions by common carriers and their parents and subsidiaries.

Ninth. The Congress should begin immediately a long-term study to develop a realistic and practical national transportation policy—stressing the interrelationship of the different modes of transportation and the most efficient use to be made of each. It is becoming clear that there is an overall breakdown in all major phases of our transportation system. The problems of automobile use from construction to insurance and repair, and the planning of highways to drive upon; air transportation, from airport planning and safety to rate regulation, mergers, and rational research and development of planes; ocean transportation, from maintaining a viable merchant marine to building mothballed nuclear ships; railroads from insuring minimal safety and maximum use to securing financial and managerial stability; pipelines from insuring any regulation to preserving our environment; and inland waterways, from eliminating wasteful subsidization to insuring efficient utilization—all are areas closely interdependent. It is clear that each has serious problems and that those problems are gradually strangling us in a hopeless entanglement of inefficiencies. It is a fact of human history that the construction of efficient and viable transportation and communication systems precedes the development of a prosperous and affluent society. The converse is also true—the decay and irrational stagnation of transportation and communication foretell blight, economic decay and social disaster.

Tenth. The Congress should begin immediately a thorough investigation of the desirability of deregulation of the transportation industry. The study should consider the advisability of the remedies ranging from minimizing ICC authority over rates, mergers and acquisitions, to outright abolition of the ICC and Government interference with market forces in the transportation industries.

There is an increasing body of evidence suggesting that Government interference in the marketplace—in the form of affirmative regulation—is counterproductive. What was launched in the zeal of protecting the public from exploitation by a monopoly—in this case the ICC—may become a body dedicated to the preservation of a cartel—in this case the railroad industry. For example, the antitrust subcommittee has received numerous complaints that the ICC allowed the Penn Central to structure its rates in such a way as to favor the Northeast over the Midwest; or, that, the Penn Central has been allowed to create a rate structure in favor of eastern parts to the detriment of the development of inland parts along the St. Lawrence Seaway. Such a policy would not only have an adverse impact upon the economic development of the Midwest parts but it also would constitute a serious dereliction of statutory duties on the part of the ICC. The economic ripples, in the form of area development, plant location, and employment are of vast consequence to geographical areas like Michigan and the rest of mid-America. Rather than provoke regional struggles over transportation rates and a welter of controversy over the details of such a debate, perhaps it is time for Congress to remove artificial interferences with the allocation of costs and resources and let the "devil take the hindmost." As a Senator from Michigan, proud of the industriousness of the people and companies of that State, I am willing to wager we will not even feel the devil's hot breath.

There is increasing concern in this Nation over economic concentration. In the past few weeks, testimony has been heard before the Joint Economic Committee on the relationship of economic

concentration and inflation. There have been calls for the establishment of a second Temporary National Economic Committee. Debate rages as to why we have the pain of rising unemployment at the same time that we are experiencing the tax of inflation. The administration persists in applying traditional monetary and fiscal controls despite evidence that the assumptions behind these remedies are no longer true and new means must be found to minimize unemployment, control inflation, and mitigate artificial and planned economic dislocation.

For the past decade the antitrust subcommittee has been holding hearings exploring the economic and social impact of concentration. These hearings have produced a long and exhaustive record—a record which has won favorable notice in academic circles but has only now begun to filter through to the Congress. The time has come for action, not replowing of already well-plowed fields if we are to deal rationally with the consequences of economic concentration and prevent future Penn Central type disasters. Penn Central presents a case study of the consequences of economic concentration and uncontrolled mergers. Its history is well documented; the antitrust subcommittee provided a bluprint which essentially predicted the route of the Penn Central from merger to bankruptcy. It is likely that the agony of reorganization will be studied, and examined ad infinitum, ad nauseam. The time has come to make use of this information and for Congress to assert its constitutional duty to regulate and protect interstate commerce. If action is not taken, the economy will continue to suffer; national security will continue to be jeopardized; and the fundamental structure of the transportation industry will remain unchanged and vulnerable to disaster. Do we act, or do we continue to run the economic, social, and political risks of concentration?

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT AND OTHER PURPOSES

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by title.

The ASSISTANT LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H.R. 17123) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1971 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and other weapons, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ABM: A BILLION-DOLLAR MISTAKE

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, very shortly the Senate will be called upon to decide what to do with the so-called Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system. This could well be the most important single issue to come before the 91st Congress. Last year the Senate agreed to the so-called phase-I deployment of the Safeguard system. This decision came only after much discussion and then only with the greatest reluctance and by the narrowest of margins. In the ensuing year much has happened to strengthen the case against Safeguard. It is now time for the Senate to take positive action to curb the development of this dangerously costly and ineffective toy.

We all remember that in 1969, Congress asked Defense Department officials to halt the Sentinel program because of the grassroots opposition against it in areas such as Los Angeles, Chicago, and Boston. When there was a proposal to place one in Seattle, even the distinguished Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON), who is considered a warhawk by many Senators, let out an uproar and protest so those plans were abandoned because of local opposition; the Safeguard system is nothing more than the same Sentinel system with a new name.

The administration and their Pentagon cronies seem to be unable to decide exactly why the Safeguard system should be accepted and extended. At various times the Congress and the country have been told that Safeguard was needed as a defense against the Chinese, as a guard against an accidental launching or attack from abroad, as a protection of our nuclear retaliatory deterrent force, and, more recently, as a bargaining chip for the SALT talks.

Mr. President, The Senate Armed Services Committee, after much careful study, wisely decided to reject the administration's argument that an extension of Safeguard was absolutely essential to defend the country against a possible Chinese ICBM attack. Dr. Wolfgang K. H. Panofsky, director of the Stanford University Linear Accelerator Center and one of America's leading scientists, outlined the case against Safeguard in testimony before both the Senate Armed Services Committee and the Senate Foregin Relations Committee's Subcommittee on Arms Control. Dr. Panofsky made it eloquently and dramatically clear that Safeguard could never be an effective, impenetrable defense against any potential Chinese attack and that, in fact, any expansion of Safeguard could dangerously escalate the arms race. He also gave convincing reasons why deployment of the so-called Safeguard antiballistic missile could not be really effective as a defense against an accidental launching from abroad. Obviously the administration and Pentagon officials have seriously misled the American people in claiming that Safeguard is necessary as a protection against Chinese attack or accidental launching.

Another factor often emphasized by the administration and Pentagon officials in their search for a justification for the Safeguard ABM system is the need to protect our nuclear retaliatory deterrent force from the Soviet Union. This argument has been presented in many forms and with numerous variations—the particular version one hears apparently depends upon not only who is speaking before what audience on which occasion, but also upon which of the other justifications for Safeguard is currently in official vogue. Basically, however, this line of reasoning holds that the United States has lost all its nuclear superiority, in fact is either now or soon will become a second-rate nuclear power, and Safeguard is desperately needed to insure that enough of our nuclear force is protected from possible Soviet attack to give us a viable and realistic retaliatory deterrent force.

Those war hawks in the Pentagon and their public relations fancy Dans claim that either now or soon the United States will become a second-rate nuclear power; and, of course, we hear more of such talk just before there will be a vote in the Senate on the deployment of the Safeguard system. All along, in the months intervening, we do not hear much about it. Then the full force of the Pentagon comes to try to terrify people at a time when they are seeking to have a vote in the Senate of the United States, hoping that will give a majority to those who are seeking to deploy this so-called Safeguard ABM, formerly called Sentinel.

Mr. President, very definitely this country should do everything humanly possible to maintain a credible deterrent force in order to discourage the Soviet Union from entertaining any thoughts of launching a first strike. Certainly no Member of the U.S. Senate wishes to leave this Nation open to the possibility of nuclear blackmail from any foreign power. Supporters of the Safeguard are filling the air with cries of hysterical terror over the new Russian capability as they seek to justify the ABM system. However, before we vote to spend billions of dollars on this new version of an old military toy, we would do well to take a closer look at the real nature of the Soviet threat and determine if the Safeguard ABM system actually is necessary to help meet that threat.

Over the past few months various members of the administration and Pentagon officials have charged repeatedly that in the last 5 years the United States has been in neutral gear in the deployment of our strategic offensive forces. Speeches are made, press conferences are held, and charts are prepared, all purporting to show that the United States is in great danger of becoming a second-rate nuclear power, if indeed has

not already. Secretary of Defense Laird charges that by the mid-1970's the Soviet Union will have 1,250 land-based ICBM's and 300 submarine-launched ICBM's. The United States, we are told, is doing nothing to counter the growing Soviet threat.

Mr. President, very definitely the facts do not support these charges. In light of this Nation's unpublicized deployment of the A–3 MIRV missiles on our Polaris fleet, the MIRV'ing of our Minuteman III missiles which is already underway, and the developing of MIRV capability for our nuclear submarines—for which this current budget alone allocates $2 billion—one can scarcely say that we are in "neutral gear." Surely the Russians know of these developments and do not think the United States is standing still. In fact a comparison of the number of "force-loadings," that is nuclear warheads ready for delivery, reveals that, according to Secretary Laird's own figures given in testimony before the House Armed Services Committee this year, the United States has 4,200 to only 1,350 for the Soviet Union. Is this an indication that we have lost superiority?

According to the London Office of Strategic Studies, adjusting rubles for dollars and for lower Russian wage levels, the Soviet Union is now spending about $40 billion per year on defense, about half the amount we are spending. The U.S. budget for strategic forces alone rose from $6.8 billion in 1965 to $9.1 billion in 1969 to $9.6 billion in 1970. The United States has held far more nuclear tests in the 5 years since 1965 than in the previous 20 years, including 24 tests in the first 6 months of 1970. We have begun deployment of ABM and MIRV, and we plan a three-fold increase in our stockpile of nuclear warheads. Is this standing still?

Mr. President, it is simply not true that the United States has been in neutral gear in developing our strategic arsenal over the last 5 years. In 5 years we have expanded the number of warheads on our Polaris fleet by 250 percent. We now hold a 6-to-1 advantage over the Russians in numbers of launchers for submarine launched ballistic missiles—656 to 110—and an incredible 15-to-1 edge in the number of warheads for those launchers. Because the rapidly increasing accuracy of missiles may soon make land-based ICBM's vulnerable to a first strike no matter what defense is built, the retaliatory force available from submarines and strategic bombers becomes even more important. Thus the increase in this Nation's undersea strategic potential takes on a crucial role.

Of the 656 launchers on our Polaris fleet, 448 now have the A–3 missile. This missile, while not MIRV'ed, has three separate independently targeted warheads which thus triples the punch on each Polaris launcher, and it can deliver an explosive force of 0.7 to 1 megaton on each warhead. The Russians have nothing similar. With the 208 single warhead A–2 missiles and the triple headed A–3 launchers our submarine fleet thus can deliver 1,552 nuclear warheads, to the 110 available to the Soviet submarine force.

In addition, the A–2 missile has a range of 1,500 miles, the A–3 has a range of 2,500 miles. Even the armament of the latest Soviet submarines, the so-called *Yankee*-class, has a range equal to only one-third that of the A–3. The Soviet Union lags behind in range, too. In January, 1971, the Navy will begin to replace the A–3 missiles on Polaris submarines with the Poseidon missile. The Poseidon, which has twice the payload and twice the accuracy of the A–3, can carry from 10 to 14 MIRV'ed warheads. Moreover, planning and research is already underway on a successor to the Polaris/Poseidon, the so-called improved underwater launched missile system, or the ULMS. The ULMS could carry 24 launchers versus the 16 on Polaris, and will be outfitted with advanced equipment which will make the craft virtually invulnerable to any antisubmarine threat.

Mr. President, it is obvious that the United States has hardly been standing still with our undersea strategic arsenal. However, Secretary of Defense Laird and others have also charged that this country is falling dangerously behind because of the 1,240 land-based missile launchers available to the Russians. Very definitely that number is highly misleading in terms of what it reveals about the real Soviet threat. As I. F. Stone has pointed out with great care, it is not the total number which is relevant but rather the various types of missiles included within that total.

Of that total of 1,240 land-based missile launchers in the Russian arsenal, 220 are old-fashioned missiles, the SS–6's, SS–7's, SS–8's, all similar to our old Titan missiles. None of these are in hard silos, and indeed the SS–6 is now regarded as a space-launch vehicle rather than a weapon. These are all the earliest, most cumbersome types of missiles, hardly designed to constitute a first-strike capability.

Very recently the administration and the Pentagon have been emphasizing the growing threat posed by the SS–9 missiles; at the present time according to best estimates the Russians have 275 SS–9's operational or under construction. In fact, in the most recent briefing on Safeguard of congressional leaders by the administration, Henry Kissinger took special pains to play up the danger of the Soviet SS–9 fleet, a danger which according to the administration can only be met by Safeguard.

Mr. President, talk of the SS–9 threat is only the modern day equivalent of crying wolf. The SS–9 is a storable liquid fuel rocket which carries a 15 to 25 megaton warhead. It is, in fact, according to testimony from Dr. John Foster, Pentagon Director of Defense Research and Engineering, only a large imitation of our old Titan II. The United States phased out most of our old liquid fuel missiles—Atlas, Thor, Jupiter, Titan I—long ago because they are cumbersome, inefficient, and pose great logistical problems in launching. We have maintained some of our Titan II's because until 1967 we had nothing to cover some of the targets within Titan II's 6,100 mile range. Now, however, we have Minuteman III and Poseidon and soon Titan II will be a thing of the past. In reality, it has been obsolete and worthless for some months and perhaps years past.

Mr. President, the SS–9's do not represent the latest in weapon technology. They are costly to operate and they lack flexibility and accuracy. Furthermore, the stored liquid fuel has many grave disadvantages. Because the fuel is corrosive, the lines have to be maintained with great care. More important, it takes 10 to 20 minutes to fire such a missile—it is not an instantaneous weapon. This is the weapon over which the Defense Department is wringing its hands. It all seems so silly, but of course it is obvious they intend to back up the military-industrial complex and secure more billions of dollars of taxpayers' money.

There is no obvious reason why the Russians should be continuing the SS–9, but many scientists believe it was originally designed to penetrate the old Nike-Zeus city defense or to attack launch-control facilities. Furthermore, there is some reliable evidence that SS–9 production is actually tapering off. The current production is less than that of 1965, the peak year, and no new SS–9 complexes have been started in the last 9 months.

Much is made of some future potential for the SS–9, such as a MIRV capability. There is at this time no evidence that the SS–9 is to be developed to carry three reentry vehicles. Right now it would take one SS–9 to destroy one Minuteman silo. Furthermore, although the Russians are now testing MIRV's, they do not yet have a workable, ready MIRV, nor is there any evidence that they plan to MIRV the SS–9. The United States, on the other hand, began testing MIRV 2 years ago and this June began deploying MIRV's on our Minuteman III force. The SS–9 is the only Soviet missile which has the power to endanger our Minuteman force. Without a MIRV capability, it is difficult to see any grave threat to our land-based ICBM force from the SS–9.

The fact is, Mr. President, that the SS–9 does not constitute a threat sufficient to justify the expenditure of billions of dollars on an unworkable Safeguard ABM System. The testimony given on various occasions by Dr. Sidney D. Drell, deputy director of the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center, and Dr. M. L. Goldberger, professor of physics at Princeton University and a long-time student of the ABM, clearly indicate that the SS–9 is essentially a useless weapon, is not a threat, and in no case should be considered a justification for the Safeguard System.

The remainder of that 1,240 total number of missile launchers available to the Soviets consists primarily of smaller, Minuteman-type missiles, the SS–11 and SS–13. In May 1969, in testimony before the House Appropriations Committee, Secretary of Defense Laird said that the SS–11, which is also a liquid fuel missile, does not pose a threat to our Minuteman forces with its current warhead yield and accuracy. He went on to say that the SS–13, a solid fuel missile, has a smaller yield and no better accuracy

than the SS–11 and is thus even less of a threat to our Minuteman force. Compare this to the fact that the United States has almost 1,000 Minuteman-class missiles, and we have already procured one-third of the projected Minuteman III total force. Furthermore, we have already begun deploying Minuteman III's armed with triple MIRVed warheads. It should be clear then, that the 1,240 land-based Soviet missile launchers do comprise a powerful force that could inflict horrible damage on the United States. They do not, however, constitute either overwhelming nuclear superiority or even the means for a first-strike capability.

Here it is relevant to take note of Secretary Laird's challenge that the United States has reduced its megatonnage 40 percent in the last 5 years while the Russians have quadrupled theirs. That is a fact, Mr. President, but it is a misleading fact, for improvements in the accuracy of weapons are much more important than increases in megatonnage. A twofold increase in accuracy is equivalent to a tenfold increase in megatonnage yield. The truth is that the United States has concentrated on improving the accuracy of our strategic weapons rather than on increasing the megatonnage. The trend is toward smaller warheads on more accurate weapons—indeed, the improvement in accuracy is threatening to make land-based missiles obsolete by making them too vulnerable to direct attack.

Mr. President, a twofold increase in accuracy would make a Minuteman III with a MIRV capability a weapon with first-strike capability. Work is going forward on the ABRES, the advanced ballistic missile reentry system, which would increase the accuracy and guidance necessary to give us a first-strike capability. No doubt the Russians are worrying over that possibility. The United States is far from being in neutral gear as a second-class power; so far in fact that one is led to wonder what the Nixon administration really seeks in its strategic arms policy, the "sufficiency" so loudly proclaimed or a new "superiority."

There is also talk of the ABM system which the Russians have built around Moscow. In the first place, this "Galosh" ABM system has only a limited defensive capability and the Russians show no signs of expanding it beyond Moscow. It constitutes no threat to the United States, and in any case the Safeguard or any other ABM system would not be the best response to it. We responded to the Russian ABM system by developing a MIRV capability to insure that our missiles could penetrate such a system. The Russians gained no increase in security with their ABM; they merely triggered a new escalation in the arms race by causing us to develop MIRV. There is ample evidence that any further work on the Safeguard ABM system by this country would have identical results.

As I have said before, Safeguard ought to be called the civil service system, because it will not work and no one can fire it.

Mr. President, it should be crystal clear that the Soviet Union does possess an awesome and powerful strategic nuclear force. It should be equally clear, however, that a threat to our Minuteman force or our strategic bomber force or our undersea force alone is not the same as a first-strike capability.

Mr. President, in truth and in fact there has been a great change in the Soviet Union since the terrorist days of Dictator Stalin. The Soviet Union is no longer a have-not nation. It is a have nation. And in recent days those in power in the Soviet Union have been veering toward capitalism. They have been emphasizing the improvement in the living conditions and the standard of living of their people. That is a fact that has been acknowledge in Europe, in Asia, and in all the capitals of the world.

Mr. President, I shall not take the time now to go into detail, but it is a well-known fact that the Russians in recent months have withdrawn divisions from Eastern Europe and placed those divisions on the 6,500-mile common border between the Soviet Union and Communist China. Constantly in recent months there has been fighting along those borders. Chinese leaders claim the Soviet Union is gobbling off slices of territory in mainland China. So there is no possibility of any monolithic Communist conspiracy such as the "Birch sappers," or members of the John Birch Society some years back, and other idiotic extremist groups, used to claim. None of that is possible. On the contrary, there is much likelihood of an all-out war between the Soviet Union and Communist China. I have spoken at length today and I will not dwell on that further.

Mr. President, a true first-strike capability would require the ability to destroy our Polaris/Poseidon fleet which is capable of remaining beneath the surface of the sea for as many as 300 days; decimate our strategic bomber force and tactical aircraft carrying nuclear weapons in sufficient numbers to allow the Russian air defenses to handle the survivors; and, knock out our Minuteman force. This would, moreover, have to occur simultaneously, for under current U.S. policy each of these three retaliatory forces is designed with the capability to inflict unacceptable damage on the U.S.S.R. or China. Each can absorb a first strike and still be an effective deterrent and within a matter of hours destroy the installations and the cities of the Soviet Union or of mainland China.

Mr. President, such an attack on the United States by the Soviet Union, or allegedly by Communist China with its crude nuclear capacity, is simply not technically possible because of U.S. early warning capabilities. If our strategic bombers were attacked first by submarine-launched ballistic missiles, our land-based ballistic missiles would be left intact. If the attempt were made to attack our land-based missiles with ICBM's and simultaneously hit our bombers, the bombers could take off in the period between the enemy ICBM launch—with a 3-minute flight time—and the arrival on target of any submarine-launched ballistic missile—15-minute flight time. Even without our Polaris force a first strike sounds implausible, if not actually impossible.

A true threat to Polaris would require a simultaneous destruction of all the submarines, and there is absolutely no intelligence available or any technical invention now known that would indicate such a threat to the security of our Polaris fleet.

Mr. President, the officials of the Soviet Union have been acting as sane men since Stalin died. The Soviet Union simply does not possess at this time a first-strike capability. Furthermore, there is no indication that they desire such a capability or could possess such a capability even if they wished before 1975. We do not seek a first strike against any nation in the world. That is beyond the thought of anyone in this country. We have a tremendous and all-powerful defense against the Soviets, and they could have no possible first-strike capability until 1975 at the earliest, even if we were to be sleeping all the time between now and then.

With all the known faults in the Safeguard system, one wonders why the administration is pushing with such urgency for a defense which will not work for a potential threat which most experts agree could not conceivably materialize.

The facts are clear, Mr. President. As of September 1969, the United States had in its total nuclear strategic arsenal 4,200 deliverable warheads; the U.S.S.R. had 1,350. The latest strategic survey from the Institute for Strategic Analysis in London indicates that by 1975 the United States will have 11,000 deliverable nuclear warheads, the Russians only about 5,000. The United States is ahead in the number of independent warheads, the U.S.S.R. in total explosive power—megatonnage. However, when speaking of deterrent power, the most important element is the number of warheads, not the total explosive power. It is estimated that between 200 and 400 warheads would be necessary to destroy the Soviet Union as a civilization; in other words, to obliterate its cities and to kill most, if not all, of its men, women, and children, destroy its railroads, its airfields, peasant homes, and farms.

Any attack which left such a number of warheads for retaliation would result in mutual annihilation. The Soviet Union is increasing its arsenal, Mr. President, but they simply do not have the power to accomplish such a knock-out. The United States already possesses a nuclear arsenal greatly in excess of that needed for deterrent only.

Mr. President, our ability to survive a nuclear attack with enough retaliatory force to inflict unacceptable damage and loss on the attacker is the cornerstone of policy of deterrence and survival. No reasonable man suggests that we should seek a first-strike capability. Our

deterrent must be protected. We must not be frightened or stampeded or terrorized into anything by an imaginary danger brought before us now by the power and might of the industrial-military complex to scare the American people at a time when we in the Senate are voting on appropriations for the Department of Defense.

Dr. Drell and Dr. Goldberger have testified and demonstrated on several occasions that the U.S. deterrent is simply not seriously threatened either now or in the foreseeable future by any possible combination of Soviet offensive or defensive weapons systems, and that in any case Safeguard would do nothing to change the situation.

Even if the U.S.S.R. could knock out or neutralize our strategic bombers and our Polaris/Poseidon force, they would still have to be able to knock out at least 700 of our 1,000 Minuteman missiles if they were to avoid being destroyed in retaliation. The motives of the Russians may remain a mystery, but even if one imagines the Russians desiring to accomplish such a feat, it would be virtually impossible to do. Mr. President, where is the threat that justifies the expenditure of billions of dollars on a costly, unworkable Safeguard system?

There is no such threat. On the rollcall vote in the Senate this Wednesday further deployment of the Safeguard system should be defeated and I believe it will be defeated.

I yield the floor.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR FANNIN ON WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 12, 1970

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on Wednesday next at 3:30 p.m. the Senate is scheduled to vote on the amendment offered by the able Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER) and the able Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART).

I ask unanimous consent that when the vote is announced on that amendment the able Senator from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN) be recognized for not to exceed 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECESS FROM TOMORROW UNTIL WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 12, 1970 at 10 A.M.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business tomorrow it stand in recess until 10 o'clock on Wednesday morning next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR MILITARY PROCUREMENT AND OTHER PURPOSES

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (H.R. 17123) to authorize appropriations during the fiscal year 1971 for procurement of aircraft, missiles, naval vessels, and tracked combat vehicles, and other weapons, and research, development, test, and evaluation for the Armed Forces, and to prescribe the authorized personnel strength of the Selected Reserve of each Reserve component of the Armed Forces, and for other purposes.

ARMS AND THE PEOPLE

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, since those two fateful days, August 6 and 9, 1945, when American planes dropped atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, the United States and the Soviet Union have engaged in what is potentially the most suicidal military struggle ever known to man. Like two mad, and often seemingly half-blind giants, they have piled nuclear armaments on top of nuclear armaments, and together have spent nearly a trillion dollars each in trying to get the better of the other.

The weapons that have been engendered by this mad race to see which nation can lure the other into the abyss are now many hundreds of times more destructive than those which in 1945 caused more devastation in a shorter length of time than the world had ever previously experienced. As if in a saga left over from the Dark Ages, the two powers seemed to have delighted in counting up their kilotons and megatons each night after the world had gone to bed and chalking up a victory sign at the birth of each new and more destructive weapon. The entire course of events for the innocent bystanders, that is, the people of the globe, assumed the dimensions of some vast cosmic nightmare in which humanity found itself again and again being hurled down into a chasm of hopeless destruction. Against the background of the awesome mushroom cloud, the cold war terrified people everywhere.

Always, good news for one rival power was bad news for the other; that we had the "bomb" made them want their own; their Sputnik frightened us; their alleged superiority in missiles made us not only seek to close the "gap" but to open it again—only in our favor; their ABM meant our MIRV and our ABM. The very terms "we" and "they," "ours" and "theirs," "us" and "them" seemed to provide sufficient justification for insoluble hatreds—insoluble except by our destruction of them, or vice versa: mistrust was the only apparent common ground between the two powers. It was a rivalry in folly.

There has been some progress achieved in retreating from universal Armageddon. Both the partial Test-Ban Treaty and Nuclear Nonproliferation Treaty are now in force. Also, the first bilateral treaty, the Consular Convention, and the Outer Space Treaty have been signed and approved by the Senate. Many cultural exchanges as well as some trade relations have been established. There is, thus, some small hope that other more positive steps will follow.

The "rite of passage" that may have launched us into adulthood was the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty signed on August 5, 1963, and ratified for the United States on October 10 of that year. As of the beginning of 1970, more than 100 countries were parties to this treaty. This is, by definition, a limited agreement, and its limitations have been well understood by both sides; but it is nevertheless an important step toward full maturity. It has radically reduced the number of tests in which otherwise both powers would certainly have engaged. Our bombs and theirs, would surely now be more destructive were it not for the mutually accepted sanctions that the treaty enforced. But both would be less, not more, secure.

More concretely, by stopping atmospheric tests, dangers to the health of both nations, including that of unborn generations, have been radically averted. In the fifties and early sixties the most potentially dangerous augmentation of pollution over the surface of the earth was coming not from industrial wastes or other manufacturing processes, but from contamination of the atmosphere by radioactive fallout. True, it will be decades before the effects of bombardment from strontium-90, the deadly bone destroyer, will no longer be harmful. But iodine-131 has already virtually disappeared from our milk supply.

As chairman of the Arms Control Subcommittee of the Foreign Relations Committee, I remain acutely conscious of the dismal and unsettling fact that the nuclear arms race continues and that negotiations with the Soviets remain problematic. If one must resolve this dilemma, as one must, it can only be through the realization that excessive caution ought never to jeopardize reasonable negotiations.

And I am profoundly convinced that any such future negotiations are in grave danger of being undermined by insistent proposals for the deployment of an antiballistic missile weapons system. I have, therefore, publicly deplored and criticized the decision of the Nixon administration to snatch up this discredited and partially discarded Johnson program. To me such an action was tantamount to turning back the clock, and meant a step away from arms control and perhaps, therefore, from peace.

President Johnson had recommended an ABM system—called the "Sentinel"—as a possible defense against a Chinese missile attack. The idea was not well received in the area of three of our larger cities, around Boston, Chicago, and Seattle. City dwellers and suburbanites alike, who were not much impressed by the imminence of the Chinese threat, did not want nuclear weapons installations of questionable effectiveness, and possible accidental dangers, cluttering up their landscapes. President Johnson's successor hoped to sell his product under the brand name "Safeguard" a more appealing label, it was thought, than "Sentinel." If space allowed, one might profitably digress here on the need for

a truth-in-packaging law since, thus far, Mr. Nixon has not made clear whether his more or less "invisible shield" of ABM's will in fact safeguard us against Russia, against China, or against the accidental firing of a missile by someone unknown. He has thus far not even settled on whether his system is to be an area defense, "thin" or "thick"—as the strategists say—or merely a "spot" safeguard for a few of our offensive missiles.

I have referred to President Nixon and "his" system, but perhaps I should more accurately refer to it as the Pentagon's project. But, of course, as always, it is the people's system—in fact their millstone. The cost has been estimated at upwards of $8 billion for the original "teaser" system, while a defense system even partially effective against any conceivable attack would cost truly astronomical amounts.

It was against this background of confusion and contradiction, of costly error and of gross danger, that I recommended that the Arms Control Subcommittee take the issue to the people in public hearings. The result of that national debate was an unprecedented public involvement in a technical issue. President Nixon won his go-ahead when the tie vote was broken by the Vice President, Mr. AGNEW. After so vigorous a battle and so close a vote, one would have thought the administration would hardly dare only a few months later to ask for a considerably expanded ABM system, yet it did. The administration itself thus seemed to be validating the charge that its earlier request for only two sites was in fact a planned foot-in-the-door maneuver.

There were a year ago, and there still are, other sharply critical technical questions which have never been answered satisfactorily by the Defense Department. For example, the "Safeguard" ABM system depends upon a single, very expensive—$200 million—radar for each Minuteman complex, with a small number—the number is still classified—of Sprint missiles to protect the silos, and an even smaller number to protect the radar.

But failure of the radar or its destruction would mean collapse of the whole operation. This problem was compounded by the fact that the Soviet Union's more cheaply developed and numerous SS–11 missiles, while not of sufficient explosive power and accuracy to endanger our siloes, are of sufficient power to destroy the radar installations. The missile-site radar, then, was much "softer" and thus easier to destroy than the silos it was supposed to protect. This was the weak point of the whole concept of the ABM, a weakness obviated by the more traditional strategy of "diversity of deterrents" whereby the missiles would be widely dispersed and therefore a sufficient number would remain operational and could retaliate for any conceivable enemy attack.

The final argument, which the administration has also thus far failed to counter is based on the fact that the "Safeguard" system, in order to be reliable, must be in a constant state of readiness, and therefore dependent on the most highly sophisticated computer systems. Such refinement of computer technology, which was gravely doubted a year ago, is even more dubious now. And since we have had no experience with actual deployment upon which to base any further expansion, I cannot see that the administration has proved or even strengthened its case.

Moreover, evidence indicates that if the threat of the Soviet SS–9—a much more powerful weapon than the SS–11—against the Minuteman silos greatly increases, then the ability of Safeguard thick or thin, to protect the missiles from nuclear assault would be entirely canceled out. Thus, dispersion and/or mobility remains the only effective deterrent strategy. And if it could be proved that the Soviets were targeting SS–9 missiles against all of our Minuteman silos, some other tactic, perhaps mobile Minuteman or more submarine missiles, would necessarily have to be considered.

It is true that some technical witnesses had testified that an effective defense of the silos against SS–9 attack could be made by employing many small radar systems rather than one large one; which, of course, would obviously render the entire defensive operation less susceptible to failure. Nor would a system of this kind have to play the dual role of hard-point defense—that is, defense of our offensive deterrent weapons—and population defense at the same time, and therefore would not be a threat to the Soviet deterrent—a perfectly legitimate argument that President Nixon stressed when choosing the Safeguard system over former President Johnson's Sentinel.

Nevertheless, should the Soviet deployment of SS–9 missiles create an imbalance in the deterrent ratio—which cannot now be ruled out unless controls are agreed upon at the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks—SALT—Conference—then, as I have said, something other than ABM deployment would appear far more effective, far less risky, and perhaps even necessary. I suggest that mobile offensive power would have a greater deterrent effect upon both Russia and China than an untested antiballistic missile defensive system. And it goes without saying that the American people are surely more concerned about Soviet intercontinental ballistic missiles and nuclear submarines than they are about her own anti-ballistic-missile sites around Moscow. And presumably the same is true of the Russian people and their leaders.

I had the impression throughout the hearings that Secretary Melvin Laird's arguments indicated he believed the way to stop an arms race is to win it. Indeed, I suspected that the real motivation may have been to gain a bargaining position against the Soviets, which is precisely the reason President Johnson, according to former Vice President Humphrey, advocated the Sentinel ABM system.

I pointed out to the Secretary that with the multiple warheads being developed for our missiles, the United States would soon have 6,500 thermonuclear weapons constantly on the alert and on the move in our submarine fleet, in addition to 3,000 landbased missiles. In addition, we have 1,000 nuclear warheads ready to be delivered by bombers, as well as 7,000 "tactical" nuclear weapons in Europe. No conceivable number of Soviet antiballistic missile systems could constitute a real shield against all these nuclear weapons. The ultimate absurdity of the administration proposal is obvious to anyone who has not entirely abandoned simple mathematics and logic: no attack from any foreign country or combination of countries could in the foreseeable future neutralize a nuclear force of this strength and diversity.

The most disturbing aspect of this almost irrational advocacy of ABM is its possible effect on the larger issues of our foreign policy, and this not merely in terms of the dangers of any nuclear escalation, but even more so with regard to the premises on which our entire strategic posture is based. It is my belief that President Nixon raised very serious questions about our basic postulate of retaliatory deterrence by his statement on January 31, 1970, that the Safeguard system should be expanded in order to provide a "credible foreign policy in the Pacific area." He went on to add that such an area defense would be "virtually infallible"—the latter phrase one can charitably interpret as merely another instance of ad lib hyperbole, as I have since heard no one either in the administration or out of it uphold, or even attempt to uphold it.

The notion of making our Asiatic foreign policy credible by nuclear weapons is entirely different from—and, indeed, more shocking than—the mere advocacy of a limited ABM system. If the new Nixon doctrine for Asia means that the United States will not commit substantial ground troops in Southeast Asia in the future, the President would seem to be proposing that undesirable moves by Communist forces in that area will be met by the threat of nuclear attack. He thus seems to have abandoned our deterrent strategy and embraced that of massive retaliation. How true it is that the more Republican administrations change, the more they remain the same. Furthermore, one wonders how such a threat could be made credible in order to discourage a possible Chinese attack against her neighbors, if we cannot even rely—as Safeguard proponents affirm—upon our destructive nuclear arsenal to deter a Chinese attack upon the United States, even when China has only a few such weapons.

We have been hearing about the Chinese nuclear threat for several years now. It has become the new club which the military-industrial complex flauntingly wields to win greater and greater appropriations from the Congress. But I question whether the execution of the threat is in any way imminent, and I incline to believe that we do have a considerable time factor in our favor. It still seems to me that it would be suicidal for the Chinese to unloose a few nuclear weapons upon the United States and thus invite retaliatory destruction. This is completely contrary to the commonsense foundation of the theory of deterrence, unless, of course, one accepts the

old racist canard that the Chinese—with their teeming population, ant-hill existence, et cetera—place no value whatever on human life.

A little more than a year ago when the Senate was considering the initial authorization for deployment of the Safeguard ABM system, I described Safeguard as a weapons system in search of a mission which it surely had not found. The search, Mr. President, continues. The mission has not been found.

The ABM system was first supposed to protect the population of this country against a presumptive Chinese missile threat, even though the Chinese still have not yet tested an ICBM. Then it was supposed to protect some of our missiles against a Soviet attack. Then it was supposed to protect our population against a presumptive Chinese attack or an accidental launch, and our missiles against a Soviet attack. Now it is supposed to protect some of our missiles against a Soviet attack, providing that the attack is not too large for the Safeguard system to handle, and to give us a "bargaining chip" in the strategic arms limitation talks with the Soviet Union. If these talks succeed, and produce an agreement limiting ABM systems and offensive missiles, then the work that has been done on deploying the system will have to be stopped, at a nonrecoverable cost of just under $3 billion, to cite the figure used by Secretary Laird before the Armed Services Committee. If the talks fail, and no limitation on offensive and defensive weapons results, the system will have to be replaced because it will not be able to handle the threat that will confront this country, according to most of the best informed and most experienced scientists in this country. In other words, if we do not need it, it is useless. On the other hand, if we need such a defense, then it is hopelessly and totally inadequate.

Many of these eminent scientists have appeared before the Subcommittee on Arms Control, International Law, and Organization which I have the honor to chair. Beginning in early February and continuing until late June, the subcommittee conducted an extensive set of hearings on "ABM, MIRV, SALT and the Nuclear Arms Race." Among the scientists who appeared before the subcommittee were three of the four former Presidential Science Advisers—Dr. Donald F. Hornig, president of Brown University; Dr. George Kistiakowsky, of Harvard University; Dr. Jerome Weisner, provost of MIT, a former director of Defense Research and Engineering; Dr. Herbert York, director and deputy director of the Stanford Linear Accelerator Center; Dr. Wolfgang Panofsky; Dr. Sidney Drell; and Prof. Marvin Goldberger of Princeton University, a member until recently of the President's Science Advisory Committee. In addition, testifying before the committee on the broader implications of the Safeguard question were two experts on China, A Doak Barnett of the Brookings Institution, and Mrs. Alice Langley Hsieh of the Institute for Defense Analyses; the former Deputy Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, Dean Adrian Fisher; a former Assistance Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency who is an expert on verification, Dr. Herbert Scoville of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace; a former assistant to President Kennedy and to President Johnson for National Security Affairs, McGeorge Bundy, now president of the Ford Foundation; and the director of the Russian Institute at Columbia University, Dr. Marshall Shulman. In addition, the subcommittee met in executive session and received classified briefings on Soviet and Chinese strategic capabilities from Richard Helms, the Director of CIA, and on the SALT talks by Gerard Smith, Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. The Defense Department's case for the Safeguard system was presented in public sessions of the committee by Secretary of Defense Laird and Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., Director of Defense Research and Engineering.

With the understandable exception of Secretary Laird and Dr. Foster, the witnesses who appeared unanimously opposed any expansion of the Safeguard system. Those with a scientific background pointed out the technical deficiencies of the system. These were, to sum up, that the Safeguard defense of Minuteman depends on a $200 million MSR radar for each Minuteman complex and on a small number of Sprint missiles to protect the Minuteman silos and the radar. Since the radar is "softer," meaning more vulnerable to attack, than the missile silo it defends, an attack on the radar would be an attractive enemy tactic. Soviet SS–11 missiles have sufficient accuracy and power to destroy the radar, although they do not at present have the capability of endangering the Minuteman silos. Thus, the Soviets could use the large number of SS–11 missiles in their arsenal to destroy the MSR, leaving the larger SS–9's free to attack the Minuteman. In addition, it was pointed out by many witnesses that the performance of the PAR radar could be impaired by the proximity of nuclear explosions. The conclusion of all of these scientists was that the Safeguard system could not defend Minuteman. One phrase, formulated almost identically, appeared in their testimony. To use the formulation employed by Dr. Hornig:

> During the last year, it has become clear beyond reasonable doubt that if the defense of Minuteman were the only, or even the principal, function of Safeguard, its deployment could not be justified.

This conclusion was underlined graphically by a chart prepared by Dr. Panofsky which appears on page 430 of the subcommittee hearings. The chart shows that if the deployment of SS–9's levels off or is limited by a SALT agreement, then the danger level of potentially lethal attacks against Minuteman silos—defined as the number of warheads capable of knocking out 700 Minuteman silos—would never be reached. On the other hand, if the Soviets decide to put a large effort into deploying MIRV's on their SS–9's, if they continue or increase the deployment rate of SS–9's or if they improve the accuracy of their SS–11 missiles, which recent tests suggest they may well be doing, then the danger level could be reached before the middle of this decade, which means before the Safeguard system could be deployed. Thus, for Safeguard to have any significant effectiveness at all, the Soviets would have literally to tailor their threat to the deployment schedule and capabilities of the system—our system, that is. Could the Soviets be relied upon for such accommodation? Thus, once again, it is revealed that if Safeguard is needed, it is inadequate. If it is not needed, it is expensive and superfluous.

Dr. Drell put the case succinctly when he told the subcommittee:

> There have been extensive studies, and I believe it is fair to say that all now recognize that Safeguard, even working perfectly, and with a full nationwide Phase II deployment costing about $10 billion can be effective in preserving 300 Minuteman missiles, which is deemed adequate as a retaliatory force, against only a very narrow band of models of an assumed Soviet strike. Against lesser threats it is not needed and against greater threats it is ineffective.

It is interesting to note that when I suggested last year that a primary motivation for ABM deployment was an "arm to parley" notion the denial was quick and vehement. This now seems to be avowed. Once again, as is the case in instance after instance, what we, the critics of ABM, said of it a year ago is now acknowledged by the Defense Department, either explicitly or implicitly.

The effectiveness of the system seems to me to be one significant argument against its value as a bargaining chip, even if such a strategy were viable. A second argument against the claim that Safeguard is a valuable bargaining chip is a direct result of the action taken by the Armed Services Committee in limiting the Safeguard system to the defense of Minuteman and in deciding that "there is no compelling need to move now to the deployment of an area defense of our population against Chinese Communist ICBM attack." This statement of the Committee on Armed Services is directly contrary to the position of the Defense Department.

If the Soviets fear our ABM deployment, which I question, it is likely to be their concern that it could be developed into a thick area, or population, defense system which would increase the invulnerability of the United States to a second strike and thus, it might be argued, put us in the position of being able to launch a first strike without fear of retaliation. Soviet fear of Safeguard could not be logically based on concern that the system will provide effective protection of Minuteman missiles and leave the United States free to launch a retaliatory second strike. But the Armed Services Committee has knocked out the population defense potential of the Safeguard system—which President Nixon

advocates—and left only the theoretical possibility of Minuteman defense—which almost all competent scientists deny. Thus it is the Armed Services Committee that has already taken away the bargaining chip—if, indeed, ABM could ever have been regarded as a bargaining chip. Safeguard, limited to the defense of Minuteman, is hardly a weapon calculated to give us bargaining leverage. As the distinguished junior Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON) told the Senate on August 5:

The Committee has, to my mind, completely removed any reason for objecting to Safeguard on the grounds that the Soviets will find it 'provocative' . . . The Soviets are well aware that since Safeguard offers only incidental protection—

I read this, Mr. President, again, to emphasize that this is the distinguished junior Senator from Washington (Mr. JACKSON), the champion of ABM deployment, whom I am quoting. Let me read that sentence again:

The Soviets are well aware that since Safeguard offers only incidental protection to the tiny fraction of our population living on or near one of the Air Force bases where Safeguard will be installed, the Soviet assured destruction capability will in no way be imperiled.

Mr. Adrian Fisher, former Deputy Director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, stated:

I am aware of the argument . . . that it is necessary to go ahead with authorizing the proposed Modified Phase II Safeguard item in order to strengthen our bargaining position in Geneva. I don't believe that is persuasive.

I digress to recall to the Senate again that when, a year ago, I suggested that this was one of the real motivations of ABM deployment, it was vehemently denied.

To continue with the statement of Dean Fisher:

As a practical matter, authorizing armaments so that they can be included in a disarmament program soon reaches the point of diminishing returns and that point may well have been reached, passed, well-passed, with the approval of Phase I. If both sides were to play this game of proceeding with further weapons systems to strengthen their hands in negotiations you would have a gigantic buildup, just so you would have something in the SALT talks and far from being a help to peace they would be a greater threat to the world. It would be an excuse for both sides to build up now, each saying, "I hate to do it but I have to do it so I have something to bargain with in Vienna." (Page 247, Gore Subcommittee hearings.)

There is, of course, another argument for not proceeding with any further deployment of the Safeguard system that has nothing to do with bargaining chips, and that is the wisdom of being reasonably sure that an expensive weapon system works in the first place before it is expanded, at great cost and great risk. Testifying before my subcommittee last year, Deputy Secretary of Defense Packard said that the plan that was being recommended at that time—

Was developed, in part, so that we can get a complete system together at the earliest possible date and shake it down. Then we will be in a position so that if the President decides that additional deployment is necessary, it will be possible to proceed with that deployment earlier than if we had waited to test the whole system.

He subsequently said at the same hearing:

We are proposing that we proceed with Phase I; that is, deployment around two Minuteman wings, and providing funds to acquire the land for the remaining sites. This initial move gives limited protection to all our Minuteman. It gives us the opportunity to get these two systems put together, shake out the bugs and put them underway.

Dr. Packard also showed the subcommittee a chart, reproduced on page 293 of last year's hearings on "Strategic and Foreign Policy Implications of ABM Systems," which stated that Phase I of Safeguard, involving missile sites at two Minuteman wings, had two purposes. The first was that Phase I "gives limited MM protection," meaning Minuteman protection. But the second was, and I am quoting the words which appear on the chart, "provides operational experience."

What has been the "operational experience" to date? The answer is none. In the words of a Defense Department statement, "No Safeguard components are installed and operated now at Phase I sites." In fact, the contracts for construction were let only this spring.

Where then, Mr. President, is the experience, is the shakedown, is the testing, which Congress was promised would be undertaken before further deployment or expansion? They do not exist.

Dr. Panofsky dealt with the question of experience to date in his testimony before the subcommittee in the following statement which appears on page 178 of the subcommittee hearings:

Where, then, is the new experience on which the decision to expand ABM deployment now was to be based? There also have been no production of radars or missiles; the contract to develop the first site for future technical use was awarded by the Army just 2 weeks ago. The date at which equipment can be received at the sites has slipped by almost 1 year. None of the technical results in the ongoing development work have made Safeguard look better. On the contrary, several factors exist which tend to degrade the expected performance of Safeguard: The ability of the PAR, perimeter acquisition radar, to function in the presence of nuclear explosions is highly dubious, and the computer severely limits the performance of the system in handling large attacks; also, costs have risen substantially. Dr. Drell told the Subcommittee:

One major argument for last year's deployment decision as stated by Secretary Packard in testimony before the House Armed Services Committee on April 6, 1969, was that this is a very complex system and actual operational sites are needed to put together the complex computer and radar components into an actual operating system. Today I am here to oppose strongly the proposed expansion not only because of the known technical inadequacies but because, in fact, we have yet to gain any of the experience motivating the Phase I decision that was promised as part of a phased deployment program. At this time no equipment is in place, no parts of the system are complete, and its operating capability is still under study. What then have we learned to support the expanded deployment?

Mr. President, the inescapable conclusion of the subcommittee's 2-year examination of the Safeguard system is that the workability of Safeguard as designed is extremely doubtful and that even if it were to do so it would not protect us against the threat that we will face in the future if the SALT talks do not succeed. As for the "bargaining chip" argument, the Armed Services Committee's action in clearly restricting Safeguard to Minuteman defense deprived that argument of any force, if it ever had any. It has also deprived the Safeguard system of any justification for its existence, let alone its expansion. Dr. Drell told the subcommittee:

All analyses of which I am aware make it clear that if defense of Minuteman is the principal or sole mission of Safeguard, its further deployment cannot be justified.

The O'Neill report, drawn up by an ad hoc group of scientists organized by the Department of Defense, reached exactly the same conclusion.

If the only purpose of Safeguard is defined to be to protect Minuteman, Phase II–A as defined in March 1969 should not proceed,

the report said.

The search for a mission for Safeguard thus goes on. The mission has obviously not yet been found.

Aside from all the sophisticated technicalities, Mr. President, I ask whether our people are concerned about questionable deployment of Soviet ABM missiles around Moscow that have no capacity to hit the United States and which we could quickly exhaust with our massive offensive capability, or are we concerned with Russian ICBM and submarine capability to hit devastating blows on the United States? If we are primarily concerned about the possibility of an attack on our country, as I believe, then is it not reasonable to conclude that the Soviets have similar concern? I pose these questions, Mr. President, to illustrate once again my belief that reliance upon an anti-missile-missile defensive strategy is a maginot line concept. In my view, the best defense is a powerful offensive capability with an unquestioned will to use it in case of a nuclear attack upon the United States—that is, with the potential enemy having no doubt that the United States has the will to use its retaliatory capacity. This is our real deterrence.

So, the ABM defense, instead of being "virtually infallible," turns out to be fallibly virtual—that is, in theory illogical, and in practice ineffective. For myself, unless our security requires it—and ABM is surely not required—I see no reason for feeding the flames of international hostility by the continued piling of weapons system on top of weapons system. And at such a cost!

Domestic needs, which have been unmet for years, cry out for solution. Unfortunately, to President Nixon $1 spent on educating our children or on needed social security benefits is highly inflationary, while $10 spent for useless and potentially dangerous weapons is, somehow, not inflationary. This I totally reject.

But the most serious implication of any ABM development is its possibly adverse effect upon the prospects for successful conclusion of an agreement at the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks or at whatever subsequent arms-control negotiations may ensue. The implications will be equally grave whether ultimately a thick or thin ABM system is created. For the level of ABM defenses which may be successfuly negotiated at the SALT, or other similar such conferences, might well determine the limitations on offensive and defensive strategic weapons that are subject to mutual agreement. The more uncertainty aroused by the ABM deployment, the greater will be the insistence both in the United States and in the Soviet Union for "damage limiting" defensive deployment. And the more defensive deployment, the more offensive deployment will be necessary to retain either "balance" or "superiority" or "sufficiency" in nuclear arms.

Now is the time to call a halt to this seemingly endless escalation. More than a year ago former Secretary of Defense Clark Clifford observed:

> The hard fact is that we may never again expect to be in as favorable a position as we now enjoy for entry into talks about a freeze in strategic nuclear armaments. Technological developments may well make any arms limitation agreement more difficult to develop and enforce a year from now, or six months from now, than it is today.

That "today" has long since passed.

Of course, there are still some people, I am sorry to say, both in and out of Government, who feel that "it is impossible to do business with the Russians" on any basis. And they are so distrustful of our ability to protect our own interests in negotiations that they feel it best not even to enter into preliminary discussions. This is both ridiculous and dangerous—for us and for the rest of the world. As William C. Foster, former Chairman of our Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, wrote in Foreign Affairs—April 1969:

> Many people have the impression that dealing with the Soviets is like dealing with creatures from another planet. That has not been the experience of this observer. On the whole they have shown much the same personal reactions as Westerners. Moreover, they respect candor about basic conditions which cannot be waived in a negotiation—just as they respect those who keep their confidences.

This in general reflects my own experience with Soviet negotiators—with whom I have had a good deal of contact both at the U.N. and as Senate delegate-adviser to various Geneva conferences on nuclear weapons—and leads to my belief that the political leaders of this country would do well not to abet and exploit the popular American apprehensions about being "unable to do business with the Russians."

I call upon President Nixon for enlightened leadership such as he spoke of in his good speech in Rumania last year.

There is apprehension and distrust on both sides of what is becoming an ever thinner, though still existent, iron curtain. Because of this mutual distrust, both nations have habitually kept ready or in development almost every new weapon its strategists, whether military or civilian, want to test and deploy. There can never be a "sufficiency" to use President Nixon's expression, for these strategists—not from here to doomsday, which quite simply is where we have been heading.

Any agreement with the Soviets—on arms limitations or on anything else—should be one that is capable of verification. I have insisted upon this. This was a major reason for the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty, as I insisted at the time, should not include underground tests. Neither side was sure that a violation by the other would go undetected. But we can detect an atmospheric test, or one under water, or in space.

Any agreement with the Soviets must serve and protect our national interests; similiarly, we cannot expect them to agree to anything that fails to safeguard what they regard as their vital concerns. But there are areas in which there is a mutuality of interest. Surely both we and they share an interest in halting dangerous and costly escalation of the nuclear arms race, under conditions by which neither side would gain an advantage. In fact, never in history have there been two nations with a greater mutuality of interest, in that never have two great nations had as much to lose from all-out war, or from a continued drain on those national resources that might well be applied to constructive purposes.

Agreement can come only when there is relative parity. We have a sort of parity now in the sense that each side can destroy the other several times over. Those who believe that ABM, or the next round, or the next, will place us in such a strong position that we could, and would, be able to engage in nuclear blackmail to compel submission of our adversaries, misread the history of the nuclear arms race and of human nature as well.

A brief chronicle of our race to the top of the nuclear volcano will support my sharply critical judgment above. In 1961 the Soviets had but a small number of ICBM's, but the United States, not believing that a small number would "satisfy the Russians" and feeling that we might be overtaken, undertook a gigantic expansion of the Minuteman and Polaris forces. We ended up with many more weapons than were needed to destroy Russia several times over. Then the Soviets responded to our increased efforts by intensifying their own ICBM program and building their own nuclear submarine fleet. The age of overkill was upon us. Both psychologically and factually, this is a terrifying situation since either side may regard or delude itself as being in a position to launch a successful "first strike."

The Soviets now seem to be developing a "fractional orbital bombardment system" which theoretically would be almost impossible to detect and destroy, since the assault weapons may come in at a low level, at a relatively flat angle. Conceivably, such a system would threaten our bomber fleet on the ground. Thus, again, a "first-strike" capability could be said to be in the process of development. And, of course, we will react in kind. Of course, but why always "of course"? There are no absolutes, as far as I know, in military technology. Is it not time that this game of technological leapfrog was brought to an end? It adds nothing to the security of anyone elsewhere in the world, and it destroys the possibility of "domestic tranquillity" at home by reason of its astronomical costs.

The domestic needs of our society and the peace of the whole world are too great for any nation to squander its riches on destructive weapons or on futile efforts to protect against such weapons. The only true protection against nuclear exchange is the prevention of that exchange. Once it has started, both sides have lost: all will have been lost.

The search for some formula to bring nuclear weapons under control has been an urgent task of four administrations, beginning with President Eisenhower. Despite a commendable start by President Nixon, the task remains. Whether it will be successfully prosecuted by the present administration is still uncertain.

Still one must have faith in the future, faith not in patrician groups or elites—a given government, the military, the scientific community, and so forth—but in the people. President Nixon won the first round with his ABM proposal. He will lose the second, I believe, on Wednesday.

The American people are too aware of their humanity, of their needs which are common to all peoples. The sentiment for a reordering of priorities runs very deep in the people of this Nation, and in the people of Tennessee. And so, too, does commonsense, that commonsense which no longer blindly trusts the words of the experts, of the professional planners, of the "new mandarins," who have led us into this valley of the shadow.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I would like to begin by complimenting the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. Although I was not in the Chamber to hear the entirety of his speech, the great portion I did hear certainly indicated a very thorough and precise look into the problem of the ABM. As usual, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee presented before this body a remarkable context of all the reasonable arguments of why this is another gigantic mistake we would make if we were to approve this system as requested.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUGHES. I yield.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I am grateful for the very generous remarks of the able Senator from Iowa. I have spent a great deal of time on the question of ABM deployment. The subcommittee of which I am chairman has conducted extensive hearings, both public and executive. I am confident that the conclusions I stated are shared by a majority of the members of the subcommittee. It, indeed, would be a grave error further to expand the ABM system.

THE SAFEGUARD ABM SYSTEM

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, once again we are debating approval of the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile system. Once again we are being told of an increased threat from the Soviet Union.

But however familiar the arguments may seem, conditions have changed. Our debate this year takes place in a different context. The events of the past 12 months have strengthened my conviction that Safeguard would be a tragic waste of resources.

In short, the changes that have occurred are in the direction of reinforcing the very substantial case against Safeguard.

What has changed in the past year? Supporters of Safeguard argue that the Russians have continued their construction and deployment of offensive missiles. If this is true, it would only be in line with my prediction of last year. At that time I said: "Inevitably, if we deploy a new weapon system, the Soviets will take measures to catch up." Soviet military planners have the same distrust of us as our planners do of them. This is why there are arms races: each side wants to get ahead of the other.

We now have a chance to stop this spiral. I hope that we will take it.

Another change in the past year has been an increase in the projected costs of Safeguard. Last year we were told that the total cost of the system would be about $10 billion. This year the estimates have risen over $2.3 billion. If we examine the history of military cost increases, so ably exposed by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE), we can confidently predict that the costs of Safeguard will rise much further in the future. My good friend from Michigan, Senator HART, said last week that the ultimate cost might reach $50 billion.

We should not be misled, since the costs seem relatively small now, into thinking that another $5 or $10 billion will satisfy the every-increasing appetite for funds. This year's billion-dollar request is only the second installment on a costly house of cards.

When will it all end? Only when we vote to stop it.

Last year, many intelligent men—experts on the technical questions of radars, computers, and deterrence—told us that Safeguard was not likely to work in actual combat conditions. They testified that Safeguard was not cost-effective, because it could easily and cheaply be overwhelmed. They concluded that Safeguard was a wasteful and unreliable system.

I will not pretend that I have fully understood all these technical arguments. But I have been waiting for administration supporters to come up with reasonable answers to these sensible objections. So far they have not.

In fact, the administration now seems to be acting as if the deficiencies pointed out last year are fully recognized.

Last year, opponents of the ABM stressed the vulnerability of the missile site radars—MSR—and suggested that a better and cheaper defense could be built with a less complicated but specialized radar designed for Minuteman defense. Deputy Secretary Packard and Dr. Foster, Director of Defense Research and Engineering, both said that they had considered the use of smaller and cheaper radars, but had decided to try to get the MSR to do the job. This year they have gone ahead with active programs to develop such smaller and cheaper radars.

Last year, the administration discounted proposals to develop a specialized ABM defense specifically designed to protect Minuteman missiles. This year, both the Air Force and Army are actively investigating such possibilities.

Although the Senate Armed Services Committee saw "no compelling need to move now to the deployment of an area defense," the bill before us does not impose that restriction on the Pentagon. In fact, administration witnesses never relented from their support of a full system of area defense. And the four sites sanctioned by this bill can still be the building blocks for such an area defense.

Our doubts about Safeguard are still unresolved. Whenever scientists raise technical objections, we are assured by the Pentagon that the bugs will be eliminated, given time and enough money.

Let me say in passing that it seems strange that Secretary Laird believes in a "fly before you buy" policy for other weapons systems, but not for the Safeguard. If ever we needed to avoid excessive costs and guarantee effective performance, it is in the ABM.

Another change since last year has occurred in the rationale for Safeguard. In recent months, we have heard three different justifications for the ABM from Administration officials. President Nixon continues to argue that the system is necessary to defend U.S. cities against a potential Chinese attack. Secretary Laird has dropped that argument—as has our Armed Services Committee—and now says that Safeguard is supposed to protect U.S. missile sites against Soviet attack. Since that objective has been seriously questioned, Dr. Kissinger now says that we need an ABM as a stimulus to an agreement with the Russians on arms limitation.

The administration no longer uses the Chinese threat, the possibility of accidentally launched ICBM's, or defense of U.S. bombers to support the need for the Safeguard system.

What are we really supposed to be buying with these billions of dollars? The administration has no clear and consistent rationale for this system. The rationale seems to be shifting according to what arguments the public seems likely to buy, rather than according to real defense needs. The ABM promises to cure more ills than the snake oil once sold by itinerant peddlers—and with about as much effectiveness, in my opinion.

There seem to be two major arguments left to be answered—the strategic argument that Safeguard is necessary to defend the Minuteman; and the diplomatic, that Safeguard is needed to insure agreement in the SALT negotiations.

Safeguard must stand or fall on its effectiveness in the defense of the Minuteman. For that purpose, however, it is poorly designed, grossly extravagant, and of the most limited effectiveness.

The perimeter acquisition radars—PAR—which cost about $150 million each, and the Spartan missiles, which cost at least $3 million each, are almost totally irrelevant to Minuteman defense. The PAR's are not needed and could well be ineffective because of the likelihood of a radar blackout produced by high altitude nuclear bursts. The Spartans would be ineffective against even the simplest kinds of penetration aids. The administration seems to admit the irrelevance of these two components, since it wants to add only Sprint missiles to the sites approved last year.

The missile site radars—MSR—is the heart—or, more accurately, the Achilles heel—of the Safeguard. But it is so expensive that only one is planned for each defense site. And the destruction of this radar would render the whole defense of its ICBM complex totally ineffective.

Such destruction would be a relatively easy task. The radar is so soft that there is no need for either high accuracy or large warheads in order to destroy it. Thus, the radars could be destroyed and the whole Safeguard defense negated without use of any of the SS–9 missiles about which we have heard so much recently. The SS–11 missiles, which the Soviet Union possesses in much larger numbers, would have a much more than adequate yield and accuracy to destroy the MSR's.

There is also a problem with the fourth major component of the Safeguard system—the Sprint interceptor missiles. Here the problem is simply inadequacy in numbers. While the administration has not seen fit to make public the number of these interceptors that are being procured, it is clear that they could be exhausted by a very modest attack. Moreover, because of their limited range, only a fraction of the Minutemen in each ICBM complex can be defended.

Although the Safeguard would not likely be totally useless in the defense of Minuteman, at best it would be useful only against a very narrow range of threats. Beyond a certain point which is far in the future, only a few months' production of more Soviet missiles would offset whatever effectiveness Safeguard could have.

This is not my judgment alone. In fact, it is the judgment of the Defense Department's own Ad Hoc Group on Safeguard. The distinguished Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT) has

added greatly to our understanding of these points by telling us about the O'Neill report from that group. That report said:

> The group believes that a more cost-effective system for the active terminal defense of Minuteman than Phase IIA of Safeguard can be devised.

The report also said:

> If the only purpose of Safeguard is defined to be to protect Minuteman, Phase IIA as defined in March 1969 should not proceed.

If the Soviet threat should develop as feared by Secretary Laird, there are preferable alternatives to Safeguard. Lt. Gen. A. W. Betts, Chief of Army Research and Development, admitted that earlier this year. He said:

> When you get that kind of threat, then Safeguard is not the way to defend.

These preferable alternatives could include superhardening of the Minuteman sites so that they would be more resistant to the effects of nuclear blasts. Almost certainly, a superhardening program would be less expensive than Safeguard, more effective, and attainable on a much shorter time scale than the Safeguard Deployment.

Another possibility would be to go ahead with the Navy's underwater long-range missile system—ULMS. While the Soviet Union obviously now has the technology to cope adequately with Safeguard, there is no evidence whatever that they have antisubmarine warfare capabilities to cope adequately with even our present submarine force, much less with the projected ULMS.

There is also the option of simply building more Minutemen or submarines, if the Vienna talks should fail and if we feel that our deterrent is becoming jeopardized. Secretary Laird has claimed that the Soviet Union can build new ICBM's in about 18 months. It is hard to see why it would take the United States much longer. We could thus build more missiles on a much shorter time scale than would be required for Safeguard deployment.

These alternatives would be necessary only if the SALT negotiations fail. But what we all want is for those talks to succeed. Thus we must answer the question: Will rejection of Safeguard destroy the possibility of a strategic arms limitation agreement?

I believe that the answer to that question is no. Our real leverage at Vienna comes from our overall strategic position and from our capacity to meet any increased threat, not with one questionable system, but with a whole array of alternatives. The Soviet Union and the United States did not sit down in Helsinki and Vienna simply to get agreement restricting ABM's, but to stabilize the number of warheads. Both nations recognize that it is in their interest to get some kind of agreement on this vital point in order to halt the arms race.

The bargaining card argument is as spurious as it is prevalent.

All along, the men in the Pentagon have said that we must judge our adversaries by their actions and capabilities, rather than by their intentions. But what if the men in the Kremlin accept the same principle? What would they see?

They would see that the United States now leads the Soviet Union in terms of deliverable warheads. We have an overkill capacity that would deter any rational man from attempting an attack on us. Even if all our Minuteman missiles were destroyed, we would still have our submarine-launched missiles and our strategic bombers to wreak unacceptable havoc on the Soviet Union.

Both nations are now moving to halt the arms race through the SALT negotiations. No one in this Chamber would want to do anything that would jeopardize those talks. But while we proceed with those vital negotiations, the administration is also proceeding with the development, testing, and deployment of the very weapons which the negotiations are intended to control.

Such a contradictory policy destroys our credibility at the bargaining table and jeopardizes the chances for success. We must not only say that we want mutual restrictions on armaments; we must also act as if we mean it.

How can we justify expanding our arsenal in order to reduce it? That kind of military logic is tragically similar to the tactic of destroying a village in Vietnam in order to save it.

Halting further construction or deployment of the Safeguard system will not endanger a SALT agreement. The Russians have reasons far more compelling than the American ABM for reaching some agreements on arms limitations. They—and we—can save billions and can free resources for domestic development if the arms race can be halted. Both nations have powerful incentives to reject notions of superiority in strategic weapons and accept instead sufficiency in deterrence.

If the Russians use our denial of ABM funds—except for research and development—they should know that the consequences will be expensive and dangerous. Both nations would feel compelled to continue the arms race and move into a new and costly generation of deadly weapons.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question? I have to go to a committee meeting, and will not be able to hear the rest of his speech. But I was impressed with what the Senator from Iowa said regarding the workability of this matter. I hope he might even go farther.

What has impressed me, in some of the hearings and the executive sessions on this matter, even last year, was that in the discussions as to workability—on which I agree with the Senator from Iowa in his conclusions—another point was added, in that there were several of the witnesses who said, "Well, even if we make it work, assuming that everything were solved, we are not so sure that we would not, by that time, be defending something that is obsolete in itself."

That is what really bothers me about it.

Mr. HUGHES. That speculation has been brought up many times, as we both realize.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes. Which adds another factor to it: Even if we assume that we got everything moving and ready, and it all was there and working as intended, we still might be talking about the defense of an obsolete war weapon.

Mr. HUGHES. I wholeheartedly agree with the Senator from Washington.

Mr. President, the history of arms control efforts since World War II should have taught us that we can reach effective agreements with the Russians only through a policy of mutual restraint. We achieved the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty and the Nonproliferation Treaty only by declaring a moratorium on testing and on the spread of weapons until the professed willingness of both sides could be formalized in a treaty.

We will obtain an arms limitation agreement only if we now show mutual understanding and restraint rather than mutual suspicion and impulsiveness.

Approval of the expansion of ABM—far from making agreement more likely—actually would jeopardize the negotiations. At a time when we should be downshifting, we would be moving into high gear.

The distinguished Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) expressed a common argument of Safeguard supporters when he said last Friday:

> Safeguard is our principal bargaining card.

That argument, in my opinion, is an expensive illusion. From all that has been said about the dubious reliability of Safeguard, I cannot see how anyone could believe that we have an ace up our sleeve. We know—and the Russians know—that the Safeguard is only a deuce. We would be bluffing only ourselves if we relied upon it to secure an agreement.

These are our answers to the major arguments against a halt in the expansion of Safeguard. I wish, in return, to pose some questions for the supporters of this expensive and dubious system to answer.

Why would the Russians abandon SALT if we stopped Safeguard? If they had strong reasons for entering into discussions, these reasons would not have been changed.

Is not the administration's policy fundamentally contradictory? Nations do not arm in order to disarm. Nor do they trust others who begin a new cycle in the arms race while saying they want to stabilize the balance of terror.

Finally, and perhaps most important, are there not better ways to spend this money? If our negotiations should fail, it seems undeniable that there are better ways to spend money on Minuteman defense. And in any event, there are far better and more productive ways to help our own people.

With the billion dollars in this bill this year, we could provide full-time preschool education for 500,000 children. Or we could provide nutritional supplements to needy pregnant women, nursing mothers, and small infants and still dou-

ble the existing food assistance programs. Or we could build an additional 350 comprehensive neighborhood health care centers. Or we could assist rural development by providing community facilities, special housing, and family farm assistance.

We could do these things; we could do other things. We all have ideas for improving the quality of life in America, and for taking steps to restore a healthy environment so that we may continue to survive.

But we must also try to survive the threat of nuclear war. To do this, we must halt the arms race.

There is no deadline for action on ABM this year. We still have time to give peace a chance, to give negotiations a chance. Before we start down the path of phases II, III, IV, and so on, I hope that Senators will give earnest and careful consideration to the proposal to stop all deployment of the ABM. Last year was not soon enough. Next year will certainly be far too late.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the amendment that I now submit and intend to propose at the appropriate time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOGGS). The amendment will be received and printed, and will lie on the table; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 829) is as follows:

AMENDMENT No. 829

On page 2, line 2, of the amendment, strike out "838,600,000" and insert in lieu thereof "381,200,000".

On page 2 of the amendment, beginning with line 8, strike out all down through and including line 20 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"TITLE IV.—PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR DEPLOYMENT OF SAFEGUARD SYSTEM

"SEC. 401. None of the funds appropriated pursuant to this or any other act may be used for the purpose of deploying a safeguard system at any site."

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) be added as a cosponsor of my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BOGGS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 831 AND 832

Mr. HUGHES subsequently said: Mr. President, I send to the desk two amendments intended to be proposed by me and ask that they be received and printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOLE). The amendments will be received and printed, and will lie on the table.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, this morning's Washington Post carried, among its letters to the editor, a most enlightened and rational statement about the true significance of ABM in the context of the SALT negotiations.

The conclusion of the five distinguished gentlemen who signed the letter is that "a Senate vote against the ABM is a vote for success in SALT."

This is precisely the conclusion which I have tried to advance today, but since their argument is more eloquent and persuasive than mine could be, I ask unanimous consent that their letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ABM VOTE AND THE SALT TALKS

Recently administration spokesmen have been insisting that unless the Congress authorizes the continued construction and expansion of the Safeguard ABM, it will not be possible to negotiate an agreement with the Soviets at SALT to limit strategic armaments. They argue that the negotiators need the Safeguard bargaining chip to induce the Russians to halt the deployment of their large SS–9 ICBMs.

This would appear to be an attempt to exploit the desire of the Senate and the public to achieve success in SALT in order to rescue the Safeguard program from defeat. The administration has always defended the Safeguard ABM defense of Minuteman sites on the basis that it was not a threat to the U.S.S.R. If true, why then should the continuation of this program be a chip to induce the Soviets to agree to limit their offensive missile deployment?

The major U.S. threat to Soviet security lies in the deployment of the U.S. MIRV systems. On April 9, 1970, the Senate passed a resolution by a vote of 72 to 6 urging that the President propose to the U.S.S.R. an immediate suspension by both countries of further deployment of *all* offensive and defensive nuclear strategic weapons systems. Yet this MIRV chip has been thrown away by the accelerated deployment of the Minuteman III and Poseidon missiles with their MIRV warheads and by the reported proposal that any MIRV limitations must be accompanied by Soviet acceptance of extensive inspection of both offensive and defensive missile sites. There is no security justification for such urgent MIRV deployment since the heavy Soviet ABM which they were designed to penetrate could not be deployed and become operational for many, many years.

It has also been reported that the possible outcome of SALT would be an agreement that henceforth the United States and the U.S.S.R. will limit their ABMs to the defense of their capitals. The continued deployment of Safeguard at the Minuteman sites will not in any way contribute to the defense of Washington, and the Senate is being asked to endorse the expenditure of funds for useless hardware if SALT is successful and for an admittedly at best marginally effective system if it is unsuccessful. Why the U.S. should try to get the Soviets to agree to the deployment of ABM defenses for Washington and Moscow instead of a complete ABM ban is not clear, since the defense of Washington will not accomplish any of President Nixon's three objectives for an ABM system. A complete ban would eliminate the need for MIRVs and simplify the problems of verification by obviating any possible need for inspection. It is reported that the Soviets have indicated interest in such a complete ban.

Finally, history has unmistakably demonstrated that restraints, not accelerated weapons programs, pave the road to arms control. Overwhelming superiority did not induce the Soviets to accept the Baruch plan. On the other hand, President Kennedy's American University pledge to halt atmospheric nuclear testing as long as the Soviets did the same rapidly produced agreement to negotiate the Limited Test Ban Treaty in 1963. Similarly, the Senate passage without dissenting vote of the Pastore Resolution in 1966 endorsing efforts to halt the spread of nuclear weapons broke the ice toward starting serious U.S.-U.S.S.R. negotiations on the Nonproliferation Treaty.

If the Senate wishes to conserve funds and make a maximum contribution toward improving U.S. security by achieving arms limitations and agreement at SALT, it will refuse authorization of funds for the expansion of Safeguard and forbid the expenditure of additional funds for the continued deployment at the two Safeguard sites approved last year until it is satisfied that the negotiators have not been able to persuade the Soviets to agree to limitations on offensive and defensive missile systems.

In our judgment, a Senate vote against the ABM is a vote for success in SALT.

W. AVERELL HARRIMAN.
KARL KAYSEN.
ADRIAN S. FISHER.
FRANKLIN A. LONG.
HERBERT SCOVILLE, JR.

Washington.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, another important contribution to the debate over the wisdom of proceeding with Safeguard is contained in the current issue of The New Republic. In that publication, Ralph E. Lapp cogently argues the case against ABM, declaring at one point in his article that:

The Pentagon, having gotten the camel's head under the tent, is trying to ram through at least a hump.

Nothing has been completed in Montana or North Dakota.

Lapp writes:

Nothing works—but now the Defense Department summons forth Phase II to cram more short-range Sprint missle interceptors into the Montana-North Dakota sites, and seeks to establish a brand new Safeguard site to protect the Whiteman AFB in Missouri.

The aptness of the article is such that I would like to share it with my colleagues, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SALT CHIPS AND SAFEGUARD

(By Ralph E. Lapp)

The US Senate is now debating Phase II of the Safeguard anti-ballistic missile program. Phase I of this ABM effort squeaked through the Senate last year by the narrowest of margins and, anticipating another close vote, the Senate Armed Services Committee has pared back the program hoping that a more modestly priced system will win support.

In reporting out the authorization bill, Senator John Stennis, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, claimed that the new version of Safeguard would cost only $6.5 billion as opposed to $10.7 billion for the full system. In making this cutback the Committee has once more shifted its stance on ABM, this time abandoning the 12-site area defense system (including protection against Red Chinese missiles) in favor of a 4-site deployment of radars and missiles. These will be aimed at defending part of the Minuteman ICBM force against the threat of a first strike by the Soviet Union. Senator Stennis maintains that the missile defense of Minuteman is absolutely essential to the survival of the United States—a thesis held with equal fervor by Defense Secretary Melvin Laird who has based his case for Safeguard on the first-strike potential of the mighty SS–9 Soviet missiles, as projected to

the mid-1970s. But Sen. Stennis and Safeguard backers made no secret of the fact that their strongest argument is that the ABM system is a cardinal bargaining chip in the SALT talks, which seek to limit strategic arms. Defeat Safeguard, Sen. Stennis argued on the Senate floor, and "We would have a situation where Congress would deny to our President the very item—the major item, I believe—of the bargaining arrangement."

In response to the bargaining chip argument, Senator J. W. Fulbright highlighted the illogic of the concept: "They say that this money is to be only for hard-point defense for missile sites for Minuteman; and the very same day in a different context, you have Dr. Kissinger, the principal adviser to and spokesman for the President, saying, 'We are considering restricting ABM to the defense of Washington if the Russians only want it for the defense of Moscow'." Ironically, the Washington ABM site is one abandoned in Phase II of the latest Safeguard plan. So it's difficult to see how a failure to fund Phase II this year has any chip-value at all. For that matter there is no ascribable value to either Phase I or Phase II since each now seeks only to defend Minuteman silos—and not to protect cities against atomic attack. The bargaining power of Phase II has to be related to the SS–9 and to further deployments of this offensive missile, but nothing coming out of the SALT talks at Vienna suggests such a deal.

Assuming, however, that the SALT agreement pointed to matching a Washington, D.C. ABM defense against the 64-Galosh missile system (ABM–1) deployed around Moscow, would this mean stopping work on the US sites planned to protect Minuteman? That's hardly a bargain that President Nixon could go for, especially since he has placed so much emphasis on the Soviet strategic threat to these Minuteman bases.

Encouraged by the one-vote margin of loss in last year's Safeguard vote, opponents of the ABM program had been eager to press for denial of further funds to Phase I ($1.0 billion) and new funds of $0.4 billion for Phase II. The former funds one site to defend Minuteman missiles at the Malmstrom Air Force Base in Montana, and a second site at Grank Forks, AFB, North Dakota. Last year, in urging approval of funds for Phase I, Secretary Laird pleaded: "Let us deploy Phase I. Let us complete it. Let us finish it. Let us see how it works and after that decide whether to go ahead." This year the Pentagon, having gotten the camel's head under the tent, is trying to ram through at least a hump. Nothing has been completed in Montana or North Dakota; nothing works—but now the Defense Department summons forth Phase II to cram more short-range Sprint missile interceptors into the Montana-North Dakota sites, and seeks to establish a brand new Safeguard site to protect the Whiteman AFB in Missouri. This 3-site ABM system will cost $5.9 billion, plus $0.9 billion for nuclear warheads for a total of $6.8 billion. There's even provision in Phase II authorization for preliminary work on another ABM site for the Warren AFB in Wyoming—the other hump of the camel!

On July 31, Senators Sherman Cooper (R, Ky.) and Philip A. Hart (D, Mich.) revealed their ABM opposition strategy, when they introduced an amendment to prohibit any new ABM sites from being constructed—beyond the two authorized in Phase I. Their amendment allows addition of more Sprints to the Montana-North Dakota sites, and is aimed at countering the don't-steal-the-President's-chips argument. That has become the mainstay of the Safeguard case, as illustrated by Senator Stennis' admonition on July 30th when he summed up a pro-ABM speech: ". . . I warn again, as strongly as I can, that a vote in the Senate against the ABM means sudden death at this sitting, at least, of the SALT talks in Vienna."

The history of the ABM project is tortuous, but never has a weapons system's justification shifted so abruptly to a basis of arms limitation.

It's tempting for a critic of Safeguard to analyze the new crop of inconsistencies, sudden swerves and policy twists in the program, but such an exercise merely underlines the irrationality of the whole program. Rather than attempt to follow the switchbacks and U-turns of Safeguard evolution, it is prudent to direct an analysis to the cost effectiveness of Safeguard, assuming the 3-site system is built and that it works.

The key question to ask about the Safeguard system is "How much does an ABM chip cost us—and how much will it cost the Soviets to match us?" Or, as Dr. John Foster, Jr., director of the Pentagon's research and development programs, put it: "—how much does it cost to add an extra defensive missile and how much to add an offensive missile?"

Dr. Foster gave his answer—$3 to $5 million for a US interceptor and $10 million for a Soviet attacking warhead. His chip cost is two or three to one in our favor. But he is also chief salesman for the Safeguard and as such he may be swept up in his own promotional zeal. Therefore, we shall examine the Safeguard system and make an independent assay of the chip cost.

First, let's look at our costs. To do this, we need to examine the US ABM system in some detail.

Phase I of Safeguard consists of the following hardware items for the Malmstrom and Grand Forks bases:

One PAR (Perimeter Acquisition Radar) for long-range detection and tracking of hostile warheads.

One MSR (Missile Site Radar) for directing missiles to intercept the detected incoming warheads.

One battery of long-range Spartan interceptors designed primarily for area defense of the United States.

Three batteries of short-range Sprint interceptors to back up the Spartans and to provide an active defense of the system radars.

The radars are the eyes of the Safeguard and they are also its Achilles' heel. Without electronic vision the giant missile system is blind and helpless to defend the Minuteman missile silos. Unlike the latter, which are underground silos built of reinforced concrete, the radars are ten times more vulnerable to a nuclear blast. As Defense Secretary Laird explained: "That is why most of our Sprint missiles will be deployed to provide protection for those MSRs."

In fact, Phase II of Safeguard adds four more Sprint batteries to the Montana and North Dakota sites to beef up the system. And in its initial version, Phase II sought to add ABM bases to protect the Whiteman (Missouri) and Warren (Wyoming) Minuteman fields. However, the Administration sensed the temper of the Senate and modified this deployment to include only the Whiteman site, reserving Warren for a future budget.

As it now stands, the Safeguard system will consist of 3 sites designed to protect 500 Minuteman missiles at a total cost of $6.8 billion. This figures out to be about $13 million to protect each Minuteman, but the figure is too low because there are fewer than 500 Sprints and Spartans in the system available to defend the silos. The Sprints are limited to defense of only one Minuteman squadron (50 silos) at a time.

If the Soviets target their attack on the weakest link in the Safeguard chain, they would aim to destroy the radars. Therefore, the number of interceptor missiles capable of fending off such an attack is the critical figure to use in calculating the cost of an ABM defense chip. The Pentagon refuses to disclose the number of Sprints and Spartans being produced in Phase I and II, presumably to keep the Soviets in the dark. Disclosure of the number would strengthen the hand of Safeguard opponents who maintain that the system is too thin to provide a thick defense of a critical component like MSR. In any event, the Soviets will know the number soon enough when the Sprint-Spartan cells are constructed and made visible to orbital photographic inspection.

It will be assumed that the total number of killer missiles available for MSR defense is 100 per base or 300 for all three ABM installations.

Assuming that each killer interceptor knocks out one incoming warhead, we divide $6.8 billion—the system cost—by 300 to obtain a chip cost of $22 million for the defense. This figure is many times that given by Dr. Foster and is to be explained by the fact that he made only marginal allowance for radar costs and neglected the total systems cost. There is no military experience in the anti-missile field, although the use of surface launched missiles in attacking aircraft shows that it takes as many as 50 defensive missiles to knock out one aircraft. The one-for-one ratio that Dr. Foster assumes is a most optimistic forecast. Should it require two Sprints to kill off one warhead, then the chip cost escalates to $45 million apiece.

Dr. Foster has minimized the U.S. chip cost; how valid is his $10 million estimate for the matching Soviet chip? Estimating Soviet costs is a perilous accounting practice, but we shall proceed by using the very same figures that Dr. Foster cites for Soviet weapons. These are $30 million for the monstrous SS–9 missile, which carries three 5-megaton warheads, and $10 million for the SS–11 missile which mounts a 1-megaton warhead.

Megaton-class warheads are essential for silo-busting—for digging Minuteman out of the ground—but they are overkill weapons when targeted on vulnerable radars. A warhead of one-tenth megaton delivered two-thirds of a mile off-target would destroy an MSR. Therefore the Soviet have a variety of offense options in staging an attack on Minuteman if they wish to knock out the ABM system. They could allocate a small number of SS–9s to a radar-busting attack, equipping these missiles with many 0.1-megation warheads. These need not all be MIRVed, i.e., independently targeted reentry vehicles; they could be partly clustered warheads like those carried in our A–3 Polaris submarine-launched ballistic missile. The US Poseidon missile, successor to Polaris, can mount a maximum of 14 warheads (MIRVs) per missile, so it is not unreasonable to assume that the much more massive SS–9 missile could carry twice as many warheads.

The Poseidonizing of the SS–9 was actually anticipated in the *Report on Military Spending* (to be discussed in a forthcoming article in *The New Republic*) released last month by Members of Congress for Peace through Law. This report put the cost of an SS–9 fitted with 20 warheads as $35 million. Thus each attacking warhead would cost about $2 million if allowance is made for launch failures.

A second Soviet option would be the employment of SS–11 missiles to carry, say, a cluster of five warheads. The Soviets have already deployed more than 830 of the SS–11s and allocation of a small fraction of these to radar-busting would make little impact on their inventory. They could also use the newer SS–13, a solid-fueled ICBM first deployed in 1968, to carry a multiple warhead. Such options would yield unit costs of about $2 million per attacking warhead.

Such offensive options are by no means farfetched; they are within easy reach of Soviet

technology and must be considered as realistic threats to Safeguard. The Soviets could also employ decoys in an attack on MSR, but we shall restrict the analysis to live warheads as stipulated by Dr. Foster.

The above reckoning gives the Soviets a unit cost of $2 million per warhead vis-a-vis $22 million for a U.S. killer missile. That's an eleven-to-one cost advantage for the Soviet. My estimate and Dr. Foster's are widely divergent, differing by a factor of 22.

Senator Stuart Symington (D, Mo.), former Secretary of the Air Force, was much concerned with offense-defense cost ratios and subjected Dr. Foster to a barrage of barbed questions in the course of a Senate inquiry. Dr. Foster countered by saying: "The way to overcome your particular concern, Senator Symington, is to put in enough missiles for defense at half the price of the offense." But if the criterion used is correct, then there is something terribly wrong with the Pentagon's arithmetic.

The criterion used by Dr. Foster is backed by the Senate Armed Services Committee, for on page 21 of its authorization report we find: "The Committee accepts the view that the relevant criterion for the evaluation of a system of active defense is not the defense cost per Minuteman silo saved, or the relationship between the cost of the protection and the cost of the missile itself. It is, rather, a comparison of the cost of the defense to the cost of the offense to offset that defense." But the Committee provides no cost figures to support its case. Instead its chairman switches to a political base, namely, the President needs Safeguard as a bargaining chip at the SALT table.

Given the corkscrew course of the U.S. ABM program, one may wonder if the bargaining chip argument is bona fide. If it is then one may ask: How many bargaining chips do we need?

As will be shown in my critique of the MCPL (*Report on Military Spending*), the Administration is proceeding to acquire major strategic weapons systems—Minuteman III and Poseidon—whose chip value must impress the Soviets. Given the military worth of offensive missiles, the Soviets may be pardoned if they view Minuteman III and Poseidon as prime pieces on the strategic chess board and ABM as simply pawns.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUGHES. I am happy to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. CRANSTON. I want first to thank the Senator from Iowa for the leadership he has provided on the ABM issue in offering this amendment. I believe that it is vitally important that the facts as he has stated them be considered and recognized by the Senate, and that we support this amendment as the soundest approach to the vast expenditure of funds that would seem to serve no constructive purpose, if ABM were continued as proposed in the pending measure. So I rise to support the Hughes amendment, of which I was the first cosponsor.

Mr. HUGHES. I wish to thank the distinguished Senator for the comments he has made regarding my approach to the amendment this year, for his continuing support, and for his concise look into the problems of this gigantic system in America which does not seem to be successful or to have the probability of success. I am grateful to the distinguished Senator for his comments of support today as in the past.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the statement has been made that nations do not arm in order to disarm. I am bound to say that I disagree with that. The entire history of conflict is to the contrary.

We armed belatedly in the First World War, only to disarm thereafter. We armed belatedly in the Second World War, only to disarm precipitately thereafter. In years almost too short to count, we armed hastily again for the Korean war, and we proceeded to cut down on forces and then armed again for the Vietnam war. The SALT talks are an effort to persuade the Russians and ourselves to disarm partially, to agree on a plateau of disarmament.

I never speak on any matters regarding the defense of the United States without wishing that I could support disarmament. The Russians for years have contended that we ought to have unilateral and complete disarmament, meaning that we disarm and they arm.

It would be far easier for me, especially in an election year, simply to say that I agree with all the proposals to disarm—let us turn the swords into plowshares and till the soil while other nations remain strong. I wish I could do that. It would make a very good argument for me in an election year.

I really wish I could support all the simplistic proposals to tie one hand behind our back and then try to move just as surely as possible into negotiation. But the evidence is indisputable to me that the one thing which has carried the SALT talks toward success has been the evidence which the Russians have seen on the part of the United States to maintain a minimal defensive posture. We are only talking about phase I of the ABM and not the so-called Chinese menace embodied in phase II.

I would hope that the SALT talks could come to an end so that we would know exactly what is expected of us, as Americans, with the deepest concern which every Member of this Chamber shares for the proper defense of the United States. But when we speak of expecting the restraint to be shown by other nations, it sounds like ancient history, to go back to 1922. That was the year, I believe, of the Treaty of Washington, and the great powers gathered and discussed naval disarmament. Then, practically everybody in America was for the most peaceful solution. Practically every Senator then, in those days, was for disarmament, and we did not have the close division of disagreement. We decided to trust everyone else. The arguments, I am sure, must have sounded as they have sounded in this year of 1970: What are we afraid of? What are we concerned about? If we disarm, they will disarm, too. They are only afraid of us.

We know what happened. We sank our battleships. We stopped the construction of other great ships on the ways. We had Colonel Mitchell go out with his flimsy plane and drop some bombs on the *Ostfriesland*, a captured German battleship, dropped some bombs on other vessels, and we sank them in the Chesapeake.

Everyone said, "The nations will not make war any more, and they will beat their swords into plowshares, and we will follow in the ways of peace." The Japanese did not destroy any vessels. They destroyed only the blueprints. The Imperial German Government did not destroy any vessels. It destroyed only the blueprints.

Now it is proposed not only that we destroy blueprints but also that we destroy our arms, that we cease to build, and that we do not defend the United States as our Defense Department says it must be defended.

I would rather have the other side of this argument. It is the popular side. It is the side on which people all say, "Never mind the defense of the United States. Nobody will hurt us."

We bought one big war and two little ones because we believed that argument before, and we will buy other wars if we believe it again. Just as surely as we stand here, we will be saying to those who are of an aggressive frame of mind, of a warlike nature, "The United States has done it again—in 1917 and 1940 and 1950 and 1961. So now we do it again, and we save money. We put it into things that we ought to put it in." I agree. We ought to put it into this and that and the other, and they all need it. But not one of them would be worth anything and not a domestic benefit would exist if this country lay prostrate at the feet of an alert and aggressive foe. No, I do not think we should go further than the Armed Services Committee has gone, but we ought to go at least that far.

We ought to remember the Naval Conference of 1922 and apply what happened after the Treaty of Washington to all the arguments being made here. I do not know of any acid that would more successfully dissolve most of the arguments we are hearing than the recollection of the United States one more time deciding that it will deal not from strength but from weakness—from the sure strength that we believe in our principles, from the certain strength that we will defend ourselves, and from the complete determination that we will not make war upon anyone else, that we wish no nation's soil, and that we wish to give no offense to any peoples.

But, surely, there is a minimal line, and here we are in disagreement—honest, concerned Senators, all men of good will—as to where the line needs to be drawn. For me, I will draw it where the Armed Services Committee has drawn it. I will support the decision to continue only with the deployment of phase I. I will hope that the SALT agreements may make it possible for nations to forget this dreadful rollcall of alphabets—the ABM, the ICBM, and the rest of the mutual horror with which we are confronting ourselves—and it can be done.

But it is, in my opinion, unlikely to be done if the Russian Government is convinced that the Congress of the United States is unwilling to defend the United States with adequate, needed, deterrent weaponry.

I wish I did not have to make this speech. I would far rather be making the others. If I could bring myself to believe it, I could make a better speech on the other side. But my trouble is, I cannot believe it. Being unable to believe it, I

can only say what I have to say. I may add it is against the advice of most of the people in my own office that I am making this speech, and against the advice of the so-called public relations people I know, who say that I should listen to the letters and the protests, that I should listen to all those people who will help me get reelected.

I wish I could. But, there is a little matter of the oath of office. Each of us here separately is responding to his concept of that oath. So am I.

I will have to support the committee.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. HUGHES. I should like to indicate to the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania that the junior Senator from Iowa very highly values his opinions in regard to this or any other problem our Nation may face. Certainly, in the common interest of all the people, his long experience and years of study and expertise in all these fields have brought him to a position of leadership in the Senate.

I respect him for the courage he has displayed in going against the advice of his public relations friends and most of the people in his office, but I should like to make a simple request of the Senator from Pennsylvania: that he read the speech I have just delivered on the floor of the Senate—I am sure he did not have the opportunity to hear it all—and if there is any indication in that speech that I advocated in any way the disarmament of this Nation, or in any way to lessen the capacity of this Nation to respond to initiatives by other countries, or in any way to abandon the maintenance of adequate military capability of this Nation, under all circumstances, I hope that he would so indicate to me, **because it certainly is not my intention** to indicate anything like that.

The discussion and debate over the ABM system, on phase I, II, or III, I think, as the distinguished Senator indicated, has the potential result that honest men, with the common security of their nation as the reason for their statements, might arrive at different conclusions.

I thank the Senator from Pennsylvania for yielding to me.

Mr. SCOTT. I want to say to the distinguished Senator from Iowa that I shall read his speech and shall read it with a great deal of interest. I did read a part of it. As the distinguished Senator knows, I have not and certainly would not imply that there is lessening, or any less interest on the part of any Senator, or on the part of any other Senator, for the protection of this Nation. I had hoped to make clear my belief that a certain level of protection of our country is the minimal level I could support, that we do disagree, and that others have a view as to other levels which they believe to be adequate.

This is the high tradition of the Senate, that Senators disagree without being disagreeable about it, that we respect the conscience and concerns of each other, as I do the deep and the scholarly way in which the distinguished Senator from Iowa has approached the subject, quietly and reasonably. Therefore, it will be a pleasure, indeed, to become acquainted with the entire statement which the Senator has made.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Pennsylvania yield for a question?

Mr. SCOTT. I am happy to yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. MURPHY. I was impressed with the recitation of the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania about the experiences of the past, where the United States had taken the lead in giving concrete evidence that we are not a warlike nation, that we seek peace, that we destroyed our armaments while others tore up only their blueprints. I wonder whether I am correct in saying that the latest experience, I recall, had to do with the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty of 3 or 4 years ago during the preparation of which, during all the advance talks leading up to the meetings, and during the meetings themselves, we found that the Soviet Union had, during all that time, been preparing for tests which gave them a great advantage in the nuclear field. Is that not quite right?

Mr. SCOTT. My recollection agrees with that of the distinguished Senator from California. That is how I so understand it.

Mr. MURPHY. The evidence is that during the entire time when we were taking the lead and once again saying, "Let us make every effort toward peace. Let us stop everything. Let us achieve peace. Let us achieve this hoped for, sought for, and prayed to objective where we can, gradually do away with armaments." But, during the time of those meetings and all those preparations, the high-yield tests by the Russians were actually ongoing and must have been of No. 1 importance in order to have been achieved at the time they were going on. Is that not the Senator's recollection?

Mr. MURPHY. I thank my distinguished colleague.

Mr. SCOTT. My recollection is the same as that of the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I want to make this statement so that it will appear in the RECORD at this point, that the statement just made by the Senator from Pennsylvania is one of the best, particularly from the standpoint of leadership. It is also one of the best analyses, at the same time, of the situation with which we find ourselves confronted. I appreciate very much his strong stand here to meet what, unfortunately, is our first obligation in the Senate; namely, to protect the security of this Nation.

I know there are others who disagree with that who are equally as sincere as I am, but I think the Senator's statement is something to point to.

In this whole debate, the statement of the Senator from Pennsylvania is the stake to which the welfare of our country can be tied, and I commend him and at the same time thank him for expressing his fine sentiments.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I want first to say that I share with the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES), my colleague from California (Mr. MURPHY), and the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), the esteem they have expressed for the Senator from Pennsylvania, the distinguished Republican leader. He has set forth a viewpoint in regard to this legislation that merits the most careful consideration by the Senate and the country.

I know of no Senator in this body—and I am sure he knows of no Senator either—who advocates any form of unilateral disarmament by the United States. I believe that every Senator in this body knows that, and recognizes that the United States must have adequate strength to defend itself in a world of anarchy.

The Senator from Pennsylvania stated that it would be vastly dangerous if others in this world were given the impression that the Senate did not recognize the United States must have "adequate, needed, deterrent weaponry."

I would most certainly agree with that statement, but I do not see how that statement can relate to the discussion on the ABM system since I think the Department of Defense itself, in testimony rendered this year to the Armed Services Committee, indicated grave doubt as to the adequacy of the present proposed ABM system and its ability to do its performed task.

If that is true, it is certainly not needed. If that is true, it is not a deterrent. If that is true, it seems to me it cannot be classified as weaponry in the sense that we would mean by weaponry, weapons that can really serve fully the defense of this country in a time of trial.

Mr. President, I rise in support of the Hughes amendment, of which I was the first cosponsor.

Last year, during the heated debate over the ABM system, a bumper strip appeared with the caption "The ABM Is an Edsel."

A year later I have concluded that this phrase was an insult to the Ford Motor Co.

The Edsel was designed to be an automobile, and it worked.

It is still unclear what the Safeguard system was designed to do.

Safeguard was conceived originally for one mission—the defense of our cities.

When it was found that Safeguard could not do this job, it was given another assignment—the defense of our Minuteman sites.

Now there is clear and compelling evidence that it will not be able to do this job either, and that there are less costly and more effective ways to handle the defense of our Minuteman.

The Safeguard system then is still, this year, as it was last year, a weapons system in search of a mission.

We have heard many arguments advanced in favor of ABM over the past years.

The defense of our cities, protection from the threat of a Chinese nuclear attack, the defense of our own land-based missiles, and so forth.

In fact, there never has been a major weapons system for which so many dis-

ingenuous and conflicting claims have been advanced.

The latest and perhaps the most ludicrous argument advanced in favor of the ABM is that we need it as a bargaining chip for the SALT negotiations in Vienna.

This argument would be genuinely funny if it were not for the tragic consequences which could flow from it.

Those who advance it believe that we can negotiate successfully with the Soviet Union only if we do so from a position of strength.

The fact is, however, that negotiation from a position of strength has never worked in nuclear negotiations between the United States and the Soviet Union.

As Dr. Adrian Fisher points out, the Soviets rejected the Baruch plan in 1946 because they felt acceptance of the plan would make them a second-class power.

Similarly, we rejected Soviet overtures for a restriction of strategic nuclear delivery systems in 1957, because of our fears that they were ahead of us in delivery systems at that time.

In fact, arms limitation arguments have been successfully concluded between the Soviet Union and the United States only in those instances when both sides approached negotiations with an attitude of restraint.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will my distinguished colleague yield for a question?

Mr. CRANSTON. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I would be most interested in knowing what arms limitations conferences my distinguished colleague considers to be successful.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I am just going on to cite some that were successful. My analysis of them as being successful is based on my reading of current history and the remarks on the ABM debate by Dr. Adrian Fisher, who was the principal negotiator for the United States with the Soviet Union, some of which negotiations were successful.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, was he the chairman of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency?

Mr. CRANSTON. No. He was an adviser in the State Department.

Mr. MURPHY. He was connected with the Department of State and not with the Department of Defense?

Mr. CRANSTON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MURPHY. I thank my distinguished colleague.

Mr. CRANSTON. As an example of the times when we did not negotiate from a position of superstrength—and not from a position of weakness—but of restraint, I will cite the Antarctic Treaty, the Test Ban Treaty, and the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons.

One of the most impressive pieces of evidence Dr. Fisher advances to support his contention that arms limitation negotiations are more successful when conducted in an atmosphere of restraint is the importance he attaches to the Pastore resolution in clearing the way for the nonproliferation treaty.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, would my distinguished colleague yield for a question?

Mr. CRANSTON. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, was my distinguished colleague in the Chamber when I referred to the Test Ban Treaty and pointed out that during the times of the talks and the meetings and all during the preparations for them, the tests which the Soviet Union conducted at that time and just before gave them a great advantage in the high yield atmospheric nuclear test? In other words, we had had a great advantage up to that point. But there is still some question as to whether they were successful negotiations from the standpoint of the United States of America.

I wonder if my distinguished colleague recalls that as to the nonproliferation treaty—and, from my standpoint, it was not a successful treaty from the standpoint of the United States—that all that treaty would do, once it was signed, would be to make the United States immediately involved if a nonnuclear nation was attacked by a nuclear power. We would have to go to the defense of the nonnuclear nation.

Then, as I recall, two nations—the French and the Chinese, both of whom had nuclear capability—said in essence they would not be a party to the treaty.

All the treaty actually did was to make it impossible for some of our potential allies in Europe ever to get nuclear capability.

There was some question in my mind as to whether that treaty was successful and whether it was to the advantage of the United States—if it was a treaty, in fact—and to the advantage of our allies in the free world.

I merely point that out because I know there has been so much discussion of these things and so much honest difference among those both for and against, that I wanted to make certain that as much of the history as I have been able to pick up is all made clear in the process of this debate so that with the good Lord's help, we might come up with the right answer. This is one area in which we dare not make a mistake.

I thank my distinguished colleague.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I thank my distinguished colleague. I simply would say to him that the Test Ban Treaty and the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons Treaty were successful in that the basic objective was accomplished after substantial time had passed following negotiations and the Senate proceeded to ratify these treaties. Apparently the Senate by a vote of more than the two-thirds which is required felt that all in all, taking into account certain unhappy events that may have transpired during the negotiations, it was in our national interest to sign the treaties and have them in effect.

I know that my colleague is deeply concerned about pollution in this Nation. He has done a great deal of work in this regard. It was because of the elimination of nuclear tests in the atmosphere that create such a threat to mankind that we felt that treaty was necessary. Regardless of what may have happened during the time of the negotiations, it was felt that we should get it ratified.

In regard to the nonproliferation treaty, it was deemed to our advantage to have proliferation halted to the degree that it could be by those nations who were willing to sign the treaty. Not all of the nations have signed it. The greater the proliferation, the more danger there would be to mankind.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I completely agree with the thesis and the conclusions of my distinguished colleague.

My only point is that with respect to an approach to a hopeful and final solution of these armaments, so often we hear people say, "Well, if we will make the first move and set a good example, the others will follow."

Unfortunately, in my lifetime, I recall so often that we made the first move and other nations did not follow.

I am just wondering whether another approach might be more successful and more productive. For example, there was discussion in the debate here as to whether the first phase of the ABM would or would not help the SALT talks. Everyone in this Chamber wanted the SALT talks to take place and to be successful.

There is still a difference of opinion on the matter, depending upon which expert one listens to, as to whether the first phase of the ABM helped the SALT talks. I am under the impression that they did help the talks and that the talks proceeded to a greater and more successful degree because of the ABM than they would have had we not voted for the ABM.

As my distinguished colleague knows, and perhaps better than I, this is an international poker game. I think the main target and desire of the United States is clearly stated; the object must be recognized for all who wish to recognize it. However, we often find on the other side suspicions with respect to whether it is real or whether it is for the purpose of facade. We always hear the same argument: "We will impress them that we want to be honest, decent, and fair and then they will react the same way." My concern is that that has not been so over the years. They are always testing and they will operate in their self-interest, as a nation.

At the moment I am concerned as a member of the Committee on Armed Services because of the conditions that exist in the Soviet Union and the ascendancy of the military group to the politburo, and the fact that they are building their military establishment not only at a fast rate but at a faster rate than our intelligence thought possible until 6 months ago. Also, at home we know that within the Soviet Union they have economic programs with very great and widespread problems, and with these conditions put together throughout history they have always resulted in serious trouble in the world.

So reading from the lessons of history and putting all of this together it

is possible the Senator from California may be supersensitive in his desire with respect to the outcome of this agreement, but it is hoped that we will come up with the proper answer that will insure properly and safely the national security of the United States, for if that is destroyed I am afraid the main cause of peace throughout the world will be destroyed.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. CRANSTON. The senior Senator from California and the junior Senator from California are totally together in being determined to do whatever is necessary for the security of our Nation, the final point my colleague touched upon. Our only difference is that sometimes we have different theories as to how best to achieve that end.

On the matter of negotiations I will grant that the question of how the other side will react to a particular set of circumstances can never be known until you are at the bargaining table. But in looking at history, in five efforts at negotiations with the Soviet Union two were unsuccessful where one side was trying to negotiate from a position of overwhelming strength and three have been successfully negotiated without the other side seeking to get the best of the other.

Thus, in the case I was last discussing before entering into colloquy with my distinguished colleague from California, it was only after the Pastore resolution was adopted by the Senate that the way was clear for negotiations leading to the nonproliferation treaty.

Only when we made it clear that we had no intention of transferring our nuclear weapons to other powers did the negotiations begin to move ahead in earnest.

I am convinced that the negotiation through strength approach is discredited both by experience and by commonsense.

I realize, however, that many of my colleagues disagree.

And I should like to leave one final thought with those who hold to a different view:

Does the deployment of a costly, noncost effective ABM system which demonstrably cannot do the job it is supposed to do increase America's strength?

My conviction is that it does not, that it is just another costly and needless mistake.

The Russians, whatever else they may be, are not stupid.

They know, as well as we do, the limits of an ABM system.

After all, they stopped building one of their own.

This being the case, it seems to me that our own ABM is a pretty soggy chip to try to cash in at the SALT talks.

Mr. President, my firm belief is that there is neither safety nor security for any of us in a continuing arms race.

I believe responsible men in all nations are coming more and more to this view.

I realize, however, that pending the day when comprehensive arms reduction agreements are negotiated, we will have to continue to spend billions for our national defense.

But let us not bemuse ourselves into thinking that pouring billions into weapons systems which do not work will afford us any additional security.

Mr. President, we have already poured enough money down the drain on Safeguard. For the reasons I advanced and the reasons so eloquently and articulately advanced by the Senator from Iowa, let us not waste any more money now.

LETTER OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE LAIRD ON SAFEGUARD ABM

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I want to place in the RECORD today a letter to me from Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird expressing the Secretary's view that diversion of the $365 million in Safeguard research and development funds to a program of R. & D. on hardsite defense would "necessitate cancellation of the phase 1 deployment."

Senator STENNIS and I had expressed the same view on the floor of the Senate last Wednesday, August 5, in commenting on the Hart-Cooper amendment to the Defense Procurement Act, and on the explanations given by the sponsors in support of that amendment.

In his letter, Secretary Laird also points out that the development of a hardsite defense system is not envisaged as a replacement for Safeguard. The Secretary wrote:

> Far from rendering Safeguard obsolete, hardsite components if deployed in combination with the Safeguard defense of Minuteman would provide a formidable counter to a severe threat, should it materialize.

Secretary Laird's letter confirms my view, expressed on the floor of the Senate last Wednesday. The Secretary states that in the event of a severe and rapid increase in the Soviet threat to Minuteman:

> We could strengthen the four-site Safeguard defense of Minuteman by deploying more Sprints and more MSRs in the same four Minuteman fields.

I ask unanimous consent that the full text of Secretary Laird's letter of August 7 be placed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., August 7, 1970.

Hon. HENRY M. JACKSON,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SCOOP: I am writing in answer to your questions about the impact of amending the authorization bill to redirect $365 million in Safeguard Fiscal 1971 RDT&E funds to development of a dedicated hardsite defense system.

Redirection of these funds would require that we stop deployment of Phase 1. Without funds for completing the relatively small amount of development work remaining and without funds for continuation of test and evaluation of system operation we could not field a completed system. This would, in turn, require that the contractors disband the skilled work force and specialized facilities assembled to produce Safeguard components.

The reason the impact is so severe is that redirection of the Safeguard RDT&E funds would preclude completion of Safeguard development and would bring to an immediate halt our test and evaluation program at Meck Island in the Kwajalein Atoll. There would be no further flight tests of the prototype system on Meck Island. I think you know that we have installed on Meck Island the essential elements of Minuteman defense—an MSR, its test data processor, initial software, Spartan launchers and Sprint launchers. We are now integrating this complex into a working system and have already passed the first milestone of a successful space point intercept with a Spartan missile under control of the Missile Site Radar and its data processor. It is absolutely essential that we complete this test and evaluation work, which gives us a very early look at the system performance. I am completely confident that the Meck Island tests will demonstrate continuing success; however, further confirmation by field testing is essential, and we want to get on with it. We must have the RDT&E funds that pay for operation of the Meck Island complex, for the Spartan and Sprint missiles flown in the test, special test targets, etc. Also, the RDT&E funds are needed to continue software development for the operational sites and to continue development of the Modified Spartan.

In the matter of developing a dedicated hardsite defense system, I fully support the development, and on numerous occasions Mr. Packard and I have so testified. We have tried to make clear the role hardsite defense plays vis-a-vis Safeguard defense of Minuteman. Safeguard is the earliest effective defense of Minuteman we can deploy. It will be effective against the likely threat of the middle 1970s, and for moderate threat levels Safeguard is economical.

It is important to understand two things: (1) dedicated hardsite defense cannot be available as early as Safeguard, and (2) hardsite is economical only if needed and deployed to counter very high threat levels. We do not expect these very high threat levels in the middle 1970s. Rather, we would expect them to develop later, if at all. But as a hedge against the possibility that the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks fail to limit Soviet ICBM deployment and that our Safeguard deployment in defense of Minuteman fails to discourage Soviet ICBM proliferation, we are developing a hardsite system that could augment Safeguard, if necessary.

Incidentally, I have read some recent press stories stating that hardsite is intended to replace Safeguard. This is incorrect. Far from rendering Safeguard obsolete, hardsite components if deployed in combination with the Safeguard defense of Minuteman would provide a formidable counter to a severe threat, should it materialize. Should the threat grow with extreme and unexpected rapidity so that it exceeds the Safeguard defense level before hardsite is available—something we do not predict at this time—we could strengthen the four-site Safeguard defense of Minuteman by deploying more Sprints and more MSRs in the same four Minuteman fields. We have no plan to do this, and we do not expect that it will be necessary; however, it is important to note that the option is available.

We are making good progress with the hardsite R&D program. It is now in the concept formulation stage, and we are defining a hardsite design which would be optimum for economical defense of Minuteman against very heavy threats. In addition we have funded some R&D work in technology areas which we are certain will be essential in developing hardsite system hardware and software.

We have not yet worked out detailed costs and schedules, but it appears that the development program will lead to a system which would become available, if needed, in the late 1970s, several years later than Safeguard. I have heard the comment of some who believe that we could make the hardsite

system available sooner, even as soon as Safeguard. These comments overlook, for example, the fact that a full-scale prototype of the Safeguard Missile Site Radar has been under test on Meck Island for almost two years now while the hardsite system is today only a concept in the early stage of definition. Hardsite hardware has yet to be constructed for test and evaluation.

Also, redirection of the $365 million of Safeguard RDT&E funds to support hardsite development is unnecessary. As we have testified, we have in the Advanced Ballistic Missile Defense line item of our budget $158 million in FY 71 R&D funds, of which $58 million is set aside for development of a hardsite defense system. This amount was chosen to be wholly adequate for this phase of the program. Additional funding at this time would not expedite the hardsite program.

In summary, redirection of the Safeguard FY 71 RDT&E funds would necessitate cancellation of the Phase 1 deployment and all further deployment options. The diversion of these funds to the hardsite program would not expedite the development because it is fully funded for Fiscal 1971.

Sincerely,

MEL LAIRD.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I should like to conduct a colloquy with the Senator from Iowa concerning the time to vote on Wednesday, a matter that I think will be of interest to Senators.

Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa has an amendment which he has just explained. Referring to the unanimous-consent agreement, there is a special provision for 1 hour to each side on the Hughes-Brooke amendments.

The Senator from Iowa made a suggestion to see what would be the situation about coming to that amendment on Wednesday and getting it disposed of well ahead of the vote on the Cooper-Hart amendment.

Will the Senator state the proposal now?

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, as the distinguished Senator has indicated, trying to accommodate the number of Senators who wish to be present for the vote on the Hughes amendment on Wednesday, it becomes apparent that, if we could reach an agreement that we would not take up the amendment until 11:30 a.m., it would probably be the most convenient time, thereby bringing it to a final vote at about 1:30 in the afternoon. If that could be arranged with the distinguished Senator from Mississippi and the distinguished Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER) I think it would be convenient, if it is also in keeping with whatever the nature of the objectives might be.

Mr. STENNIS. I think we should not try to change the unanimous-consent agreement. All we could do would be to have an understanding that the author of the amendment and the manager of the bill will work to that end. This would leave 2 hours before 3:30, the time for the vote on the Cooper-Hart amendment. The proposal has appeal to me. The Senator from Kentucky is in the Chamber as is the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER). They might have some comment to make.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUGHES. I yield.

Mr. TOWER. I have not had an opportunity to discuss this matter with the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), but I understood his amendment would be called up subsequent to the amendment of the Senator from Iowa, in which case it would seem to me, considering the time expended to vote, that the Hughes amendment should come up earlier and be voted on Wednesday, but somewhat earlier than 1:30. As I said, I have not had an opportunity to discuss this with the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. HUGHES. The Senator from Iowa is willing to give the Senator an opportunity to speak with the Senator from Massachusetts, or with whomever he wishes, to work toward this end.

The purpose of the colloquy is to see if it is possible if we could bring it up before 11:30.

Mr. TOWER. I understand the agreement specifies no time, except, from the standpoint of debate time, that they should be disposed of prior to the vote set at 3:30 on the Cooper-Hart amendment, as conceivably amended or not amended.

My suggestion is this: It is conceivable that the amendment of the Senator from Iowa and the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts could be brought up in turn and debated, with the vote being postponed until the debate on all amendments has been concluded, and then the debate on each amendment in turn being voted on, arriving at the vote on the Cooper-Hart amendment at, say, 3:30.

Mr. STENNIS. May I call attention to the fact that, although I called it the Brooke amendment, it is altogether different from the Hughes amendment. It is an amendment to the bill; it is not an amendment to the Cooper-Hart amendment. The amendment of the Senator from Iowa is an amendment to the Cooper-Hart amendment. I think they are two separate and distinct matters, even though I used the name of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. TOWER. It was my understanding, though, when we got the consent agreement, that the time on all the amendments would be limited to 1 hour except that there would be a limitation of 2 hours on the amendments of the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Iowa, which would imply that the Senator from Iowa intended it as a substitute or as an amendment to the Cooper-Hart amendment. Otherwise it would not apply here. If it were an amendment to the bill only, it could be brought up at a subsequent time to the vote on the Cooper-Hart amendment.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator from Massachusetts is in town. Perhaps he should be notified.

Mr. COOPER. The Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE) is not present at this time. I understood him to say he would offer his amendment to the bill. Would it be helpful if the Senator from Mississippi, the Senator from Texas, the Senator from Iowa, the Senator from Michigan, and I could meet here at a stated time tomorrow and see if we could work out the schedule for Wednesday's vote in a more satisfactory manner?

Mr. STENNIS. I think so. If it could be done this afternoon, it would be much better, because so many Senators want to know.

Mr. COOPER. At the conclusion of the speech of the Senator from Kansas, I shall try to reach the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) and the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE).

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, it makes very little difference to me how it is done. I am simply trying to protect the Senator from Massachusetts. I would like to ascertain whether he intends to offer his amendment prior to the vote on the Cooper-Hart amendment or subsequently. It was my understanding, when the original consent agreement was propounded, that it would be offered as an amendment to the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky and the Senator from Michigan. Otherwise, it would not have been included in the consent agreement.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. President, I wish to make this statement on behalf of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART) and myself.

On August 5, Senators JACKSON and STENNIS raised a question about our amendment No. 819 to the military procurement bill, H.R. 17123. We wish to assert once again, as we did in a press statement that day, that the Hart-Cooper amendment does not restrict the use of the $365 million requested by the Department of Defense for research and development on Safeguard. It is the view of Senator HART and myself that research and development should be directed toward the deployment of an effective system specifically designed for the protection of the Minuteman deterrent, but our amendment does not compel the Department of Defense to use the research and development funds in this way.

The language of the Hart-Cooper amendment makes this statement clear: that it does not affect or restrict in any way the use of the funds provided in the bill for phase I, including the use of those funds for research, development, testing, and evaluation.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment (No. 819) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMENDMENT No. 819

On page 7, line 1, strike out "$1,031,600,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$838,600,000".

On page 16, line 8, strike out "$322,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$192,800,000".

On page 17, beginning with line 15, strike out all down through line 5 on page 18, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 402. (a) No funds appropriated pursuant to this or any other Act may be obligated or expended in connection with deployment of the Safeguard antiballistic missile system, or any part or component thereof, at any site other than the two sites at which deployment was heretofore authorized by law (Malmstrom Air Force Base, Great

Falls, Montana, and Grand Forks Air Force Base, Grand Forks, North Dakota).

"(b) The provisions fo subsection (a) shall not apply to the obligation or expenditure of funds for research, development, testing, and evaluation activities carried out in support of any advanced antiballistic missile program at sites heretofore established for such purpose."

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's viewpoint. I thank him for putting that matter in the RECORD as a part of the history. We will have to refer to that again at an appropriate time.

THE SAFEGUARD SYSTEM

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, last year I spoke of the need for authorizing the deployment of the first phase of the Safeguard ABM system. As you recall, the debate of this issue was long and heated. As I said last year:

Spirited debate is inevitable when we are confronted with a problem of such technical magnitude and scientific complexity as our deterrent defense system.

We are now considering an authorization to continue work on the Safeguard system, a step which represents the minimum response to an urgent need.

The President has made a clear and persuasive case for this continuation of Safeguard. As in the past, he has been reasonable, prudent, and realistic in his proposals.

It is unbelievable that the Senate is now trying to handcuff President Nixon in light of what he has achieved in the last 18 months.

First, the President has a plan for peace in Vietnam, and it is working.

Second, an Arab-Israel ceasefire began Friday night as a result of Mideast peace proposals prepared by the Nixon administration.

Third, progress is being made at the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks—begun under the Nixon administration—in Vienna.

In view of these developments, it seems indefensible that the President's judgment, motives, or wisdom would be questioned now with reference to Safeguard.

CRUCIAL MOMENTUM

Last year, by a narrow majority, authorization was granted to begin work on two sites—Grand Forks Air Force Base, N. Dak., and Malmstrom Air Force Base, Mont. That work has begun and much has been accomplished. Most importantly, the Safeguard program has developed the momentum so necessary for the timely and orderly prosecution of the deployment. Thousands of Government and contractor personnel have been employed. Production lines have been established. Site construction has been initiated. Getting all of this started and keeping it going in an orderly, coordinated fashion is no easy job. It is a stupendous management task that, once interrupted, is extremely difficult, costly, and time consuming to resume.

Just as we have established a momentum with the ABM, so have the Soviets, since 1965, built up a momentum in developing and deploying their strategic offensive force. This momentum is most disturbing as it applies to the installation of the giant SS–9 ICBM. If this momentum continues, we face the prospect in a very few years of a real threat to our Minuteman ICBM force—the backbone of our deterrent.

This year we are considering additional authorization to continue the momentum established by the work already authorized. This authorization, as recommended by the Armed Services Committee, would permit work to continue on the previously authorized sites at Malmstrom and Grand Forks and also authorize full deployment at Whiteman and advanced preparation at Warren Air Force Base. In making its recommendation, the committee stressed the urgent need to provide for the defense of our land-based deterrent.

THE SAME ISSUE

Mr. President, the issue before us now has not changed from last year. The issue revolves around the strategic reality of our defense posture. The time has again come when the Senate of the United States either gives the President the tools to bring peace and security, or denies them. In this respect, nothing has changed. Nothing has happened since last year to justify altering the course we established then. The threat has not disappeared—it has increased. We do not have an arms limitation agreement with the Russians, and we do not know when we will. We were confident the system would work last year. We are more confident than ever this year of its effectiveness. In short, if there was a valid reason to begin deployment last year, there is certainly a valid reason to continue, uninterrupted, at least the minimum deployment needed to preserve our security.

Now, let us look at some of the more prevalent arguments that have been raised by those who oppose the system.

TECHNICAL CAPABILITY

Perhaps the most frequent charge leveled at Safeguard is the assertion that it will not work, and that the Minuteman defense part of Safeguard is composed of castoff equipment designed to defend cities rather than hardened silos. These assertions are not true. Safeguard radars and missiles are made of components well within our current state of the art with performance characteristics well matched to the multiple mission requirements of Safeguard. In other words, current, proven technology is being employed in the development of the system. This development is drawing to a close as far as the major subsystems—the radars, computers, and Spartan and Sprint missiles are concerned. Integration of these subsystems into a prototype ABM at Kwajalein Atoll has begun, and the test programs of both hardware and software have progressed extremely well to date. In short, we have overwhelming technical evidence that the system will perform its assigned missions.

MINUTEMAN DEFENSE

The assertion that Safeguard equipment is not designed to defend hardened Minuteman silos is equally false. The requirement to provide for defense of hard targets was established in the early days of the Nike X research and development program. Nike X components were developed from the outset with the dual requirements of providing hard target and city defense capability. Sentinel built on Nike X components and provided an option for Minuteman defense. Sentinel sites were planned for this capability.

When the Nike-Zeus program was reoriented toward the Nike X program, Secretary McNamara in his statement to the House Appropriations Committee on February 6, 1963, stated:

The revised program pursues certain specific developments in radar technology and will be oriented toward the defense of hard sites, such as missile bases and command posts, against ballistic missile attack.

Regarding Sentinel, Secretary Clifford stated in his January 1969, statement on the fiscal 1970 defense budget:

The Sentinel System would also have a number of other advantages. It would serve as a foundation to which we could add a defense of our Minuetman and bomber forces if that later becomes desirable.

In effect, Safeguard defense of Minuteman exercises the Minuteman defense option that was always part of the Sentinel design.

DEFENSE OF RADAR

Another argument leveled at the system is that the missile site radar is not as hard as the Minuteman silo it defends. The survivability of the Safeguard radars does not rely on hardening but on defending them with Sprint missiles. The radars are hardened to the level required to utilize the capability of Sprint to defend them. For the offense to be confident of destroying the radars he is forced to target enough missiles to exhaust the defense missiles stockpiles whether he attacks the radars of the Minuteman silos.

ADDITIONAL RADAR

Critics of Safeguard sometimes say the projected threat to Minuteman is unreal and that no defense is needed. At other times they say that the projected threat could "overwhelm" Safeguard and presumably destroy Minuteman too. Another favorite criticism is that Safeguard is effective only against a "narrow band of threats." It is true that Soviet forces operational today do not require Safeguard, but their threat continues to grow. It is true also that Safeguard, like any defense system, can be exhausted if the threat grows indefinitely. The Safeguard defense of Minuteman was chosen to cope with neither the extreme of no threat growth nor maximum conceivable threat growth. The Safeguard deployment is aimed at threat growth between these extremes and—perhaps more important—is aimed at discouraging the endless proliferation of Soviet hard target killers. Nevertheless, if the threat should grow significantly larger than the level against which the Safeguard Minuteman defense is designed, additional radars could be added to provide even greater leverage in the price charged the offense to penetrate. New, less expensive components dedicated to hard target defense are being developed as a hedge against a massive threat to Minuteman.

PROTECTION AGAINST "BLACKOUT"

In addition to charging that the radars are vulnerable because they are "soft," opponents of the Safeguard system also say that its radars can be "blacked out" by large precursor warheads detonated at high altitudes specifically for that purpose. They also contend that self-blackout may result from Spartan warheads detonated against the first enemy reentry vehicles.

The truth is that over the past several years, extensive analyses have been made of the effect on the ABM radar of both self-blackout and precursor blackout. On the basis of the studies, it was concluded that the fully deployed Safeguard system would not be seriously limited by self-blackout effects during attacks up to the maximum postulated Chinese Communist threat level as long as proper decisions are made concerning intercept doctrine. The same conclusion is true for the estimated heavier attack against the defended Minuteman force. This is because we would primarily use the low yield Sprint whose blackout effect on the defense is minimal.

A further conclusion of past studies is that precursor attack planning must take into consideration the attacker's operational difficulty in mounting such an attack with high confidence that his attack will succeed. Since the success of a precursor attack depends on getting a series of reentry vehicles in front of the Safeguard radars in a critical timing sequence, the enemy planner must program his force to give him a high probability of achieving this sequence without a single failure, or "hole," which would cause the attack to fail. Studies show that to achieve a high expectation of a successful precursor attack on one target, an enemy planner would have to expend a great many warheads in the attempt. This is especially true because he must allow for failures of his own missiles if he is to be reasonably sure of maintaining the blackout. His planning would be further complicated because he must consider the capability of Safeguard to "look around" the blackout cloud, a tactic which is possible because of the overlapping coverage and data-sharing capability of the perimeter acquisition radars—PAR's. Furthermore, some interruption of radar data can be tolerated as long as the system is designed to cope with interruptions—and it is. Consequently, the numbers of reentry vehicles required for a high-confidence precursor attack is well beyond the expected size of the Chinese ICBM force for some years to come. Also, a Soviet submarine-launched precursor attack against Safeguard is self defeating because the time required to set up and complete the precursor attack would enable many SAC aircraft to fly away from their bases. Defense of Minuteman against a Soviet attack is primarily based on the Sprint missile, which, with the missile site radar—MSR—will perform adequately in spite of interrupted perimeter acquisition radar—PAR—data during the engagement. Because the MSR utilizes a higher frequency than the PAR, the blackout problem is negligible.

SAFEGUARD AND THE SALT TALKS

Finally, I would like to discuss an area in which, in my opinion, considerable misunderstanding still exists. That is the role of our ABM in the current talks with the Russians regarding strategic arms limitation. In our past experience in dealing with the Soviets—both as allies in World War II and as adversaries in the cold war, one central fact of life has emerged; and that is that they give up nothing without receiving something in return. This is especially true when the defense of Mother Russia is involved. I cannot, for the life of me, understand how so many of us fail to appreciate this. In order to conduct successful negotiations, both parties must have something to negotiate with—something so important to the other side that he is willing to give up something for it. Make no mistake, my friends. The Russians are not in Vienna today out of concern for us. They are there for their own advantage, not ours.

If, as has been suggested by some, we cancel, delay or put in escrow funds for further ABM deployment in the hope that this will facilitate negotiations we would be guilty of the sheerest folly. Safeguard in escrow is the same as national security in escrow.

To explore this further, let us strip the SALT talks to their bare essentials—what do we want and what do we have to give up in order to get what we want?

Our prime objective in these talks is to constrain the Soviets from achieving a first-strike capability against us. We would accomplish this through negotiated limitations in their strategic offensive weapons—primarily the SS–9 ICBM.

Our best hope for achieving such limitations is to negotiate Safeguard. Safeguard is the one major ongoing U.S. program that the Russians are interested in restricting. Were we to do this unilaterally for them, we would be voluntarily stripping ourselves of our negotiating capability. Why then would the Soviets want to restrict their SS–9 deployment? Certainly not for anything we could do for them. That would have already been done.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, at the beginning of my speech I mentioned a momentum—I believe Secretary McNamara referred to it once as a "mad momentum"—in our ABM program and the Russian's ICBM program. No one would like to see that momentum dampened more than I. I am sure both we and the Soviets could make better use of the enormous resources that are being expended for these awesome weapons. For this reason, I hope and pray that the SALT talks are successful, and that we can devote more energy to solving our many other problems.

But I am a realist. I know that no solution to any of these other problems would be worth the price of living in a world in which the Soviet Union could act as it wished, unafraid of our retaliation. I imagine, if you will, the outcome of the Cuban crisis had this been the case. President Kennedy would have been faced with two unacceptable options: First, abject surrender; or second, thermonuclear war with Russia. Both of these are unthinkable and unnecessary. We can, with the Safeguard system, maintain the strategic balance which so far has prevented a nuclear holocaust. If, later, a successful agreement is reached in the SALT talks, and the Soviets are willing to stop the construction of their large SS–9 missiles, we could conceivably consider reducing our ABM deployment.

We should be aware, however, of the fact that it is relatively easy to stop something like the Safeguard program. It is another thing to start it up again after we have stopped. We cannot turn the program on or off at will like a water faucet. If we interrupt the program, we had best be prepared for a long and costly delay before we can start it up again. We had best be sure the threat has stopped growing. Until then, prudence dictates that we maintain the momentum of the program.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I support, as I did last year, President Nixon's request for the additional deployment of Safeguard.

I would also agree with the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, who pointed out earlier that whether we are discussing the ABM or the so-called "end-the-war amendment"—I designate it the "lose-the-peace amendment"—which will follow later, the easy argument today in America is to forget national security, and discuss reordering of our priorities, to put national security on the back burners and to hope and pray that we will live in peace, while the other side is developing more weapons systems, while we do nothing.

I do not question the motives of any Member of this body as Congress has a great responsibility to give direction to our military and foreign policy. But it does appear, as I stated at the outset, that we should look at what President Nixon has accomplished in 18 short months. He is winding down the war in Southeast Asia. We do have a ceasefire in the Middle East. We are making some progress at the SALT talks. Why should we, in Congress, in view of these accomplishments, seek to impose our judgment on the country when it comes to the ABM or some other weapons systems, defensive in nature, not offensive? The ABM deals with protecting our deterrent, not a first strike capability.

This should be paramount in our minds as we prepare to vote upon this critical issue.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DOLE. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. I would like to ask the distinguished Senator from Kansas this question: Is it not true that every argument that is being raised this year with regard to the Safeguard system was raised and debated at length last year?

Mr. DOLE. The Senator knows that last year the principal argument was that if we approved the ABM, it would disrupt the SALT talks. It was argued they will never start; never get off the ground. As we all know, the SALT talks have pro-

ceeded, and we are making progress. Those who used that argument last year have turned it around now. I believe we are making progress in the SALT talks because we are proceeding with deployment of ABM. It can be stopped very quickly but in view of the progress being made at the SALT talks, I would hope that we, in our wisdom, would approve the second phase of ABM.

Mr. MURPHY. I ask the distinguished Senator, further, is it not the opinion of some of those involved in the SALT talks that the fact that we did have the ABM, that it was voted, seemed to impel the Soviets to be more amenable and more anxious to conduct the talks and has actually been the cause of much of the progress that is hopefully being made?

Mr. DOLE. Again, there is no doubt about it, so far as the junior Senator from Kansas is concerned.

The committee report, on pages 22 and 23, the committee makes the same finding. We have had progress in SALT talks because we are dealing from strength, because we are, in an orderly way, with the direction of Congress, proceeding with our ABM. This has been largely responsible for the progress made. But what will we have to negotiate with if the Senate negotiates the President right out of the ballgame?

Mr. MURPHY. I agree with the distinguished Senator.

I should like to ask one further question. We have heard from one set of scientists testimony which is opposed diametrically by another set of scientists of equal reputation and capability, I would say. Last year, one set of scientists never opposed the research and development. They only opposed the deployment. In other words, they said, "Test it, but don't build it."

We have almost the same situation this year, with the continuation of the Safeguard system, by the same set of scientists. Another set of scientists has said, "By all means, research, develop, and test it, build it, deploy it." But we only seem to hear testimony from one group who oppose.

Is it the judgment of the Senator from Kansas that possibly those who are in favor of Safeguard have just as much right to speak for the scientific community and just as fine reputations in their scientific endeavors and achievements as those who oppose it?

Mr. DOLE. The obvious answer is, "Yes."

I would point out to the distinguished senior Senator from California that on last Friday, the distinguished junior Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) delivered an excellent speech on the floor of the Senate in which he discussed those scientists who said "No" and those who said "Yes." He made the very argument the Senator from California is now making—certainly, the arguments of those who say we should proceed are entitled to as much credence as those who say we should not.

For some strange reason, in the New York Times-Washington Post axis these views are never heard. Those who oppose the ABM are heard. Those who oppose the President are heard, but seldom are those who support the President and those scientists who support proceeding with the ABM. For some reason, this is not news. It is only news when the President is lambasted.

Mr. MURPHY. If my distinguished colleague will be patient with me for another moment, I should like to say that last week, in flying back to California, I had the good fortune to be seated next to a very highly rated scientist. From Dulles Airport almost to the Colorado River, he told me all the arguments against proceeding with the Safeguard, none that I had not heard before.

I then asked him whether or not he thought we needed a defense, and he agreed that we do. I then asked whether in the scientific community there is any other suggestion of a defense that would be practical, not an offensive weapon, not to make war on anybody, not to attack anybody, but to have it there in case anybody, for whatever reason—through bad judgment, through insecurity—should have the unfortunate desire to attack this country, so that we would be able to defend our capability to strike back. He agreed that we should keep this capability. I said:

"What would you suggest, other than the Safeguard?"

He was again at a loss. He said:

"Well, we could harden the silos, harden them to a degree where an enemy missile could not harm them."

Nobody is quite sure whether that is possible. Nobody is quite certain whether it is feasible. Nobody is quite certain as to what it will cost. As a matter of fact, once the program is started, I believe the costs will be greater than the continuation of Safeguard. I have come to this conclusion after hours of hearings, as a member of the Committee on Armed Services.

So I say to my distinguished colleague, once again, that I wish I could find the basic reasoning behind this opposition. I wish I could find a place where possibly I am wrong in my conclusion. Again, I hear the same record being played over and over again. I hear the objection that there is no attempt to weaken the security of America. I am certain that is true. I am certain there is no Member of this body that would ever want to put the future security of this country in jeopardy. But it is a question of judgment. I submit, if we have to make a mistake, if there must be an error, that that error must be in favor of the security of the United States of America, No. 1. No. 2, I think that the lessons of the past have shown us, as my good friend has pointed out, that when we negotiate with the Soviet Union, the stronger our negotiating hand, the more apt we are to come out with a protective conclusion at the end of those negotiations, not the contrary.

I thank my colleague from Kansas for his patience.

Mr. DOLE. I think my distinguished colleague from California, and would add that, in any event, we must take appropriate measures to guarantee the survivability of our retaliatory capability. That is the key argument. I do not question the judgment or the motives of a scientist who says "No." The Senate is evenly divided and it can be assumed everyone here is concerned about the safety and the welfare of America and our posture in the world. But if 50 scientists say "yes" and 50 scientists who say "no," perhaps that testimony should be disregarded unless there is some strong reason, but the final judgment must be made in the Congress.

I am certainly not a technician or an expert in all the areas concerning Safeguard, with reference to radar or the missiles themselves, but it appears that in a close decision, as President Johnson decided when he said that Sentinel was necessary, I supported President Johnson on that, although a member of another party. I happen to believe that whoever the President may be, whatever party he belongs to, his chief consideration is always the security of the Nation. It makes no difference whether he be a Republican or Democrat, a liberal or a conservative, I would give any President the benefit of doubt. It is a difficult decision involving the spending of millions and millions of dollars that could be used for domestic programs, or that could be used, I would add, to help reelect that President. So all the temptations are there to make a decision against Safeguard or against Sentinel and to use the money for domestic programs that have political appeal.

The President who makes the determination that we should go forward with the Sentinel, as President Johnson did—and he had my support; that we should proceed with Safeguard, as President Nixon did, and as the Senate, in a close vote and the House, by a large vote, authorized; then, again, this year, as President Nixon and the Secretary of Defense and others directly responsible for the safety and security of this country make this decision, that decision should carry very great weight with all Senators.

I recognize the right and at times the obligation to disagree when one feels strongly on an issue. I only suggest that where the scales can tip either way, the matter should be resolved in favor of the national security and resolve it as the President decides, whether it be Kennedy, Johnson, or Nixon, or whoever.

But, it is a difficult decision. It does involve the spending of additional millions and millions of dollars, which money could be used for hundreds and hundreds of domestic programs. It is difficult, when the American people are tired of the war in Southeast Asia and when the American people want to withdraw from Southaest Asia, to talk about more money for defense. But, in the long run, we must be alert. We must be concerned with the ultimate security of this country.

As has been suggested by the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT), millions of dollars could be saved and those millions of dollars might be invested in domestic programs.

But what happens if, for some reason not conceived by any of us, we lose our liberty or our freedom, or our national security should be seriously threatened, what good, then, would $100 million be

for urban renewal, or $100 million for the poverty program, or $100 million for an agricultural program, if our national security is threatened or endangered?

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield at that point?

Mr. DOLE. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Over the weekend, I had occasion to spend some hours with some of those who have the responsibility for our entire space program. They were some of the men who gathered together and made the initial commitment, organized it, and put together the systems teams that made it possible. These are men who have been dedicated to the service of their country all their lives and who have made a record that outdistances any record of any other group I know of in actual accomplishment.

These men continually came back to one point that disturbed and worried them—if they were the type to be afraid, they would be frightened—on one basic point; namely, that some years ago, our military establishment had a 4 to 1 advantage over any other military establishment in the world, not for the purpose of making war but for the purpose of guaranteeing the peace.

Now we can no longer make that claim. Our Military Establishment has been permitted to dwindle away, some in hopes of setting a good example for the adversaries, and some because they felt it was impractical to spend so much money. Of course, I must say, since I have served on the Armed Services Committee, I find we are spending an awful lot of money buying theories and ideas and not nearly so much on hardware as I would have expected for the dollars spent. But this group of men were so concerned because the entire balance had changed and that there was danger, a danger, as I pointed out in this Chamber early today, that the adversary is building his establishment at a rate faster than we thought possible, and he continues the posture of an adversary, so far as we are concerned. Very seldom has there ever been any concrete evidence of true friendship or a true desire to find a peaceful solution to the world's problems which we have hoped to solve for so long in this country. These men—experienced, experts, knowledgeable, and dedicated—these men are worried. They are concerned that we not let it slip any further.

Certainly, as my distinguished colleague has said, the time has come when I feel that we must certainly, without any question, find a way to guarantee our power and our capability to defend ourselves, in case that should be necessary.

I thank my colleague from Kansas for his patience. As he has pointed out, what good will it be if we make a mistake in this judgment and one day find that we have lost our liberty, that we no longer have a great country enjoying freedom. People say that is ridiculous, that it could not happen. I think my colleague will agree with me that it can happen and that it can happen quickly, with the speed of communications nowadays and with the speed of change going on.

We had better be sure that we are right. We had better not make a mistake on this one, or a few million dollars one way or another, as my colleague has said, will not make any difference.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, in closing, let me again thank my colleague from California. I know of no one in this illustrious body who has a longer or more active concern for the freedom of America.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I commend the able Senator from Kansas for the splendid presentation he has made here today. I would like to also commend the distinguished and able Senator from California for the splendid colloquy he has carried on with the Senator from Kansas.

There is no question, in my judgment, in the minds of the people of America that they want this country preserved. They are willing to pay for this protection to our Nation.

It is important that we remain prepared. The former President of the United States and the present President of the United States both recommended that we go forward with the antiballistic missile.

The former Secretary of Defense and the present Secretary of Defense have recommended it.

The Chairman and the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff under the former President and the Chairman and the members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff under the present President have recommended this.

It is true that some of these people have knowledge that the public does not. But all of these people in a position to know and to understand this serious problem feel that we should not delay the ABM. It is my hope that we will not delay it further.

I felt this matter so keenly that back in 1963, in presenting top secret information to the Senate, I asked that the doors of the Senate be closed.

At that time I spoke on the ABM. I brought out the threat of the Soviets and revealed that the Soviets—and this was top secret information at the time—had established an ABM in the Soviet Union.

Mr. President, it is important that we not delay this matter.

I again commend the distinguished Senators from Kansas and California for their splendid presentation and colloquy here which I hope that every Member of the Senate will read.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the debate of the Cooper-Hart amendment which would delete phase II of the Safeguard ABM has now been in progress for over a week.

In this debate, Mr. President, three points raised by the opponents need to be answered. These arguments offered by the opposition are as follows:

First. If the ABM is so important, why is the Nixon administration willing to negotiate on it at the SALT meetings in Vienna?

Second. The radar for Safeguard will not work; and,

Third. Delay of phase II would not be harmful to our national security.

It is my belief that there is considerable misunderstanding regarding the role of our Safeguard ABM in the current talks with the Russians regarding strategic arms limitation.

Based on debate last week, it appears many have the mistaken idea that these talks arbitrarily pair the negotiation of our offensive weapons with Soviet offensive weapons and similarly the negotiation of our defensive weapons with their defensive weapons. This is not true.

One of our prime objectives in SALT is to constrain a Soviet offensive first-strike capability through negotiated limitations in their strategic offensive weapons—primarily the SS–9 ICBM. Our best hope for this kind of a settlement is to negotiate on Safeguard, a defensive system.

In this context, there is a close interrelationship between strategic offensive and defensive systems, and the United States-Soviet agreement to begin SALT negotiations specified that SALT would deal with both offensive and defensive systems.

Mr. President, our overall objective, with or without SALT, is to deter the Soviets from launching a first-strike at us with the hope to destroy or neutralize our capability to retaliate. There is more than one way to accomplish this objective. Until we have a satisfactory agreement in SALT, we must take steps to insure that a significant portion of our strategic offensive force would survive a Soviet first strike.

The proposed Safeguard deployment would go far toward achieving this goal. Since we do not have any formal agreement now with the Soviets, it is only prudent that we continue our work on Safeguard. We certainly cannot gamble on the assumption, or hope, that a suitable agreement will make its deployment unnecessary.

If, on the other hand, the Soviets are willing to stop the construction of their large SS–9 missiles—in other words cease action to endanger our deterrent capability—then we could conceivably consider reducing our ABM deployment. I most emphatically do not favor abandoning our ABM altogether.

The important question to ask yourself in this regard is, "What have we accomplished by all this?" If, through successful negotiation, we have succeeded in achieving our objective of maintaining our deterrent posture with a limitation or reduction in strategic force levels, then a reduction in our ABM deployment would not endanger our national security.

Mr. President, in order to achieve a successful agreement, however, both sides must have something to negotiate. In order for us to persuade the Russians to do what we want them to—cease deploying SS–9's, we must be prepared to offer them in return something in which they are interested. As it happens, Safeguard is the major on-going U.S. strategic program which the Soviets are interested in restricting. This bears out the wisdom of past supporters of the ABM. With a strong bargaining tool, such as Safeguard, the United States could exert considerable leverage in getting Soviet

agreement to limit the buildup of their offensive systems—which, as I said earlier, is our prime objective in SALT. This is why, in the absence of an agreement, it is so important that we maintain the momentum already built up in deploying the Safeguard system.

Finally, if we voluntarily inhibit this momentum, we would be removing the prime incentive for the Soviets to reach a timely agreement. It would serve to signal to the Soviets the advantage of further delaying or blocking the program by drawn-out, protracted negotiations—while their own missile deployment continues to move forward at a good pace.

Mr. President, I fear that whatever reputation we as Americans may have earned in the past as for driving hard bargains would be quickly dissipated by such a horse trade.

Mr. President, there are those who question the capability of the Safeguard radars to perform effectively and I would like to speak to that point briefly.

The two radars used in the Safeguard system are both characterized as "phased array." This new type of radar has a fixed face and no large moving parts such as we were used to seeing on older vintage radars. The radar beam is moved electrically rather than mechanically. Having fixed components actually enhances the radars' hardness or survivability in the environment in which they may be called upon to operate.

All major Safeguard system components, including the radars, have undergone extensive research and development testing which has already progressed to the point where the design of critical items has been validated.

The perimeter acquisition radar, or PAR, is the longer ranged of the systems' two radars, and tracks incoming targets. We may recall that, in the interest of both economy and time, a full working model of the actual PAR was not built for testing in the system's development. However, a similar model radar has been constructed by the Air Force and has been used for some time at Elgin Air Force Base, Fla. A limited engineering developmental model of the PAR was constructed and activated at the Syracuse General Electric plant during last year. No serious technical problems have been encountered in this development, and we have confidence that the equipment readiness date will be met at the first PAR site. Presently certain important components are being tested and, by September of this year, about 95 percent of the PAR components are scheduled to be released for production.

Mr. President, the other radar is the MSR, or missile site radar. It is shorter ranged than the PAR. It is also responsible for guiding the interceptors to the proper point, in addition to tracking the targets. A prototype MSR was constructed on Meck Island, on Kwajalein Atoll in the Pacific. It has been working since September of 1968. Checkout of the MSR as well as integration with other system components has continued since then. I note that the radar has met or surpassed its design objectives and no major problems have been encountered.

Beginning in March of 1968, checkout of the MSR data processing system was initiated and integrated operation of four data processing units has been achieved. The software for the first part of the system test program has been installed. Commencing in July of last year, tracking of local targets was accomplished with the initial software in operation. In December of 1969 two ICBM's launched from Vandenberg Air Force Base were tracked. So the capability of tracking ICBM targets has already been exhibited.

Mr. President, just recently the MSR and its computer guided a Spartan missile on a planned space point intercept. This took place on June 24, 1970.

The latest test which exercised the MSR's tracking capabilities took place on July 23. The radar tracked a reentry vehicle and associated tank which were launched by a Minuteman missile from Vandenberg Air Force Base, Calif. Preliminary information made available indicates that all test objectives were achieved. System integration test continue at Meck Island.

Mr. President, in summary, of this point, confidence in the Safeguard radar components is very high. The system is progressing well. Its radars have met the standards expected of them at this point in the program. There is every reason to believe that we can expect the system to continue to perform as required in the future.

Mr. President, the Hart-Cooper amendment on the anti-ballistic-missile system would authorize only the continued deployment of phase I of the Safeguard system for this fiscal year, rather than proceed with the modified phase 2 increment proposed by the Senate Armed Services Committee.

In other words, it is proposed to do nothing in this fiscal year other than continue work on the initial two sites at Grand Forks and Malmstrom Air Force Bases.

Mr. President, as the Senate knows, the committee proposal would authorize continued work on phase 1. It would also authorize work to start on a third ABM site at Whiteman Air Force Base, Mo., and advance preparation work to start at a fourth ABM site at Warren Air Force Base, Wyo. Both of these ABM sites would be established to protect Minuteman missiles at these Air Force bases. The committee proposal would also provide for additional Sprint missiles at the currently approved phase 1 sites.

The impact of this amendment—that is, to continue only phase 1 work—would be significant on two points. First, costs and schedules, and second, our national security. I would like to briefly summarize the impact the Hart-Cooper amendment would have in these two areas.

First, with regard to cost and schedules. The two-site phase 1 deployment would be completed as presently contemplated. The initiation of any work beyond this phase 1 deployment could not be undertaken during fiscal year 1971. If it were later decided to grant authorization and funds, say in fiscal year 1972, to proceed as rapidly as possible with a four-site deployment, that deployment could not be completed until late 1977 or approximately 12 months later than currently possible. Its cost would be about $0.3 billion higher than under current possibilities.

With respect to a full 12-site deployment, if later authorized in fiscal year 1972, the cost would be increased by $0.4 to $0.5 billion. Also, the delay would amount to some 18 months over that possible if the modified phase 2 requested in fiscal year 1971 were authorized.

Second, the impact on our national security. The Soviets have a considerable offensive missile force size and a momentum built up in the continuing deployment of these forces. If this continues or is qualitatively upgraded it will pose a severe threat by the mid-1970's to the Minuteman deterrent. Delay of the defense of our Minuteman with ABM's beyond our present two-site deployment will result in an unacceptable period of Minuteman vulnerability. Such an unwise action would also delay countering the Soviet threat to our bombers and the Chinese Communist threat to our population should it later be decided to deploy the 12-site Safeguard full phase 2.

Mr. President, after consideration of these impacts—particularly as they effect the vulnerability of our Minuteman force, I urge the Senate to reject this amendment and permit Safeguard deployment to proceed as proposed by the committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I wish to make a few comments with regard to the ABM.

According to witnesses who appeared before the Gore subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the principal reason the Soviets are concerned about the Safeguard is their concern that it might be developed into a thick area or population defense system which would make the United States invulnerable to a second strike and thus put us in a position of being able to to launch a first strike without fear of retaliation. In other words, they fear that our ABM might destroy the capacity for deterrence that their own ICBM capability presently gives them.

Soviet concern about Safeguard is not based on the concern it would provide effective protection of Minuteman missiles which would leave the United States free to launch a retaliatory second strike.

This is perfectly obvious because Minuteman is only one of three segment of our deterrent striking power. The Polaris fleet now being equipped with Poseidon missiles is far less vulnerable to any known destructive capacity. And we have, in addition, hundreds of bombers representing an additional deterrent force.

The Armed Services Committee, however, has knocked out the population defense potential of the Safeguard system and left only the theoretical possibility of Minuteman defense. Thus, it is the Armed Services Committee which has already taken away the bargaining chip—if it ever was a chip. Safeguard limited to the defense of Minuteman is no bargaining chip at all.

The "bargaining chip" argument distracts attention from the moot questions of whether the Safeguard system will work and whether it will protect our Minuteman force even if it works per-

fectly. Furthermore, it locks us into a position in which we are logically obligated to go ahead and build the system, even if it is no good, if the SALT talks do not produce an agreement.

One "bargaining chip" must surely lead to another. If we must negotiate from strength, can the Soviets afford to do less? If we go ahead with Safeguard, there is every logical reason for the Soviets to proceed with the development and testing of more accurate missiles or missiles with larger payloads or both to negate the effect of what they fear may grow to be an area defense system.

The administration has argued that the Soviets feared MIRV's and that the threat of their deployment was a good bargaining chip. In this connection, Dr. Foster told the Gore subcommittee in early June that in his judgment the effect of the deployment of MIRV's "will be to help the U.S. position in the SALT talks." Now MIRV's have been deployed and the fact of their deployment has made it virtually impossible to control the spread of that weapon through a mutual agreement.

Mr. Gerard Smith, head of ACDA, in a statement before the Armed Services Subcommittee on the SALT talks which was included in the hearing record of the Armed Services Committee, said:

I don't think I go as far as some people would who think that you ought to go ahead faster with Safeguard to step up the bargaining leverage. I think that the bargaining leverage at the present, and the sort of approaches that I have heard about in connection with Safeguard, is going to be quite adequate.

If both the Soviet Union and the United States insist on proceeding with the development of weapons system in order to strengthen their hands in negotiations, the effect of the SALT talks will be to accelerate the arms race, not control it.

In testimony before either the full committee or the Gore subcommittee, the following witnesses have said that they do not agree with the bargaining chip argument: Ambassador Kennan, Marshall Shulman, McGeorge Bundy, Dr. Wolfgang Panofsky, Adrian Fisher, Dr. Donald Hornig, and Dr. M. L. Goldberger. Pertinent excerpts from their statements follow, and I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

George F. Kennan, former Ambassador to the Soviet Union:

"I would not, normally speaking, try to depreciate in any way the value of having good bargaining cards in your hands when you deal with the Russians, provided these are real ones. But I think that in the present instance, with these SALT talks, if there is going to be any favorable prospect for their success, our position as we go into them ought to be very clear, and it ought to be a position of readiness to stabilize, if they are willing to stabilize. What gives me anxiety is the fear that if we go on with the development of these systems they won't know exactly what we are doing, and there will be a feeling on their part, 'Well, goodness knows what they are trying to get away with. Are these talks merely a means of stalling us off while they try to get some new technological edge on us?' In other words, I think just at this time, just as the talks are about to begin in all seriousness, is a good time for us not to take new initiatives in the weapons field." (Testimony before the Committee on Foreign Relations, February 6, 1970.)

Marshall Shulman, Director, Russian Institute, Columbia University:

"The argument that we should proceed with MIRV, and also with Safeguard Phase II, in order to have a bargaining counter in our hand is short-sighted. To enter upon these programs in order to have something to bargain with, or in order to apply pressure upon the Russians, is likely to have an effect opposite to what is intended. A logical Soviet reaction to such actions would be to question our real intentions, and to redouble their own military efforts. If SALT proceeds over a long period, as it may do, and if both sides argue the need for continuing their buildup to improve their bargaining advantage, the effect of the SALT negotiations will be to leave us both worse off than if they had never been begun. Negotiating about strategic weapons is not entirely like a poker game—both sides *can* lose." (Page 25, Gore Subcommittee hearings.)

McGeorge Bundy, Special Assistant to President Kennedy for National Security Affairs:

"We should be especially on guard, I think, against the notion that it is useful to press the development or deployment of any given weapons system because of its value as a bargaining counter for SALT. It is quite true that if we get nowhere in SALT and if Soviet strategic expansion continues, we shall have to take careful stock of our own needs. But there is no evidence at all that pressing the deployment of systems we do not yet need is likely to have a constructive effect on Soviet behavior in SALT. There are times and topics for toughness with Moscow, but SALT in April is not one of them, and many of those who urge this tactic are men who do not want SALT to succeed. It will be very hard to get a good agreement even if we do only what we have to do in our own weapons development. It will probably be impossible if we provide unnecessary ammunition to Soviet weapon lovers by pressing our own deployments relentlessly throughout the talks." (Page 90, Gore Subcommittee hearings.)

Dr. Wolfgang Panofsky, Director, Stanford Linear Accelerator Center:

"The argument for an expensive but technically ineffective expansion of Safeguard in order to 'negotiate from a position of strength' has little merit: although the Soviets have greater total explosive power than we do in their nuclear arsenal, we have numerical superiority of 3 to 1 in nuclear warheads, and U.S. MIRVs are ready for deployment. . . . My personal view is that at present no further increases in numbers of warheads, or in ABM deployment, are needed to negotiate from a position of strength. I think this is an unequaled opportunity to negotiate from a position where both sides can feel with confidence they have a secure deterrent." (Page 179, Gore Subcommittee hearings.)

"While emphasizing the negotiability of ABM deployment the President and DOD witnesses urged an expanded Safeguard system now, in spite of the obvious technical inadequacies, in order to be in a position of negotiating from strength at SALT. The expressed fear is that since the Soviet strategic forces are growing in numbers, while the $7 billion U.S. strategic budget is only buying qualitative improvements, the Soviets will not feel under sufficient military pressure to negotiate a limitation of strategic arms under terms acceptable to the United States. But are we really negotiating from weakness? Quite apart from MIRV deployment, the status of United States versus Soviet intercontinental strategic offensive forces is given in the following table . . . the total number of deliverable warheads as of September 1969 is 4200 on the side of the United States, and 1350 on the side of the Soviets. This belies the fact that the United States is in an inferior position." (Page 191, Gore Subcommittee hearings.)

"We here are saying that Safeguard is not useful in any major way to protect Minuteman, but the Soviet in looking at it will say if it is not useful for that purpose, then what are the Americans doing, why are they making this designed compromise? The reason we are making the designed compromise is because we want to have the option of quickly going into the city defense mode. . . . This is the dichotomy: we are saying rationally that we don't think it's as much protection, but the Soviets are saying it may grow into some protection; similarly, when we are talking about the Soviet ABM we are saying we don't think it is much good, but it may become good so we had better buy MIRV. It is just this kind of double thinking by which the arms race becomes accelerated through these arguments." (Page 216, Gore Subcommittee hearings.)

Mr. Adrian Fisher, former Deputy Director, Arms Control and Disarmament Agency:

"I am aware of the argument . . . that it is necessary to go ahead with authorizing the proposed Modified Phase II Safeguard item in order to strengthen our bargaining position in Geneva. I don't believe that is persuasive. As a practical matter, authorizing armaments so that they can be included in a disarmament program soon reaches the point of diminishing returns and that point may well have been reached, passed, well-passed, with the approval of Phase I. If both sides were to play this game of proceeding with further weapons systems to strengthen their hands in negotiations you would have a gigantic buildup, just so you would have something in the SALT talks and far from being a help to peace they would be a greater threat to the world. It would be an excuse for both sides to build up now, each saying, 'I hate to do it but I have to do it so I have something to bargain with in Vienna.' " (page 247, Gore Subcommittee hearings)

Dr. Donald Hornig, President, Brown University and Special Assistant to President Johnson for Science and Technology:

"It is sometimes argued that it will improve our bargaining position at SALT. I am not an expert on Russian psychology but it really doesn't make sense to me to expedite arms control costs by deploying major new weapons systems. Nor does it make sense to spend billions of dollars to accumulate hardware so that we will have something to bargain away at the conference table. In fact, that seems downright wasteful and we don't have that much to waste right now—except, perhaps, in the Department of Defense." (page 388, Gore Subcommittee hearings)

It seems to me the history of the arms race is such that either the circumstances are propitious now for negotiation or they aren't. It scarcely seems likely to me that military initiatives on our side are likely to improve the climate for negotiations. It surely isn't true that our suspicions that the Russians were accelerating their deployment of SS–9's, which they may have thought of as negotiating from strength. It certainly hasn't improved the climate here for negotiating. So I simply find it very hard to believe that initiating new arms moves is a way to take steps toward arms reduction." (page 405, Gore Subcommittee hearings)

Dr. Marvin L. Goldberger, former Chairman, Jason Division of IDA, Member, President's Science Advisory Committee 1965–1969:

"It has been reported in the press that the Soviets have expressed considerable concern about our proposed ABM deployment. It has been also stated frequently that our decision

to go ahead with Safeguard gives us an important 'blue chip' to be used in the negotiations. For example, in the discussion following Dr. Foster's June 4 statement to this Subcommittee, he argued that it was important to go ahead with Safeguard at this time because the Soviets would not be inclined to limit ABM deployment by agreement if they could get the same advantages without one. I am not an expert on Soviet psychology or on negotiations, so I won't speculate on the validity of this argument. . . . In connection with Safeguard, however, we should not insist on deploying an ineffective system just for bargaining purposes. Safeguard should stand or fall on its own merits. Should a SALT agreement be reached which precluded ABM, it is certainly just as easy to stop building or tear down an effective ABM system as a defective one." (page 532, Gore Subcommittee hearings)

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Having thus cited what I believe to be the transparent weakness of the administration's "bargaining chip" justification for Safeguard, I wish to say a few words about the numerous technical weaknesses of the Safeguard system.

Dr. Panofsky pointed out to the Armed Services Committee the principal new technical criticisms which have emerged since last year's debate. These were that Safeguard defense of Minuteman depends on a single $200 million MSR radar for each Minuteman complex and on a small, classified, number of Sprint missiles to protect the Minuteman silos and the radar. Attack on the MSR radar is an attractive enemy tactic since it is softer than the missile silo it defends. Soviet SS–11 missiles are of sufficient accuracy and power to destroy the MSR, although they do not endanger the Minuteman silos. In addition, the performance of the PAR radar could be impaired by the proximity of nuclear explosions. Dr. Panofsky concluded that "if the defense of Minuteman were the only or even the principal, function of Safeguard, its deployment clearly could not be justified."

Dr. Panofsky's chart—found on pages 430 and 544 of the Gore subcommittee hearings—shows that if one assumes that Soviet installation of SS–9's will level off or be limited by SALT, the "danger level," of potentially lethal attackers against Minuteman silos, will never be reached. On the other hand, if the Soviets decide to put a very large effort into deploying MIRV's for the SS–9's or if they upgrade the SS–9 force or the SS–11 force with extremely high accuracy reentry vehicles, then the danger level can be reached before the middle of this decade. For Safeguard to have any significant effectiveness at all, the Soviets would have to tailor their threat to correspond to a small area.

Dr. Panofsky also told the Gore subcommittee that—

The total schedule for deploying the Safeguard phase I defense is not controlled by providing the hardware—that is, the missile and radars—but is paced by the unprecedented complexity of the computer and the associated programming which is required to control the system.

The Defense Department's answer to this, found in the armed services hearings, was that "The schedule for deploying Safeguard is not controlled by software availability" and that "software development does not pace the deployment of subsequent sites." Dr. Panofsky said, in surrebuttal, that—

The fact is that the performance of the system is limited at this time against sophisticated attacks by anticipated software capability.

And he added that if the Defense Department were to make available the classified calculations of the capability of Safeguard to handle incoming threatening objects that one single MSR must defend, the argument could be pursued.

Dr. Hornig made the flat statement in Armed Services Committee hearings that "aside from inappropriate design and vulnerability—the Safeguard system is ineffective even if it works as planned." He also refered to "the question of whether a system so complex, and so difficult to test, can possibly be counted on for first-time successful operation" and commented:

None of our experience with other complex weapons systems suggests that this is the case . . . in most systems statistical reliability is enough. We can live with a 15-percent failure rate on offensive missile by taking it into account in our force level planning. But in the highly integrated system placing a threat of uncertain dimensions we must reckon with the possibility of catastrophic failure.

In the same Armed Services Committee hearings Dr. Hornig also referred to the computer programs as "the pacing item for Safeguard deployment." He said:

Even the design objective currently will limit it to handling (deleted) re-entering objects, including both real warheads and decoys, per Minuteman squadron of 50 silos. This is really a very small number, corresponding perhaps to only three ICBM attackers if effective decoys are used.

Dr. Hornig summed up his technical criticisms of the Safeguard system during his testimony before the Gore subcommittee by pointing out that the number of attacking missiles destroyed and the number of Minutemen saved would be negligible compared to the cost of the system, that the defense of each Minuteman complex depends on a single expensive radar more vulnerable than the missile silo it defends, thus a substantial part of the already limited supply of Sprints must be devoted to protecting the radar, that the Soviet SS–11 missiles have the power and accuracy to destroy the radar, that the computers system is so complex and the programing problems so staggering that those experienced in the field have no faith that the system would actually work properly when called upon. He said, in conclusion:

During this last year it has become clear beyond reasonable doubt that if the defense of Minuteman were the only, or even the principal, function of Safeguard, its deployment could not be justified.

Dr. Marvin Goldberger, appearing before the Gore subcommittee, noted that recent theoretical work had indicated that the PAR performance would be so degraded by the nuclear explosion environment produced by both offensive and defensive missiles that its contribution to Safeguard performance was highly questionable and that problems had arisen in connection with the computer which would seriously limit the system's ability to handle large attacks.

Dr. Sidney D. Drell, Deputy Director of the Standard Linear Accelerator Center and also a witness of the Gore subcommittee, said that even if Safeguard worked perfectly it would do so "against only a very, very narrow band of models of an assumed Soviet strike. Against lesser threats it is not needed and against greater threats it is ineffective." He pointed specifically to the "gross mismatch of a few very expensive, very sophisticated, relatively vulnerable radars defending many missiles that are hardened and relatively cheap." He said that "there is grave doubt that the PAR will serve any purpose for Minuteman defense beyond that of supplementing the other existing or planned systems that provide early warning of an enemy attack" because of the computer limitations in digesting information provided by the PAR and because the radio waves from the PAR are severely bent by the ionospheric disturbances accompanying high altitude nuclear bursts which would seriously degrade the PAR performance in a nuclear environment.

Because the advocates of the Safeguard system have laid such great emphasis on the nature of the Soviet strategic threat in an apparent attempt to frighten the American people and the Senate into acceptance of Safeguard, it is worthwhile to note the testimony to date on that subject.

First, according to Defense Department testimony before the Armed Services Committee, the deployment of SS–9's in 1969 is greater than in 1968 but "less than that which occurred in 1965, the year of peak deployment." Dr. George B. Kistiakowsky, a distinguished former Special Assistant to the President for Science and Technology, provided the Gore subcommittee with a chart showing trends in ICBM forces and said that the figures showed that the curve was "leveling off."

Second. Dr. Herbert York, dean of the graduate school of the University of California at San Diego, and former Director of Defense Research and Engineering, told the Gore subcommittee that "the killing power of a warhead against a hard target, such as a missile silo, depends much more critically on accuracy than on yield." He said that any conservative Russian planner looking at accuracy figures "would have to conclude that in a relatively short time U.S. technology could improve missile accuracy by another factor of 2 or 4 and thus convert not only the Minuteman MIRV but even the Poseidon MIRV into a missile silo destroyer.

Dr. Panofsky has also said that "what counts is the number of warheads not the total explosive power." And Dr. Goldberger referred to the SS–9 as an "essentially useless vehicle."

Third. Secretary Laird laid some stress on the fact that the Soviets have tested both a depressed trajectory ICBM and

a factional orbital bombardment system or FOBS. On the other hand, Dr. Scoville, former Assistant Director for Science and Technology of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, told the Gore subcommittee that FOBS was, in a sense, another form of ICBM requiring that accuracy and yield be sacrificed. FOBS was available, he said, for surprise attack only against relatively soft targets and did not in any way threaten our deterrent force. According to Dr. Scoville, "It is just not a counterforce type of weapon."

Fourth. As far as the Soviet "henhouse" radars are concerned, Dr. Wiesner told the Gore subcommittee that we have known about the radars "for a great many years" and that they seemed totally defenseless and easy to penetrate. In reply submitted to questions by Senator COOPER, the Defense Department said that "the Soviet 'henhouse' is, because of its lower frequency, more susceptible to degradation caused by nuclear burst than the PAR."

Since the appearance of the "Fitzgerald report" on the reorganization of the Defense Department, the administration has, with great fanfare, adopted what it describes as a "fly before you buy" policy. The application of this policy to this year's Safeguard proposal reveals a strong need for testing of Safeguard before further deployment is authorized.

First. Testifying before the Gore subcommittee last year, Deputy Secretary of Defense Packard said that the plan that was being recommended at this time "was developed, in part, so that we can get a complete system together at the earliest possible date and shake it down. Then we will be in a position so that if the President decides that additional deployment is necessary, it will be possible to proceed with that deployment earlier than if we had waited to test the whole system.

He subsequently said at the same hearing:

> We are proposing that we proceed with phase I; that is, deployment around two Minuteman wings, and providing funds to acquire the land for the remaining sites. This initial move gives limited protection to all our Minutemen. It gives us the opportunity to get these two systems put together, shake out the bugs and put them underway.

On page 293 of last year's Gore subcommittee hearings there appears a chart entitled "Phases and Options With Costs." Phase I, sites at two Minuteman wings, is for the objective stated as follows: "gives limited MM protection, provides operational experience."

Second. Summing up the research and development milestones in Safeguard, the Defense Department said in testimony before the Armed Services Committee that the MSR had tracked local targets in the Kwajalein Atoll and two ICBM's launched from California, the PAR was under fabrication, a limited engineering development model of the PAR was operating at the contractor's facility, eight Spartan flights had been conducted since mid-May 1969 of which six were successful and two were failures, and eight Sprint flights had been conducted since late May 1969 of which five were successful, one a partial success and two failures. The missile site data processor at Meck had operated with three of its four processors.

Third. Commenting on the experience to date, Dr. Panofsky stated to the Armed Services Committee:

> The President promised last year that this program will be reviewed annually from the point of technical progress and the evolving threat. What, then, is the new experience on which the decision to expand ABM deployment now was to be based? There has been no construction activity on the sites authorized last year; the contractor developed the first site for future technical use as awarded by the Army less than one month ago. The date at which equipment can be received at the sites the slipped by almost one year. None of the technical results in the ongoing development work has made Safeguard look better.

The same statement was made to the Gore subcommittee by Dr. Panofsky.

Arguing in favor of research and development and not deployment, Dr. Panofsky told the Gore subcommittee:

> I do not believe a deployed system is the way to learn from the mental performance. . . . First, you can't test as well. We can't fire into the deployed sites. . . . Second, the actual deployed sites will be under the management of routine Army forces; deployment has to be combined with troop training using standardized manuals, and so forth, because personnel keep being rotated. Therefore, all the procedures have to be worked out to be independent of the detailed skill and training of the personnel because they are rotated. You, actually, have available less flexibility, after deploying military systems.

Dr. Drell told the Gore subcommittee:

> One major argument for last year's deployment decision as stated by Secretary Packard in testimony before the House Armed Services Committee on April 5, 1969 was that this is a very complex system and actual operational sites are needed to put together the complex computer and radar components into an actual operating system. Today I am here to oppose strongly the proposed expansion not only because of the known technical inadequacies but because, in fact, we have yet to gain any of the experience motivating the Phase I decision that was promised as part of a phased deployment program. At this time no equipment is in place, no parts of the system are complete, and its operating capability is still under study. What then have we learned to support the expanded deployment?

Another important element in our consideration of the Safeguard decision are the costs involved. As is usually the case, the Defense Department has only told the Senate and the American people part of the story.

First. The usual cost figure put out by the Defense Department for the full Safeguard system is $12 billion—$10.7 billion for the Department of Defense acquisition cost and $1.2 billion for the AEC cost. These figures were given to the Armed Services Committee by Secretary of the Army Resor, Secretary Laird and the Department of Defense in formal statements. These figures do not, however, include: the cost for the improved Spartan warhead, the annual operating cost which Secretary Laird estimated at about $370 million, the indirect costs for the manpower overhead.

Second. As far as manpower overhead is concerned, in a prepared reply to the question, the Defense Department told the Gore subcommittee that when the two phase I sites become fully operational, about 2,900 military and 2,260 civilians will be employed for a total of 5,160 Government-employed personnel at an annual direct personnel cost of about $23 million and $30 million for civilians. If all 12 sites become operational, some 7,250 military and 4,500 civilians will be employed—a total of 11,750 Government-employed personnel. But these are just the personnel required to man and operate the tactical sites. To keep the entire system in operational readiness would require a total of about 9,500 military and 9,250 civilians or about 18,800 Government-employed personnel. The total annual direct personnel costs related to these strengths would be about $64 million for military and $123 million for civilians.

Third. Secretary Laird said that if we continue with phase I until June 30, 1971 and then cancel it, the nonrecoverable funds would amount to $2.76 billion. If phase II–A were authorized and the whole program were then canceled on June 30, 1971, the nonrecoverable funds involved would be $2.96 billion.

Fourth. The Defense Department said in a formal reply to a question from Senator Gore's subcommittee that the Safeguard system had cost $5.7 billion since 1958 in amounts approved from Army development and deployment of ballistic missile defense systems.

Finally, Herbert York told the Gore subcommittee that he estimated the total cost of the Safeguard system at $50 billion.

Mr. President, I have called particular attention to the statements of these noted scientists, all of whom have played important roles in our Government over the past 20 years, because these men are no longer employed by the Defense Department or by the Government. They are, therefore, free to give their individual judgment without fear of embarrassing an executive department as a member of that department.

Last year and earlier this year in debate, it has been pointed out—and I only wish to reiterate—that practically all of the scientific support for the concept of the Safeguard system has come from scientists who are in the employ of the Defense Department.

Dr. John S. Foster, Jr., director of the Research and Development for the Department of Defense, of course supports the expansion of Safeguard deployment. It is to a great extent at least, one of his concepts; and while I do not wish to denigrate Dr. Foster as a scientist, I simply think that it is a part of our great bureaucratic system that if you are going to play a part at all, you cannot afford to take issue with your superiors on matters of this kind—especially in a case where you have yourself originated a system or a concept. I can understand, moreover, how such men have great curiosity to see whether their ideas can be brought to fruition.

As against that, I submit that the overwhelming evidence from all of the principal scientists who have interested

themselves in this field is that, given the present state of the art, the Safeguard system is ineffectual, the concept itself is faulty, and the only thing that really should be pursued at this time, in view of the tremendous costs involved, is further research and development.

I believe that Senators who oppose the further deployment of these systems at this time, are in unanimous agreement with this view. But most of them feel and are convinced that the weight of the evidence that it would be a great waste of our very limited resources if we proceed to deploy, at this stage, the Safeguard system.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOLE). The Senator from California is recognized.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I have a statement here from a scientific group which I have read with a great interest, and I should like to remark upon its contents and certain comments therein. This statement was released on August 3, 1970.

I note with a great deal of interest that an organization which calls itself the Federation of American Scientists has released a statement opposing Safeguard signed by a group of scientific opponents of the system. I note that this statement very carefully indicates that it was based on excerpts from the report of the Armed Services Committee hearings compiled by one Jeremy Stone, who is apparently the secretary of the Federation of American Scientists.

It is not clear from reading their statement whether or not the scientists involved actually signed or are in complete agreement with this statement. The highly publicized scientific opponents to the Safeguard system, according to this release are: Jerome Weisner, W. H. K. Panofsky, Marvin Goldberger, Herbert F. York, and Herbert Scoville, Jr. All of these gentlemen have had a long and exceptionally busy interest in opposing Safeguard, both in the press and in periodicals, and before the Congress during the past 2 years. The utterances of some of these gentlemen take on added importance because they are publicized as having been scientific advisers to former Presidents of the United States—I might say with a fine bipartisan balance.

There does not seem to this Senator to be anything particularly new in the opposing statements which they have attempted to put together out of the testimony in the hearings. Many of the arguments raised were the same arguments raised 2 years ago, again last year and seem to have already been heard and discredited for all practical purposes.

The main objection which comes to mind, of course, was the statement that we heard continually during the debate last year on phase 1 of the Safeguard that if this phase 1 was voted by the Senate it would hinder the SALT negotiations now taking place between the United States and the U.S.S.R. This, of course, has been demonstrated to be completely untrue.

As a matter of fact, it appears that one of the most important aspects of the entire SALT negotiations has been created by the very fact that a year ago Safeguard was started. The opponents however seem to be quite willing to discard any old discredit arguments and attempt to invent new ones as they go along, and there always seems to be a strange mixture of political opinion and philosophy added to the scientific knowledge for which these men and their capabilities are being heard in this matter.

The statement of August 3 seems to be based completely on the argument that Safeguard would be ineffective as a defense of Minuteman even if the system would work perfectly as it was designed. It is quite obvious that this is a matter of opinion, and the proof may not be even in keeping with present knowledge or experience. I assure my distinguished colleagues that there is another group of scientists who are just as fervent in their position that the Safeguard will do the job. Indications at the moment, from the knowledge to which I have been subjected, would lead me to have confidence in the Safeguard system.

I would also submit that there is still another list of scientists of high reputation who would completely disagree with the conclusion of the Federation of American Scientists. As one who has listened carefully at the hearings of the Armed Services Committee and during the extended debate of last year, I have every confidence that Safeguard will do the job for which it is designed.

Also, on several occasions I have suggested that if there is a better system either in concept or imagined at the present time in the minds of some of these scientists, they please bring it forward as quickly as possible and let us have a look at it, because there can be no question that the present world conditions demand that the United States of America do everything practical and possible to defend itself in case of aggression.

The present basis of the opponents' argument is in quotations of the statements of Secretary of Defense, Melvin Laird: Director of Defense Research and Engineering, John S. Foster, Jr.; and the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS). They attempt to prove, by the statements of these gentlemen, that in effect Safeguard can be overwhelmed if the Soviet threat grows sufficiently large. I have read this carefully to try to understand exactly what they mean. It appears to me that they mean that if the Safeguard deployment is carried out as presently proposed, without changes, and the Soviet threat continues to expand and grow and contain added improvements, at some point Safeguard would not be adequate for the desired job. Now, I would think that it would be perfectly obvious, not only to highly publicized scientists but even to a layman such as myself that any particular defense could be overwhelmed if its strength, capability, and condition remain constant while the offense of the enemy was permitted to grow and expand and improve, to conditions that we do not even bother to study or imagine.

I would think that we would have to assume that this was certainly a fair statement under any circumstances or any phase of defense, whether it be the Safeguard or any other of our weapons systems.

I was interested in the various quotations, selected by Mr. Stone apparently, and possibly agreed to by the scientists—all historic opponents of the ABM—to justify their positions. All seem to be discussions of the level of threat which Safeguard is designed to handle. Thus, Secretary Laird's statement on page 36 of the hearings report shows clearly that if the Soviets deploy MIRV warheads on the SS–9 and greatly improve the accuracy of SS–11 and improve the accuracy of their ICBM force, and continue to deploy additional ICBM's, then and then only does the Safeguard defense, as presently proposed, need to be augmented in order to do the job. It then becomes obvious that if we wish to maintain an effective defense for our Minuteman missiles against these very high-threat levels, the Safeguard would have to be and could be augmented.

Secretary Laird shows in his testimony that this augmentation could be most effectively done by the use of new, more numerous, and less expensive radars. Again, this scientific group made reference to a statement by Dr. Foster that Safeguard can be "completely overwhelmed." It is not quoted in its entirety for, I believe, reasons that should be obvious to all and, in effect, Dr. Foster's statement says about the same thing that Secretary Laird's statement said. When we reexamine Dr. Foster's statement carefully, we find that he was only referring to the case—which he spells out—where the Soviets: First, could be deploying accurate MIRV's on the SS–9, second, have increased the accuracy of the SS–11, and third, have continued to deploy many additional ICBM's.

There does not seem to be anything new or startling in this disclosure. As I pointed out previously, it is only fair to surmise that unless we arrive at a stage of purposeful agreement in the SALT talks, the arms race—at least so far as the United States is concerned—the preparations for our defense, must continue to improve, and must be the concern of all who wish to preserve the future of this Nation in the face of the present and growing threat.

The statement which is quoted from Senator STENNIS's remarks, in my opinion, is even more out of context. Senator STENNIS is quoted as having told the Senate on July 30:

> The Soviet Union now has enough ICBM's, ballistic missile launchers, which with qualitative improvements could pose a serious, and perhaps deadly, threat to our Minuteman deterrence by the mid-1970's and beyond. The Department of Defense advises that these qualitative improvements can be made much faster than we can develop and deploy a system to counter them.

From this, the Federation of American Scientists draws the conclusion that even if the Soviet Union deploys no more missiles, it could, by qualitative improvements, make Safeguard obsolete before it is built.

Senator STENNIS, and quite rightly, in the next unquoted sentence draws the conclusion that since the Soviets could threaten an undefended Minuteman by qualitative improvements, we had better get about building our defenses and doing it right away.

He states:

In other words, it is vital that we take the appropriate steps now so that, in the not too distant future, we will not be in a position of having a vulnerable, land-based Minuteman force.

Very simply, the honorable Chairman of the Armed Services Committee is urging the continued deployment of the Safeguard in order to protect the Minuteman strike force.

As I read the Senator's statement, I find nothing that would justify the conclusion that Safeguard is obsolete or will become obsolete in the immediate future.

It is possible that it may come into being later than we wish and it may need to be augmented if the threat of the Soviet SS–9's and SS–11's with improved accuracy continues, along with the continued deployment of both. But, in my opinion, Safeguard will not become obsolete because its deployment makes an excellent nucleus for the additional components which can be supplied when and if they are needed to meet a growing threat.

The final statement by these illustrious gentlemen of science says that this very large threat requiring Safeguard's augmentation is, in the words of the Federation of American Scientists, "the expected and possible threat." Now this is not what the spokesmen for the Department of Defense and Senator STENNIS have said. They have said, rather, that the continuation of all adverse deployment, with all the dire possibilities that can be scientifically constructed is a "worst case threat" to which we can react if necessary, but only if the future conditions establishes the necessity.

In the meantime, there are just as many scientists who believe that Safeguard will be effective against the more moderate expected or possible threat and who believe that Safeguard can be augmented if the "worst case possible" threat should emerge.

IF SALT TALKS WORK—WE CAN FORGET IT

Summarizing, quoted statements out of context to prove Safeguard will be overwhelmed by what is considered the "expected threat" only proves that the opponents are willing and seem almost anxious to shade responsible statements to buttress their position. Safeguard as now conceived will be effective in countering present threats and moderate growth threats and is as capable of augmentation if required to counter the very high growth threats.

And in closing, I would point out that as far as this Senator is concerned I have listened attentively and patiently to those who oppose the deployment of the Safeguard system. I would say, that during the debate of last year no one opposed the research and development of the proposed Safeguard system, but the objections were only aimed at the deployment or construction of the proposed cites. Now, 1 year later, we find the same voices being raised against continuance of the deployment of this same system in keeping with phase 2 as requested by the administration.

I would also point out that, just as in the case of last year, with all due respect, that within the scientific community there seems to be no other system which all can agree upon which would better preserve the national security than the present Safeguard.

Therefore, Mr. President, I hope that my colleagues will understand that this group, calling themselves the Federation of American Scientists has not come forward with anything startling or new and no one should be surprised at their continued opposition to the further development and deployment of Safeguard. It is only consistent with their decisions over the years. I would further point out that in the light and knowledge of the present day, until a better system has been presented, we should proceed with all speed, not only for the purpose of protecting this great Nation but also as has been demonstrated for the purpose of hopefully bringing productive agreements out of the SALT talks.

It has become apparent, when dealing with the Soviets, they like to negotiate from strength. It is also apparent that they respect and respond to an adversary who seems to deal from the same position.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator from California yield?

Mr. MURPHY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wanted to ask the Senator this question: The Senator has made reference several times to other scientists who take the opposite view to the views I mentioned. I cited their names—Drs. Panofsky, York, Wiesner, Drell, and Goldberger. The Senator from California did not mention whom he had in mind. Were these people employees of the Pentagon, or independent of the Pentagon?

Mr. MURPHY. I do not know where the Senator from Arkansas referred to some of his employees being at the Pentagon. I had thought my remarks were not referring to the names my colleague recited. I was referring to the names I presented here on this notice I received from the Federation of American Scientists. I would not know as to the employment of these men. I do know that last year, before the Armed Services Committee, we had a long table of scientists, I believe, four on each side, and they all seemed to be of equal standing in their communities. They seemed to be in complete disagreement. Dr. Teller might be named as one in favor of Safeguard. Dr. McMillan of ULCA was another. Others included Dr. Wigner, Dr. O'Neil, Dr. Wohlsletter, and Dr. Kahn—if I am not mistaken. There seemed to be a complete balance at that table of witnesses as to their position with regard to the effectiveness of Safeguard. That is what I was referring to.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wondered who they were. The Senator had not mentioned any names. I wondered who they were, to whom he had reference.

Mr. MURPHY. Before my distinguished colleague came into the Chamber today, I recited an experience I had a week ago, on an airplane, with a distinguished scientist from California, who was objecting to Safeguard. He explained his objections. At long last I said to him, "Well, is there another alternative?" All seem to agree that there must be some Safeguard, that there should be a defensive weapon. I know some opponents last year said, "Well, we could build more offensive weapons." I do not think that is the answer. I think that might really disturb the SALT talks. But he referred, when I asked him if there was another system, to the hardening process which as my distinguished colleague probably knows we have listened to and gone into.

I am not certain, one, whether they would be effective; or, two, as to the cost. I seem to recall in testimony that there was evidence the cost might be even greater than the proposed cost of Safeguard. I am always a hopeful soul. I continue to hope, as the President has said and promised, that once the SALT talks begin to achieve their purpose and it becomes unnecessary to continue with this defensive system, will be stopped and it can be stopped without a grave expenditure of money, which all of us deplore, in the event that becomes necessary.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I may say to the Senator that some of these gentlemen who are opposed to Safeguard have suggested there is an alternative of a defensive nature, and much more economical in order to preserve a deterrent and to prevent a first strike capability, and that would be alternate mobile land-based or sea-based offensive missiles.

But there is also the further suggestion that if we must have a defensive ABM system with more or less the function of the ABM, then it would be far better to redesign it and have multiple small radars, that is, practically one radar for every missile site, a radar that costs much less than the MSR designed for the Safeguard system. These very highly-trained and highly reputable scientists said:

If you must go this way, that is the way to go.

I think they call it the "hard point" defensive system which is now being developed or experimented with.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, we listened in the committee to all the evidence we could find with regard to the hard site system. I am glad to see that the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), is present. I think that he would bear out the statement that it was the decision of the committee at long last that the Safeguard was in our judgment the more practicable, the more feasible, and the more compelling one to consider.

I do not wish to indicate or to preclude the fact that there will not be a better system just around the corner.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, the Senator said that those who opposed it had not come up with a better system. These gentlemen who have been some of

the most reputable scientists in the country say:

If you must have this, the "hard point" defense is the system.

However, they say it needs further refinement and research.

Their real objection, and mine, and the real objection of many Senators, is that the Defense Department is proceeding to deploy a system, which at best, is very questionable, and at worst, is wholly impracticable. It is a carryover of an old design for area defense. It is kind of old Nike-Zeus system which, as I understand it, the Armed Services Committee concluded is not an acceptable concept at this time. If I understand the conclusion of the Armed Services Committee, they concluded that they would not support an area defense system. That reduces the question to one of defending Minuteman.

These scientists say:

If that is your objective, the Safeguard is not well designed for that. It ought to be abandoned and you ought to proceed with the "hard point" system.

The whole purpose is not to precipitate an argument among the scientists but rather to get the best available scientific judgment, since this involves untold billions of dollars. Under the present conditions, it seems to me that this is sufficiently important to warrant a little more research.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, if the Senator would yield for a moment, last year during the debate there were continual references to great numbers of billions of dollars.

Last year, as I recall, no one disagreed with the fact that the research and development should continue.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MURPHY. The difference in cost between research and development and deployment in last year's appropriations bill, I believe, was somewhat under $400 million.

The request this year, I think, would only raise that amount less than $200 million.

I acknowledge the total cost of the entire system, if it be carried through to the worst possible conclusion, would cost billions of dollars.

I do not think at the present time that this is what we are concerned with, as we were last year. We argued at great length about a matter of less than $400 million. That is a very important sum, but it is not untold billions of dollars. I am always heartened by the fact that on many occasions the President has said that just as soon as the necessity for this defensive weapon ends, this system can be shut off and discontinued.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator knows that is not the history of these programs. To cite one that I know of, there was a piece in the paper today concerning the TFX. That was, and is, a very controversial weapon. The Committee on Government Operations went into this matter. I thought they proved that it was a questionable program. Nevertheless, it was continued.

This morning I noticed that the Australians had made a bargain to lease the phantom jets because they do not believe the TFX is any good. Yet we put billions of dollars into that program.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I will be glad to tell him that last Saturday, a week ago, I went to Nellis Air Force Base, Nev., and spent the day there. I was concerned about the matter. I had read about the TFX and had listened to the questions that had been raised about it.

I must say that I came away convinced that this is without question at long last—even at three times the original cost—the only system we have at the present time to do the particular job for which it was designed. And it will do that job, I am quite convinced, better than any other aircraft in the world.

It is not a fighter aircraft and should not have been designed as a fighter aircraft. It is an attack bomber. It has remarkable capability.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Why do the Australians refuse to take delivery of a plane on which they have already laid down $200 million and say that they want the Phantom E?

Mr. MURPHY. For the reason that we have had trouble with it. We have reworked the wing boxes and have made other changes which, I am assured—not by the scientists, but by the pilots who fly the aircraft—will correct the problem.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I thought they were all grounded. I did not know that there were any flying.

Mr. MURPHY. If the Senator will let me finish, they flew one then and are now once again operational.

Mr. President, before the Senator from Arkansas leaves, I would like to point out that I am just as sensitive to history as he is. I know the danger of these problems once they start.

I have talked for a long while—perhaps not as effectively as my distinguished friend, the Senator from Arkansas—about the strength and complexity of bureaucracy. Bureaucracy goes into the Department of Defense, the Pentagon, and all over this huge Government of ours. I opposed it with as loud a voice as I could over the past 25 years.

I opposed the TFX 2 years ago and last year in the committee. And in spite of that fact that they have an excellent aircraft, the difference lies in the fact that once there is another system that is better, we will and must proceed to it.

Unfortunately, we had nothing else. In the past year we find that our B–52's are now 16, 18, and 20 years old. If we had been as careful with upgrading our new plans for aircraft, we might not have to stay so long with the F–111 or the TFX, as it used to be called.

The Safeguard is a new system. I assure my esteemed colleague, with all the honor I can summon, that the day a better program comes along, I will say, "Shut this off," and the day hopefully when the world situation indicates that we do not need this program and can enter into peaceful cooperation and coexistence and understanding with other nations, I will be the first to remind the President—and I hope that he is still President and in his first term when that time comes—that we do not need the Safeguard. I am sure that the Senator from Arkansas would join in that hope.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I would certainly join in that hope. Indeed, I would.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 3547) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Narrows unit, Missouri River Basin project, Colo., and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ASPINALL, Mr. JOHNSON of California, Mr. HALEY, Mr. SAYLOR, and Mr. HOSMER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 689) providing for an adjournment of the House from August 14, 1970, until September 9, 1970, or sooner if reassembled by the Speaker.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR CHURCH TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the disposition of the reading of the Journal on tomorrow, the able Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH) be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR McGOVERN TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH) on tomorrow, the able Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN) be recognized for not to exceed 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR YOUNG OF OHIO TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks by the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN) tomorrow, the Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG) be recognized for not to exceed 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR PERIOD FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the remarks of the Senator from

Ohio (Mr. YOUNG) tomorrow there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business with statements limited therein to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR HANSEN TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of the period for the transaction of routine morning business tomorrow the unfinished business be laid before the Senate, at which time the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN) be recognized for not to exceed 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, there have been various inquiries from Senators, as well as conferences with authors of various amendments that come under the unanimous-consent agreement whereby the Senate will vote on Wednesday. A reading of the unanimous-consent agreement shows there is no time set for the voting on any particular amendment, except that voting will start not later than 3:30 p.m.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Is the Senator aware that there is a very important luncheon downtown which should be completed by 2 o'clock?

Mr. STENNIS. Yes. I am very conscious of the luncheon, but we are bound by this unanimous-consent agreement involving a great many Senators and quite a number of amendments. It is binding on all of us, and we are committed under the unanimous-consent agreement.

From what I can determine from these conferences, voting may start around 12 noon on Wednesday. It could be that my estimate is off some, but in order to get these amendments disposed of under the unanimous-consent agreement according to its terms, voting may start as early as 12 o'clock noon. I make that statement for the information of Senators.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Would it be improper for the Senator from California to suggest further unanimous consent that out of respect for those who would like to attend this luncheon honoring Representative MENDEL RIVERS there be no voting between 12 noon and 2 p.m. as an accommodation to them?

Mr. STENNIS. I would like very much to go to the luncheon. It is an important affair. I think that if we were to amend the unanimous-consent agreement we could only do it by notifying the leadership and the great number of Senators involved in these amendments. That would be the only fair way to approach it.

Mr. MURPHY. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. STENNIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. The Senator indicated that voting on Wednesday "may" start as early as 12 noon.

Mr. STENNIS. Yes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Does not the Senator agree it is possible under the unanimous-consent agreement for voting to start as early as 11 a.m.?

Mr. STENNIS. That is entirely possible, yes.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Because any Senator could offer an amenment—aside from the amendments by the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES) and/or the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE)—either of whose amendments requires 2 hours under the previous agreement, all other amendments requiring 1 hour.

So, in view of the recess the night before and the laying of the unfinished business before the Senate immediately upon the convening of the Senate on Wednesday following the prayer, a Senator could offer an amendment at 10 a.m. and after 1 hour of debate there could be a vote. Therefore, voting could begin at 11 a.m.

Mr. STENNIS. The Senator is correct. I was addressing my remarks to the known amendments, to those most likely to be offered.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STENNIS. I yield.

Mr. MURPHY. Will there be a morning hour on Wednesday?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. There will not be a morning hour on Wednesday prior to the scheduled vote at 3:30 p.m. There will be a period for the transaction of morning business sometime during the afternoon subsequent to the vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART).

Mr. STENNIS. We are all locked in and bound by the terms of the unanimous-consent agreement. We could not alter it except by unanimous consent after notice.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR COOPER TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN) tomorrow, the able Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER) be recognized for not to exceed 1 hour.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR ALLOTT TOMORROW

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, will the Senator make a request that the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT) be recognized following the Senator from Kentucky? The Senator from Colorado wishes to be recognized for 1½ hours.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Yes. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks by the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER) tomorrow the able Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT) be recognized for not to exceed 90 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CONDITIONS IN SOUTHEAST WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Whites in Far SE Bitter, Estranged" published in the Washington Post on August 4, 1970.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHITES IN FAR SE BITTER, ESTRANGED

(By Carl Bernstein)

For the white resident of Anacostia and adjacent Congress Heights—across the Anacostia River in the far Southeast—"race is the primary fact of life," observes the Rev. Samuel Frazier.

The white pastor of a predominantly Negro church in Anacostia, Mr. Frazier says race "colors" the white resident's thinking "at almost every level," from where he drinks his beer to where he worships his God.

Indeed, largely because of considerations of race, the whites of the far Southeast have developed a life style that, as black City Councilman Stanley J. Anderson puts it, "is different than the way people live anywhere else in this city."

There are other factors, of course, not the least of which is that the estimated 7,500 to 10,000 whites of the far Southeast represent the largest single concentration of blue collar whites in the city.

Here, white teen-agers and young adults share a mania for customized cars, the corner gas station is a place to hang out, and the white school dropout rate, according to school officials, is the highest among whites in the city. In the three "white" bars of Congress Heights, the jukeboxes feature country music, not rock, and ducktails and tattoos are high fashion. On the streets, one hears the hard-edged twang that is native of the Southern Marylanders and to white Washingtonians who never went to boarding school.

"Their hearts are in Prince George's County," says Mr. Fraizer, in a telling observation about the whites of the far Southeast.

They live in neat red-brick bungalows that sit high above the city on Congress Heights, in pockets of poverty near the Anacostia River flats, in clusters of modest apartments and small frame houses in the area known as Hillcrest. Most are working-class people who drive trucks, plaster walls, drive cabs, repair cars, fix plumbing or otherwise use their hands or their backs to earn a living. Some are unemployed; others, like the 43-

year-old woman who drives an ice cream truck with her younger sister, are underemployed.

Though many are either native Washingtonians or have roots in the city that predate World War II, they shop in Maryland, socialize in Maryland and, often, are buried in Maryland. Though they live within the city's boundaries they have all but abandoned Washington, a city they believe has abandoned them. Ten years ago, they comprised 65 per cent of the population of the far Southeast; today they represent less than 5 per cent.

Frustrated over what they regard as a lack of influence in city hall, "they have this feeling of 'what's happening to my world?'" as Mr. Frazier puts it. They see school discipline and educational quality sliding; vital services—like street cleaning, garbage collecting, even police protection—deteriorating. They see apartment units that 10 years ago housed small, white families fall apart as poor Negro families with six and seven children move into one and two-bedroom units.

Thirty-seven years ago, J. A. Streifus moved to Washington from his native Indiana and began driving a Diamond Cab. For the last 11 years he has lived in Congress Heights, the section of Southeast bounded by the Anacostia River, St. Elizabeth's Hospital and the Maryland line at Southern Avenue.

"I've seen Washington go from the most law-abiding city to the least," says Streifus, a tall, 60-ish white man with a full head of gray hair. "I used to like the Heights. This was a fine community, good decent folks. Not any more.

"We were at 741 Alabama Ave., and it went all black," says Streifus, who now lives in a comfortable one-bedroom garden apartment in the 500 block of Mellon Street.

"The big problem is the kids. They make nasty remarks to my wife if she tries to so much as sit on the porch or go to the store. 'I'm fixing to move to Prince George's County. I have no alternative than to attribute it to the blacks. They'll tell you the same thing about the kids, the good ones. Blacks are the victim of the same thing, probably more than whites. We got Filipinos here and even they're moving out.

"It's nice to live in Spring Valley and not be a racist. But it's different if you have to live out here."

Along the rows of neat houses with flowers growing in the front yards on Lebaum and Orange and Mellon Streets in Congress Heights, the whites are especially bitter. A decade ago the population of the Heights was between 90 and 95 per cent white.

Councilman Anderson recalls being literally run out of Congress Heights as a Negro boy growing up in the far Southeast when it was rigidly segregated.

Today, the population of Congress Heights is at least 95 per cent black.

Geraldine Bishop is 22, married, the mother of two children, the wife of a mechanic. She has lived in Congress Heights for five years.

"I hate it," she says of the neighborhood. "It's like little Africa. This whole place is infested," says Mrs. Bishop, like many whites, who moved to the far Southeast from economically depresed towns in West Virginia, southern and western Maryland, and Virginia.

Like many of her neighbors, Mrs. Bishop says the only reason she remains in Congress Heights is the low rent, usually less than $100 a month for a relatively spacious one-bedroom apartment that would cost at least 25 per cent more in the suburbs.

She and many other whites in Congress Heights and Anacostia regard the stores, shops and services near their homes as either Negro or white—a division that, by Mrs. Bishop's count, leaves the whites with three bars along Nichols Avenue and little else.

"People here shop in Eastover or Marlow Heights" in Prince George's says Mrs. Bishop.

"No there's nothing to do around here," she says. "There's a movie house, but it's colored. The schools are all colored. The skating rink is colored. The swimming pool is colored. The playground is colored. I sit in the house at night and watch television. There's nothing else to do except go up to Walker's (one of the three Nichols Avenue bars) on Thursday and Friday, when there's a country music band."

SENSE OF ISOLATION

The sense of idleness and isolation expressed by Mrs. Bishop seems to be a basic tenet of life among the whites of far Southeast, especially those who have yet to reach middle age.

"If you don't go drinking you work on your car or go visiting," says Wayne Carroll, 23, a plumber who lives in the same neighborhood as Mrs. Bishop. "We drive around a lot," he says. "Lot of times we'll go down to Waldorf"—the strip of restaurants and clubs along Rte. 301 in Charles County or to the drive-in in Oxon Hill in Prince George's County.

Carroll, who dropped out of school after finishing the ninth grade at Hart Junior High, is among the regulars who hang out at the Scot gas station on Nichols Avenue, the hub of social life for some whites in Southeast.

Like Carroll, most of the regulars at the station cling to the dress and hair styles that, in the big eastern cities, are associated with the 1950s. In Carroll's case, the uniform consists of heavy white socks, thick-soled, pointed black loafers, white short-sleeved shirt unbuttoned over a white tee-shirt, slim-jim continental pants and longish hair slicked back into a ducktail.

This contrast to the long-haired white youths of Cleveland Park and Georgetown is consistent with the values shared by most whites in far Southeast.

"Hippies are scarce as hen's teeth up here," says Eva Rutherford, who has lived in Congress Heights since 1950.

"I guess it's because they come from a richer class. You got to be a college student or somebody who had it easy to be a hippie. That's not true of our people up here. We didn't go to college. We worked hard for a living. This country has been good to us. We pay our taxes and expect other people to do the same.

"If you asked anybody up here why people burn the flag and do things like that, I'd expect they'd tell you those people are crazy."

OUTSIDERS BLAMED

Like many homeowners in Congress Heights, Mrs. Rutherford, who is 64, attributes most of the problems of her neighborhood to outsiders.

"The people in this neighborhood are all right," she says. "Color's got nothing to do with it. White boys come through here raising cain sometimes, too. Next door, the colored folks are as nice as can be. But the kids in Southeast are terrible. You go down this street three blocks and see how they tore up those apartments, the black kids that live there.

"Some of them took my pocketbook and just beat the sap out of me in my own back yard. Those teen-age kids are always smart-alecking. We sit in the yard and they come cussing and threatening.

"We need a whole new round of judges. I want that in the paper with my name under it. If they would hang 'em or shoot 'em or something it would stop some of this foolishness."

The problem is so severe, maintains Mrs. Rutherford, that two years ago she and her husband, a retired boiler room engineer at the Metropolitan Club, bought the house next door to the one they had lived in for 15 years—"so nobody with a lot of kids would move in."

The Rutherfords, who had planned to retire on a small pension and Social Security, have financed the purchase by caring for St. Elizabeth's outpatients in both houses. More than 150 families in Congress Heights and Anacostia, most of them white, supplement their incomes by caring for outpatients, for which St. Elizabeths pays "foster home" owners $125 a month for each patient.

"Don't think we did it because we like the neighborhood," says Mrs. Rutherford. "We stayed here because we had no choice. I'm too old now to do anything different and my husband hasn't been too well. We're not going to pull up stakes this late in the day . . . Besides, I'd keep this place until it plumb rots down before I'd pay the real estate man for points. We've been on this street since 1950 and we didn't get points when we paid $15,000 for the (first) house.

"We put a lot of money into it ourselves. I don't think we could get our money out of it if we sold."

ATTITUDE TOWARD D.C.

If the whites of the far Southeast feel estranged from their own neighborhoods, their attitude toward the rest of the District of Columbia is characterized by downright antipathy.

In the common parlance of Anacostia or Congress Heights, when a resident talks about "Washington," he means that section of the city north of the Anacostia River.

"It's pretty over there," says Geraldine Bishop, "but Washington is for big shots"—an attitude shared by many of her neighbors.

"I know of people who pay $225 a month for a one-bedroom apartment!" she says. "I used to go over there every once in a while to see the monuments and museums. But now, I don't go into Washington but once every two or three months."

"Why should I give a damn about Washington, D.C.," asks Don Luber, 34, an auto mechanic who has lived in the 400 block of Mellon Street for 17 years. "I lived in Southwest, we moved here so we could be out of the slums. Now its getting to be a slum here.

"I don't see the government of Washington, D.C., doing anything for me. I see them paying a lot of other people money not to work. I see them letting the criminals go free.

"When I was a boy I used to go fishing sometimes instead of going to school. You know what they did to me? They sent me to the old Industrial Home School. I don't see them doing that anymore."

Luber, a District native, is part of what Mr. Frazier calls "that rare breed"—whites who were either born in the District or have been here most of their lives and still live east of the Anacostia River.

STRICT SEGREGATION

"They're the ones who got left behind," says the minister, who next month will become associate director of the Washington Urban League. "Most of them" he believes, "are either older or couldn't afford to move to Prince George's like their friends who left in the '50s and '60s."

Until then, the far Southeast had been known as one of the most rigidly segregated areas of Washington, although substantial numbers of Negroes had lived there since the Reconstruction era.

When Uniontown, as Anacostia was originally called, was surveyed and laid out as a community in 1854, the deeds to the lots in the original subdivision provided that no land would "be conveyed to any Negro, mulatto, or person of African blood."

However, in 1869, about 150 Negro families, among them Councilman Anderson's grand-

father, accepted the offer of the Freedmen's Bureau of "four acres and a mule" on the Anacostia tract then and now known as Barry Farms.

Immediately Irish newcomers, some of whose descendents still live in Anacostia today, objected to having Negro neighbors.

Nevertheless blacks comprised about one-fifth of the far Southeast's population by 1900 and the rigid segregation that was to persist there through midcentury was firmly established.

"Congress Heights was always a white community." Councilman Anderson, 41, remembers, noting that it is separated from Anacostia by a wall running along the grounds of St. Elizabeths.

"As kids growing up, we didn't go beyond that wall," he recalls. "When I went up there I was run back, physically. The only black people who went up there were service people like my father, who was a janitor up there."

CHASED FROM POOL

In 1949, when the Interior Department ordered that the Anacostia public swimming pool be opened to all persons, 50 Negro boys paid the small fee and attempted to enter. They were chased out by white bullies as park police looked the other way. That evening an angry crowd of Negroes collected and were dispersed by mounted police.

The upshot was the closing of the pool for the rest of the summer while the Jewish Community Council conducted a human relations course for the police and the Amerivan Veterans Committee devised a set of rules for conduct at the pool. It reopened a year later without incident.

Shortly after, Maj. Gen. Ulysses S. Grant III, whose grandfather had been President when Negroes first moved to Anacostia, announced plans by the National Capital Planning Commission to relocate "thousands of members of the colored population . . . . in the rear of Anacostia."

Later, Grant declared that there had been a misunderstanding of the planning commission's proposal for the relocation of Negroes who would be displaced by the renewal of Southwest Washington. He denied that the redevelopment area would be a magnificent white metropolis with servants' quarters at the rear.

Nonetheless, that is substantially what happened as thousands of blacks, dispossessed by the rising of the "New Southwest," moved to Anacostia in the 1950s.

OVERCROWDING BEGINS

The exodus from Southwest marked the beginning of the overcrowding that today afflicts most sections of Anacostia and Congress Heights.

While the population of other large sections of the city remained almost static, the Anacostia-Congress Heights complex grew from 85,000 in 1950 to 125,000 in 1960, 35 per cent of it Negro.

Today with little appreciable new construction since 1960, at least 200,000 persons live in the far Southeast.

"The real change began around '56 in Anacostia," Councilman Anderson recalls. "School integration had started in '54 and (white) people started leaving wholesale."

Later, thousands of white civilian and military personnel left the far Southeast as the naval gun factory was closed, the Navy Band moved from its home next to Bolling Air Force Base and Bolling's personnel list was cut back sharply.

Through the exodus, the District government accelerated its policy of locating most of the city's public housing across the Anacostia River where today 7,500 families—three-fourths of the public housing tenants in the city—live. There was no comparable increase in school classrooms, city services, transportation, recreation or other facilities to keep pace with the population growth, Anderson says.

"A typical mistake," says the councilman, "was the purchase of Valley Green," a 350-unit apartment complex in Congress Heights bought by the city for public housing in 1964. "Of course Valley Green is a slum now," he says. "That place wasn't meant for large families. It wasn't built for the plumbing and heating to be used by that many people all the time."

WATCHES TRANSITION

From the porch of her simple frame home on Milwaukee Place at the edge of Congress Heights, Vera Naylor, a 56-year-old native Washingtonian, the mother of eight children aged 14 to 35, watched the transition.

"It used to be a lovely place here," Mrs. Naylor, the wife of a retired pipefitter, says. "It was settled people then. Now it's all congested with traffic and people and very noisy. No, I don't say I care for it any more. Quite a few places have closed. Now the Peoples Drug at Nichols Avenue and Portland Street is closing down.

"I feel this way. I was born and raised here and I'm definitely not prejudiced. I want a chance to live and let live. Maybe it would have been just as difficult if whites were put into conditions like that, I don't know. But it's been very difficult since the blacks moved in.

"My husband, he got beaten severely going to the Safeway. My 14-year-old grandson, he isn't getting any education at Hart (Junior High School). He's always getting kicked down and beaten up. We transferred him but it wasn't any better where he was, so now he's back in Hart and scared to death.

"My son, the youngest, the other day he was going to the field to play ball and three boys took his money and hurt his arm. He had to go to Cafritz (Hospital) too. The hospital bills are enormous. I can't take care of it any more. My husband was in there for weeks.

"I don't think my son will ever get over his fright. They held a gun on him. There's nothing being done about this problem. It used to be people would go to court and it was effective.

"Something is wrong somewhere because people seem to be lost. It's a hard situation out here—I've seen too much. Nobody is getting a decent education in this city. There aren't enough recreational facilities and the ones that exist, my children get run off of. My kids are down as far as education is concerned. Nope, I don't like it here any more . . ."

In 1823, inspired by the spectacular view of the Anacostia and the capital city across the water, John Howard Payne, another Anacostia resident who lived only a few hundred yards from where Mrs. Naylor sits on her front porch today, wrote these now-famous words to a song:

Mid pleasures and places
Although I may roam
Be it ever so humble
There's no place like home.

"All I can say is, times are not like they used to be," Vera Naylor says.

RECESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess pending the call of the Chair, with the understanding that the recess not extend beyond 10 minutes from now.

The motion was agreed to; and at 5:28 p.m. the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 5:31 p.m., when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. CRANSTON).

ADJOURNMENT TO TOMORROW AT 10 A.M.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, August 11, 1970, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate August 10, 1970:

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following Air Force officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, Title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, Title 10, United States Code, to perform the duties indicated, and with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be major (dental)

Corrigan, William J., [redacted]
Rinaldi, Phillip G., [redacted]

To be captain (dental)

Lepore, Marion, [redacted]

To be captain (medical)

Shaklan, Barry N., [redacted]

The following Air Force officers for appointment in the Regular Air Force, in the grades indicated, under the provisions of section 8284, Title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

To be first lieutenant

Aber, Leland A., [redacted]
Adam, Gary G., [redacted]
Adamson, James I., [redacted]
Affonso, William G., [redacted]
Aguilera, Joseph L., [redacted]
Aguire, Richard F., [redacted]
Alexander, Michael E., [redacted]
Alexander, Richard D., [redacted]
Allaman, Peter M., [redacted]
Allan, Howard R., [redacted]
Allen, Henry L., [redacted]
Allen, Larry L., [redacted]
Allen, Lewis H., III, [redacted]
Allevato, John T., [redacted]
Allison, John D., [redacted]
Allum, Alvin L., [redacted]
Ambrose, Richard F., [redacted]
Ambrose, Richard W., [redacted]
Amos, Charles A., [redacted]
Anderson, Charles A., Jr., [redacted]
Anderson, Gerald J. F., [redacted]
Anderson, Irvin A., [redacted]
Anderson, James E., [redacted]
Anderson, John A., [redacted]
Anderson, John H., [redacted]
Anderson, Kelly D., [redacted]
Anderson, Kurt B., [redacted]
Anderson, Louis A., [redacted]
Anderson, Monnie F., [redacted]
Anderson, Neal T., [redacted]
Anderson, Robert R., [redacted]
Anderson, Stanley I., [redacted]
Anderson, Thomas E., [redacted]
Andrews, Robert S., [redacted]
Andrews, Terence M., [redacted]
Andrus, Guy R., Jr., [redacted]
Annesser, James W., [redacted]
Ansorge, Gene A., [redacted]
Arbaugh, Thomas W., [redacted]
Ardillo, Nick P., Jr., [redacted]
Ardis, Wesley R., [redacted]
Arms, Charles I., [redacted]
Armstrong, Robert J., [redacted]

Arnett, George D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Arola, George T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Artz, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ashe, Anthony B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Aufdenberg, Edward R., II xxx-xx-xxxx.
Augustine, Richard W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Babcock, Paul H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bacskai, Ronald J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bagby, Alva E., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Baker, Charles W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Baker, Henry D., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Baker, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Baker, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Baker, Norman D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ball, Michael S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ballentine, Rodger D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Banister, Larry S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Banker, Leon J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Baran, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Baranowski, Bronislaw F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Barber, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Barclay, Douglas G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Barker, Bruce W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Barker, Henry H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Barksdale, William S., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Barleen, Arnold L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Barneyback, Stephen E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Barrett, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bartee, Luther M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Barton, Frederick E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Barton, Lloyd H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bassett, Loyal G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Battiston, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bayne, Howard L., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bayus, Kenneth E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Beach, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Beacht, Russell W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bearden, James G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Beck, Peter M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Beckh, Peter xxx-xx-xxxx.
Beckman, Samuel K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Beggerly, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bell, Alan F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bellis, John A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Belmont, Gary R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Benda, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Benke, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Benkert, Daniel D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bennert, Raymond M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Benton, Mark J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Berg, Howard G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bergholz, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bernia, Dennis A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Berthelotte, William P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Best, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bettinger, Alexander, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Betts, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bieringer, Gerald F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bihner, William J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Black, Walter J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Blair, Carlton W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Blair, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Blanchard, Claude L., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Blanchard, Stephen M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Blaschke, Robert E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Blase, Carlton G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Blewett, Timothy E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Blinn, Roger K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bliss, Thomas F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Blomberg, Earl A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Boddy, Robert F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bohnsack, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bonasso, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bond, Dennis G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Boots, Stephen K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bordeau, Wayne R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Borland, Dennis P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Boshears, Willis M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Boswell, Gorden F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bouch, Kevin S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bouchard, Peter A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Boucher, Jean A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bouthillier, Raymond A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bowers, John V., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Boyd, Jimmy L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Boyd, Stephen B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Boyer, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bradley, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brady, Charles C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brady, Kenneth L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brahan, Michael G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brand, Merle A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brandon, Peter B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brandon, Whitney A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brank, Hence F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brashear, Ralph W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bray, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Breaux, Kerner A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Breitling, Richard P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brekke, Ivar S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Breland, Lonnie J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bridges, Thomas F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brock, Carol B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brock, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brockardt, Frank G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bronzo, Anthony F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brooks, Thomas E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brooks, William J., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brown, Henry A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brown, Ronald T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brown Steven J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brown Steven M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brown, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brownlee, Donald H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brumfiel, Philip A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brummund, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bruner, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bruns, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brunt, Curtis W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bryant, Floyd Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Buby, Randy L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Buck, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bufton, Larry W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bughman, Niles J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bull, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bulleit, Jack W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bullerman, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bundschuh, James J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bunger, Allen D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Burch, Joe T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Burdeshaw, Fred H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Burge, Pruett W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Burger, Kenneth J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Burin, Martin, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Burk, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Burke, Michael B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Burke, Thomas P., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Burnistine, Elmo xxx-xx-xxxx.
Burns, Jerry E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Burri, Otto W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Burton, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bush, Harold J., xxxx.
Butcher, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Butcher, Maxwell P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Butler, Johnnie B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bynum, Neil S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Byrd, Harry E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Byrne, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cadugan, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cagle, Danny P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cahill, Robert F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cahoon, Lloyd W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Calhoun, Charles K., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Callaghan, Stephen F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Calta, Dick, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Campbell, Clyde W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Campbell, Dana F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Campbell, Dennis L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Campbell, Frank B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Campbell, John S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Campbell, Milus C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Campion, Norman J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Carey, Jack R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Carlson, Randolph L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Carmichael, Richard H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Caroon, William T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Carpenter, Robert F., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Carpenter, Stephen C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Carr, Michael F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Carrico, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Carrier, Robert B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Carro, Roger C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cary, John L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Casciano, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Casey, Harold F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Casper, Gary P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Castle, Gary R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cathey, Ronald A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cauffiel, Garry L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Caven, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cervi, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Chamberlin, Brian, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Chambless, Lewis L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Chevalier, Paul R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Chewning, Dudley G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Chiapusio, Rodney D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Chik, Phillip L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Chinn, Charles M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Chisholm, Frederick L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Chisler, Ralph A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Chism, Duane L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Chittum, Charles L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Choate, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Choffel, Michael F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Christen, Barry W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Christopher, Timothy J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Chronis, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Church, Kenneth J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Chvatal, Joseph J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cipriano, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Clark, Charles T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Clark, Jess R., xxx-xx-xxxx 3.
Clark, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Clark, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Clarke, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Clatanoff, Noran W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cleary, Michael O., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cleland, William T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Clement, Peter A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Clonts, Kenneth D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cloos, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Coates, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Coburn, Arthur E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cochran, Thomas M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cogswell, Roger R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Coile, James T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Culangelo, Douglas A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cole, Dennis L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cole, Neil R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Coleman, Gary R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Coleman, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Colestock, Harry E, III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Collins, Charles J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Collins, Rolland C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Combs, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Comstock, William P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Congleton, Jerome J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Conlon, Michael E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Conner, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Conner, Wayne M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Connors, Daniel V., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Connors, Danny T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Conroy, Wayne F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Conte, Ralph, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Converse, Elliott V. III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cook, Jerry C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cook, Lynn S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cook, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cookson, Edward D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cooley, James V. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Coon, Lionel D., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cormack, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cornelius, Samuel B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cory, Bryan J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Couture, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Covert, Jerry L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cox, John A. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Coy, Jeffrey L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Craig, Dennis W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Craig, Herbert L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Craig, James S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Craig, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cramer, Charles E. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cranfield, Stephen L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Creighton, Donald J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Crews, Alan L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Crick, Robert T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Crismon, Larry H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Critchfield, Richard M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Crivello, Michael R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Crockwell, Richard M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Crone, Ronald M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Crowley, Duane E. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Crowley, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Crownover, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Crum, Curtis G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Crum, George T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cunningham, David H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cunningham, Jerald L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Curry, Gary L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cushing, George, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Czyzak, Stanley R., xxx-xx-xxxx.

Dakers, Uldis J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Daly, Michael R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dambra, Giuseppi V., xxx-xx-xxxx
Danielson Mark G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Danos, Dean J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Daughtry, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davidson, Gordon R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davidson, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davie, Anderson Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davie, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davies, George A. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davis, Dennis G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davis, Larry R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davis, Paul B. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Deacon, Donald J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Deardorff, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Decabooter, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Deckard, Gary D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Declue, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Defee, Robert A., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Defelice, Joseph D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Degrassi, Andy A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Deichelmann, Stephen T. xxx-xx-xxxx
Dejong, Ralph G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Delacruz, Rogelio, xxx-xx-xxxx
Delvecchio, Anthony, xxx-xx-xxxx
Delzell, Stephen L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Deming, Nelson L., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Demore, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Denault, Jerry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Denison, Norman W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dennis, Harry S., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Dennison, Charles M., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx
Deputy, Howard W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dereus, Tommy J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Derfler, Frank J., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx
Desousa, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dickerson, Larry S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Diesen, Bernard C., III xxx-xx-xxxx
Dietz, Edward R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dijanni, Joseph J. xxx-xx-xxxx
Dimotta, Francis J. xxx-xx-xxxx
Dingee, David B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dinkins, Douglas N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dixon, Howard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dobbins, Harold R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dobney, Arthur M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Doering, Ronald F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dolgins, Alfred J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Donaldson, Roderick P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Donkin, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Donovan, Steven R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dorris, Stephen P. xxx-xx-xxxx
Doughty, Ronald H. xxx-xx-xxxx
Downey, Clyde J., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Doyle, James T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Draper, Eugene, xxx-xx-xxxx
Dressler, Samuel W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Drozdz, Stanley J., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx
Duckworth, Anthony E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Duerr, Fred J. xxxx
Duffield, George F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Duffy, Bernard P., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx
Dugas, Louis A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dumas, Gregory, xxx-xx-xxxx
Duncan, William R. xxx-xx-xxxx
Dunlop, James B. xxx-xx-xxxx
Dunn, Michael R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dunn, Thomas G. xxx-xx-xxxx
Durand, Bernard A. xxx-xx-xxxx
Durbon, William D. xxx-xx-xxxx
Durden, Jerry M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Durrant, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Duval, Robert J., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx
Dwyer, Joseph J., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx
Dyson, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Eanes, Jack E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Easterly, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Eastman, Edward L. xxx-xx-xxxx
Eaves, Stephen D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Eby, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Eckles, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Edge, Ellen M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Edmunds, William W., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx
Edsall, Barton S. G. III xxx-xx-xxxx
Edwards, Ernest E., III xxx-xx-xxxx
Edwards, Laurel J. xxx-xx-xxxx
Edwards, Raymond G. xxx-xx-xxxx
Efferson, Bobby L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Egan, Thomas M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Eggleston, William H. xxx-xx-xxxx
Ehrlich, Stephen M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Eisman, Leon P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Elliott, Earnest H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Elrod, Robert V., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ely, Larry B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Emerson, Kenneth R., xxx-xx-xxxx
English, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ennis, Raymond C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ensinger, Milton R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Epstein, Samuel P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Erickson, Jon A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ernst, Auvern A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ernst, Thomas J. xxx-xx-xxxx
Ervin, James L., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx
Essinger, Gordon L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ettling, Albert J., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx
Evans, George E., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx
Evenson, Loren J. xxx-xx-xxxx
Ewing, Donald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ewy, Ralph L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Eye, Donald K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Eyler, Jimmie T., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx
Fabian, Edward D. xxx-xx-xxxx
Fairbanks, Robert A. xxx-xx-xxxx
Fanetti, Roger D. xxx-xx-xxxx
Fanning, Joseph P. xxx-xx-xxxx
Farkas, Richard L. xxx-xx-xxxx
Farrell, Michael G. xxx-xx-xxxx
Farris, James R. xxx-xx-xxxx
Fenwick, Larry D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fergus, John R. xxx-xx-xxxx
Fergusson, Brenda R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fern, Michael J. xxx-xx-xxxx
Ferranti, Richard J. xxx-xx-xxxx
Ferrier, Michael G. xxx-xx-xxxx
Ferris, Joseph D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fields, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Figueroa, Francisco A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Filkins, Charles W., III xxx-xx-xxxx
Fink, David F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fink, Joseph E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Finley, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fischer, Curt, xxx-xx-xxxx
Fischer, Herbert W. xxx-xx-xxxx
Fisher, Carroll S., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx
Fisk, Michael D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fiske, Jordan J. xxx-xx-xxxx
Fitzpatrick, Thomas J. xxx-xx-xxxx
Fleeger, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fleharty, Alvin J. xxx-xx-xxxx
Flynn, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Flynn, Todd C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Foley, Paul J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ford, Brian L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ford, Harry O. xxx-xx-xxxx
Ford, Martin J. xxx-xx-xxxx
Ford, Phillip J. xxx-xx-xxxx
Forster, Arthur C., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx
Forsythe, John H. H., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx
Fortmeyer, Charles R. xxx-xx-xxxx
Fosdick, Roger B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Foster, Bruce E. F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Foster, Charles S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Foster, Gary W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Foster, Jon K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Foster, Richard E. xxx-xx-xxxx
Foster, Wayne C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fowler, Marion R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fowler, Thomas W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fox, George P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Franco, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Franklin, Arnold L., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx
Franklin, Robert J. xxx-xx-xxxx
Franz, Richard J. Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx
Frechette, Louis A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Frederick, Robert P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Frederick, John M., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Freeman, James D. xxx-xx-xxxx
Freeman, Robert N. xxx-xx-xxxx
Freshwater, Monty C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fritsch, Martin M. xxx-xx-xxxx
Froehlich, David V. xxx-xx-xxxx
Frost, Gary R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Frost, William B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Frueh, Michael E. xxx-xx-xxxx
Fry, Lee W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Frye, Edward R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fuller, Ernest A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fuller, John P. xxx-xx-xxxx
Fultz, Randall L. xxx-xx-xxxx
Futch, Henry C., III xxx-xx-xxxx
Gaan, Michael R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gaby, Lewis, II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Gaddis, Eugene H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gagen, Dennis C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Galinger, Boyd R., III xxx-xx-xxxx
Gamble, Thomas H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gammill, Otto G., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx
Gaskin, Donald B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gaskin, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gaver, John F. xxx-xx-xxxx
Gavron, Alan H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gebert, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Geertz, Stephen J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gentry, Joe H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gentry, Neal W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Georgas, Nick, xxx-xx-xxxx
George, Gerald P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Germann, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Giarraffa, Joseph F. xxx-xx-xxxx
Gibb, Charles P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gibbons, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gibson, Paul S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Giese, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gilchrist, Gary L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gildea, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gillespie, Kenneth M. S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gillespie, Melvin D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gillett, Bruce D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gilman, John E., IV xxx-xx-xxxx
Giroux, Peter J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Glessner, Donald G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Glover, Albert R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Goembel, Carlos D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Golden, Richard R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Goltz, Eugene J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gooch, Eugene D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Goodmon, Jerre B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Goodrum, Thomas G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Goodwin, David F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gorby, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gordon, James E., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Gornall, William S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gosnell, Gary L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gould, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gould, Sammy B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Goulet, Manley R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Graham, James D., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx
Graham, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Grahn, Victory G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Granados, Alfred C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Granger, Peter A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Grant, Tucker B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Grapentine, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Grate, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gray, Irving L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Greene, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Greenfield, Johnnie F. xxx-xx-xxxx
Gregory, Norman D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gressang, Randall V., xxx-xx-xxxx
Grey, Roger, xxx-xx-xxxx
Grice, Kenneth E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Griffin, John M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Griffith, Charles S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Griffith, Stanley, xxx-xx-xxxx
Griffiths, Paul L., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Grillo, Edward F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Grimble, Stephen M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Grimes, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Grimm, Ralph B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Grobe, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Grominger, Howard M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gross, Jon L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ground, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Grunenwald, William J. xxx-xx-xxxx
Gude, Gerald F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Guerra, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gunter, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Guse, Steven D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Guthrie, Roger H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gutowski, Ralph R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gyure, Ronald J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Habgood, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hague, Jeremiah W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hahnenstein, Alfred H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Haldane, George M., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Hall, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hall, Douglas H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hall, Frederick W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hall, Hyrum A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hall, Jackson M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hall, John B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx

Hall, Manly W., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hall, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hallen, Gregory S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hampton, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hancock, Allan B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Handy, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hanson, Larry E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hardin, Benjamin L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Harris, Douglas E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Harris, John L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Harris, Leonard, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Harris, Richard H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Harrison, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Harrison, Larry G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hart, Albert R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hart, Darrell E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hart, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hartley, Charlie H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hartsfield, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Harvey, Stephen P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Harwood, Donald M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Haslam, Frederick R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hasley, Richard L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hassebrock, Roland A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hassell, Frank A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hattendorf, James G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Haverlak, Eugene, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hawk, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hawley, Gary A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hayes, Peter A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Haynes, Arnim V., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Haynes, Dennis K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Haynes, Gerald W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Heagle, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Heagy, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Heaps, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hedderlysmith, Bruce A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hedlund, Arthur R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Heiss, Edward L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Helms, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Helt, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Helton, Edward D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Henderson, Frederick H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Henry, George, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Herndon, Robert N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Herrell, Dennis E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hess, Michael E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hester, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hickey, Terrance, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hicks, Arthur G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hicks, Robert G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hielscher, Dalton W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Higgins, Gary L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Higgins, Keith L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hill, John O., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hill, John R. M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hill, Ralph D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hill, Randall M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hill, Walter C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hille, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hilt, Barry L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hind, Edwin A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hines, William C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hinkle, David S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hirschorn, Stephen I., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hirshberg, Sidney S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hise, Jerry K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hitchcock, Charles H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hladky, Paul D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hoberman, Barry, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hoch, Karl J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hoch, Ronald C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hoem, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hoff, James S., Sr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hoffman, Irving L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hoffman, Robert E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hoffman, Robert P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hofmann, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hofmann, Thomas H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hoge, Calvin V., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hogle, Walter S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Holaday, Kent T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Holcomb, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Holland, Chaz M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hollingsworth, Ronald E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Holmes, Ned D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Holser, Paul R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Holt, William H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Holtzman, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Honeycutt, David F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hopler, Edwin A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hoppe, Darrell R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hoppe, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Horkavi, George D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Horn, Grat H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hornor, Edward G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hornung, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hortenstine, Joseph G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hout, George W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Howard, Carlton T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Howard, Gary W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Howard, Jimmy H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Howard, Phil T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Howe, Gary R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Howe, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Huber, Donald L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hubert, Henry S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hudler, Dale B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hughes, Harry H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Humphrey, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hunter, Gary K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hunziker, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hutchinson, Donald D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hutchinson, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hutchison, Terry L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hutter, Andrew C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hutton, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hyle, Stephen B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ingelido, Michael J., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Inscoe, Willard D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Irwin, George E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Iskra, Thomas M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Iversen, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Iversen, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Iwamura, James K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Izatt, John D., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jackson, John E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jackson, Larry L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jacoby, George A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
James, Barry N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jameson, David M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Janeway, Bobby D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jardine, Edwin P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jaspers, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jenkins, Maurice A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jenkins, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jensen, Shelton C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jeu, Frederick, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jewett, Stephen E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jinright, Wendell F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johansen, Olaf K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnson, Carl G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnson, Carrol R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnson, Charles E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnson, Clinton E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnson, Dale G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnson, Edward K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnson, James A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnson, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnson, Ralph D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnson, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnson, William G., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnston, Charles L. G., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnston, Jerry W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Joiner, Larry W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jonak, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jones, Claude S., XXXX.
Jones, Edmund R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jones, Howard L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jones, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jones, Robert P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jones, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jones, William A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jordan, Gene A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jorgensen, Alvin W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jorgensen, Samuel C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Josey, Ben E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kabler, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kaiser, Donald W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kaliher, Donald E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kaluza, Michael E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kanaster, Larry D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kancitis, Andris, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kane, Kenneth P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kaptain, John P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Karas, Wayne J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Karlin, Francis L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Karlin, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Katz, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Keeler, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kehnle, Anthony C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Keith, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kelley, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kelly, Frank K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kemp, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kempf, Nicholas J., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kendall, Paul S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kendrick, Charles V., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kennedy, Daniel, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kennedy, Gordon H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kennedy, Robert B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kennedy, William E. C., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kester, Ernest E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ketchum, Leongirard R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kiermaier, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kiley, James T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kilgo, John L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Killworth, Michael N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
King, Donald, xxx-xx-xxxx.
King, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
King, Ronald, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kinnear, William P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kinnebrew, Lee, III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kipp, Marvin L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kirkland, Clayton M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kirkland, Malcolm E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Klausz, Steve, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Klein, William D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kleinhenz, William J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Klement, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Klemp, Arthur K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Klos, Jerry F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Knaub, Michael H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Knepper, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Knight, Billie G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Knight, Delbert L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Knight, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Knight, Warren V., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Knittel, Paul F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kuntsen, Eric V., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kobernus, George M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Koch, Perry L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Konegen, Rudolf R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Koontz, Charles D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kossey, Paul A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kramer, Willard P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kraske, Gary E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kratzer, Ronald M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Krecic, Ronald J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Krenzel, Arthur E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kroese, Ted R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Krueger, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Krzymowski, Victor K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kuenning, Thomas E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kuhns, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kullberg, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kurina, Jerry W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kutner, Michael B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kwiatkowski, Leonard F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kyle, James S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Labbous, Salem E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lacey, Michael F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lackey, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Laflamme, Herbert E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Laframboise, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lamb, Allan R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Landes, Clifford W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lane, Jimmy N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lane, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lang, Roy E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lange, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Larsen, Roger H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lascala, Ronald, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lasky, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Laszynski, Thomas F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lau, Leo E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lavin, Paul M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lawder, Shelby D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lawhern, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lawyer, David F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lea, Joseph D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Leatherwood, David, A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lecki, Ronald C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lee, Jeffrey F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lee, Larry O., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lee, Robert E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lee, Thomas W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lefforge, Jack A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Leithiser, William A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lemoine, Gaston J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lentz, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Leone, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lewis David E., xxx-xx-xxxx.

Lewis, Dean W. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lewis, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lewis, John S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lewis, Joseph W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lewis, Tommy L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Libert, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Linville, Ray P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lipp, George B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lipton, Howard N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lisle, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Little, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Littlefield, Laurence D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Litts, Phillip E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lomax, Francis E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Long, Harlan E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Long Stephen G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lono, Antonio E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Loomis, Lee H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Loose, Chester S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Loose, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lopp, James K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Love, David D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lovell, Jack R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lowry, Norman L., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Luczak, Ralph J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lueders, Denis A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lund, Stuart A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lundmark, Dennis P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lung, Emmet G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lutter, Charles W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lutton, Lyle D., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lynett, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lyons, Stanley B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Maage, Donald W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Machmer, Paul D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Magee, Edward B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Maginal, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Magliolo, Andrew J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Magness, William M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mahan, James B., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mahler, Michael E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Maki, Dennis A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Makinney, Charles F. K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Malcolm, Hugh S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Malone, Michael W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mangan, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mangels, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Manire, William G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mann, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mannix, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Marek, Edward S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Marks, Jerry E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Marr, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Marsh, Gregory P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Marshall, George W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Marshall, Willie L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Marsho, Daniel F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Marstall, James B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Martens, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Martin, Michael D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Martin, Michael F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Martin, Michael T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Martino, Frank E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Marvin, Carroll C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mascari, Phillip L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Masters, Francis M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Masterson, Mark W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Maxon, Gary L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
May, Alvin H., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Maze, Walter W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McAdams, Martin J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCarron, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCarron, William J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCarthy, Stephen P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCarty, Curtis, xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCarty, Joseph, xxx-xx-xxxx.
McClure, Roger L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCoy, Johnny M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCrea, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCulloch, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCutcheon, Robert H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McDaniel, Kenneth K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McDaniel, Larry T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McDaniel, William B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McDonald, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McDonald, Joe R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McDonald, Ralph B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCeneany, Dennis P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McGann, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McGarvey, Richard G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McIntyre, Andrew J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McIntyre, Henry J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McIntyre, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McKenzie, Francis F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McKercher, David B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McKnight, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McLain, Albert H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McLargin, Gary E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McLean, Donald P. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McLeod, Marion C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McLeroy, Joe C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McMahon, Dennis J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McMillen, Victor R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McMillin, Harry C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McMullin, Joseph R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McNabb, John T., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
McWilliams, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McWilliams, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mead, Charles H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mead, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Megow, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Meier, Daniel T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Meisten, John N., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Melchoir, Richard B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Melchisedeck, Jerry L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Melton, Thornton C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mendenhall, Laurence D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Merkel, James J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Meroney, Virgil K., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Merrell, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Merriott, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mesaris, Harold L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Meserow, Louis H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Metz, Thomas L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Metzker, Paul F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Meyer, Herbert F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Michelson, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Micklas, Paul J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Middleton, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Middleton, Robert R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mihara, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Milam, Alvin L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Milbrandt, Gordon K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, Arthur L., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, Charles G., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, Edward B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, Edward J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, Ernest R., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, Harvey J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller Lloyd D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, Ronald D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, Stanley E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mills, Allyn K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Minks, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mirrer, Keith S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Misek, Eileen F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mitchell, Edwin D., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mitchell, Harry R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mitchell, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mitchell, Louis J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mitchell, Ronnie D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mize, Mark, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Modlin, Edwin H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moffitt, Michael C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moha, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Molbert, Lennet J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Monroe, Gilbert L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Montague, Lyle L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moore, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moore, Philip W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moore, Warren W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morgan, Dennis P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morgan, Geraldine S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morgenstern, David H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moriarty, Joseph M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morley, Charles F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morris, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morris, William W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morrison, Jimmie G., xxxx.
Morrissey, Francis I., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morrow, Donald B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morsics, Frank, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Motonaga, Bert T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moyer, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Muehring, Paul E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Muellner, George K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mullen, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mullen, Russell E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Muller, Alvin D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mullikin, Michael O., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mullin, Jonathan B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mulvaney, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mundt, Henry G., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Munson, Robert R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Murdock, Louis J., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Murphy, Jerry M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Murphy, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Murray, Goodwill S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Murray, Phillip C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Murray, William J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Murray, Woodrow E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Musgrove, Gary M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mustakas, George T., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Myers, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nalley, Bobby L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Naue, Dennis A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Neal, Robert F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nelson, Eric E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nelson, Gary W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nelson, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nelson, Richard W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nelson, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nenner, Ronald B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nettleton, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Newell, Paul C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Newman, Douglas E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Newton, Peter J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nicholau, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nichols, Esau, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nicholson, George E., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nickel, Kenneth F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nicklas, John G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nield, Thomas V., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nielsen, Jim L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nieser, Tracy, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nimmo, Edward J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Norman, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
North, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Norton, Frederick P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Novak, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Null, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nulty, Frank T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Numoto, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Oates, Garland S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Oates, Norman C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
O'Bryan, Donald J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
O'Connell, Francis J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
O'Connell, Paul D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
O'Connor, William P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Odell, Thomas M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Odell, William L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Odle, Dick E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ohlsen, Michael C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
O'Keefe, Gerard P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Orchard, Stetson J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Orekar, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Orlando, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Orton, Robert B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ostergren, Lawrence D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
O'Sullivan, John F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Otterbein, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Owings, Markley J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Paddock, Richard S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Page, Warren L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Paige, Frederick D., IV, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Palmer, Russell R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Palmer, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Parks, Bennie F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Parks, Edward B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Patterson, Arthur W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Patterson, Charles N., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Patterson, Marshall S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Paul, Richard R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pauls, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Peddle, Mark J., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pedone, Stephen P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pedtke, Thomas R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Peloquin, Michael R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Penny, Luther R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Perrilliat, Clairborne W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Perry, John S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Peters, Eric A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Peterson, Peter E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Peterson, Russell L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Petrusky, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pettit, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pettyjohn, Daniel E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Phalen, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Phelps, Terrance J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Phillip, Eugene T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Phillips, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pierce, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx.

Pitzer, Peter G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pleggenkuhle, Daryl A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Plott, Frank L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Plowman, Leland H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Poe, Rodger B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Poe, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Poindexter, William R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pollock, Robert M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Poplin, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Porter, Dennis A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Porter, Donald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Poth, Gregory E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Powers, Russell J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Powers, William J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pozzo, Louis R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Price, Jerry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Price, Lansing B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Prout, Donald G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Punches, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Putnam, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Puzas, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Quance, Thomas P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Quebe, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Quisenberry, Charles M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rachmel, Lee W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rafuse, Harold E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rail, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ralls, Charles D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ralph, George R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ramey, Steven C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Randel, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rannazzisi, Santo J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rans, Stephen J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ranson, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rapp, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rarick, Kenneth R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rawcliffe, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rea, Michael W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reaver, Kenneth A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reddan, Michael M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reding, Jerry W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reed, Earl S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reeh, Charles D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reese, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reese, Pat L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reichman, James G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reid, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reid, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reiter, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reuper, Richard H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reynard, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rian, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rice, Harold D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rich, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Richards, Hugh J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Richardson, Darrell L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Richmond, Don C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ridge, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Riely, Michael W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Riffe, Thomas W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Riggins, Dennis D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Riley, Earl W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Riley, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pinella, Joseph T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ringstrom, Ronald J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Riopelle, Martin A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Riordan, Monti J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ritter, Arthur W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Roa, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Robert, Wade H., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Roberts, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Roberts, Duane C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Roberts, James O., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Roberts, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Robinson, Alan M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rodgers, Jimmie A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Roecker, Lloyd L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Roen, David T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Robers, Owen, xxx-xx-xxxx
Rogers, Steven B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rogers, Tate M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rogers, Victor M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Roller, Russell F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Romaglia, Frank J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rooney, Michael R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rose, Allen E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rose, Charles A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rose, Peter N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rose, Stephen R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rosenthal, Marvin H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Roshak, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Roth, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Roth, Kenneth E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rougeau, Joseph M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rous, Robert K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rovenstine, Jay A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Royer Peter M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ruddy, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rumberg, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Runkle, Jack R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ruppert, Peter J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rush, Dean R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Russell, Evan, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Russo, Daniel L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rust, Steven K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rutenberg, David C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rutledge, Larry D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ryals, Allen C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ryan, Harold D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ryland, William K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sagsveen, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Salge, Alvin A., xxxx
Salminen, Frank W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sampson, Ronald T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sanborn, Alvin M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sanford, Gary M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sargent, William D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sarkozy, Lawrence J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sasman, Edward D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sasnett, Rufus P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Saunders, Larry W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Saunders, Robert G., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Savacool, Donald J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sawaya, George J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schaefer, William L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schaffer, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schaffer, Raymond C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Scheafer, Harry A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schellhase, Milton G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schering, Roy F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schildmeyer, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schlobohm, Christian P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schmidt, Jerry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schnee, Walter L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schneider, Michael D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schrepel, Milton F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schufman, Joseph L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schuh, Ronald B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schuster, Harve J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schuyten, Peter, xxx-xx-xxxx
Schweitzer, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Scott, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Seals, Daniel P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Seaton, Gary G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sechler, Duard L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Seck, Harry F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Seda, Joseph E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Seidler, Richard B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Seifer, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Seines, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sergent, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shale, Douglas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shaner, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shanklin, William M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shea, Clifton L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shea, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shea, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shepard, Joel E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shepard, Kenneth E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shepherd, Gerald C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shepherd, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shermer, Caton A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shiker, Jack D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shively, Robert A., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Shotwell, Lance D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shultz, Cletus E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Siders, Stephen R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sides, Robert R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Siegfried, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Silliman, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Simko, Charles G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Simmons, Clayton D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Simmons, Eugene B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Simms, John G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Simon, Attila T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Simon, Philip O., xxx-xx-xxxx
Simons, George W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Skala, Kenneth E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Skar, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Skersick, Richard K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Skinner, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Skluzacek, Eugene W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Slaughter, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sloan, Johnny B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sloan, Ronald V., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sloan, William T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Small, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smartt, Daniel K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Douglas B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Edward M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Jerry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Leland T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Michael D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Omer L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Ronald H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Thoms J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, W. S., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Walter E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Wyatt S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Snyder, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Snyder, William W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Socha, Leon P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Soebbing, Dennis R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Soldmann, William T., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Soucy, Robert B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Spates, Frederick R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Spencer, David D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Spitler, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Spooner, Donald A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Spratlen, Terence C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sprick, Charles D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stajdel, Patrick J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stamler, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stange, Kenneth C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stanley, Samuel D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stark, Rodney L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stauffer, Roger K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Steele, John B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stephens, Raymond L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stephens, Roy L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stephenson, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stevens, Steve F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stewart, Burrell H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stewart, John H., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Stewart, Leroy, xxx-xx-xxxx
Stewart, William B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stewart, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stiles, James V., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stocks, Gary E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stockton, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stormo, Douglas D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stovall, Glen W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stover, Evan P., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Strawmyer, Jan N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Strayhorne, George V., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stromain, Paul T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stroschein, Larry A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stubblefield, Thomas B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stubbs, David K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stubbs, Gregory D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Studwell, Victor E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Styler, Brent A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Suda, Lawrence L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sullivan, Joseph W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sullivan, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sullivan, Raymond F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Swettenam, Fredrick L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Swisher, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sykes, Edward L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Tadd, Roland F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Takakawa, Rodney N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Talbert, Glenn B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Talbert, Michael B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Talbott, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Tate, Michael D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Taylor, George W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Terrell, Frank M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Thisius, Dennis L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Thomas, Allan, xxx-xx-xxxx
Thomas, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Thomas, Neal M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Thomas, William S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Thomley, Alan M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Thompson, Kenneth R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Thompson, Paul R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Thompson, Ralph C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Thorp, Donald K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Thorson, Delmar D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Thrash, Joseph P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Thurston, Marland C., xxx-xx-xxxx

Thyng, Daniel L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tichenor, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tiedemann, Thomas W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tiernan, Robert K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tihomirov, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tillstrom, Richard P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tilma, Teddy G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Timko, Andrew, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tirone, Joseph M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Titus, William E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tobey, Carl P. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Toles, Stephen L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tolin, Anthony J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tolle, Tommy J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tomlinson, Edward M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tompkins, Rodney P., xxxx.
Toran, Isaiah, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Torkelson, Leon A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Travis, Ralph D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Travitz, David H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Trentham, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tucker, Charles G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tucker, Lloyd E. III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tudor, David K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tusinski, Joseph A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tuttle, Bruce C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tyler, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tysinger, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vallas, Theodore G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vanderwilt, Philip B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vandoyen, Johannes, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vergin, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vermeiren, Richard M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vernor, Alois C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Verso, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vizi, Donald A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Volk, Douglas L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Volpe, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vonkrosigk, Rodney K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Voth, Dennis J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wadlington, James T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wadsworth, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wagner, Paul A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Waliiko, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walker, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walker, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walker, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wall, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wallace, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wallace, William F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walsh, Robert P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Washburn, Frederick D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wasniewski, Andrew S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Watson, Gary G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Watson Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Weaver, Billy H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Weaver, Bruce W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Webb, Danny W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Weiss, Marc H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Weller, Frederik, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wells, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Welsh, Billy A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wendt, Howard W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wendt, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
West, Donald E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
West, John F., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Westerville, Karl E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Whalen, Joseph E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wheeler, Michael I., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Whiat, Murray R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Whitby, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
White, Arthur P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
White, Frank O. H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
White, Harry A., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
White, Homer E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
White, Hubert W., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
White, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
White Neil R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
White, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Whitehouse, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Whitesell, Donald E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Whitley, Donald F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Whittaker, Loren F. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Widders, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wiese, Craig S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wiesner, Larry E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wikheim, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilber, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilder, Lawrence T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wildermuth, Paul S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wiles, Charles J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilkinson, Spencer W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilks, Phillip G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Willett, Robert V., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williams, Edward L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williams, John B. III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williams, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williams, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williamson, Marshall D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Willis, Herbert P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Willits, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilmot, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilson, Bobby G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilson, Garth L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilson, Orren D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilson, Robert R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilson, Stephen E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilson, Woodrow, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Winge, Gaylord H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Winkler, Paul H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Winnik, Laurence N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Winston, William S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wirth, Larry G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wise, Jeffrey D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wise, Keith R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wise, Michael G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wise, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wise, William M. III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Witek, Edward, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Withrow, William E. III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wittmayer, Roger N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wohlwend, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wolf, Stephen H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wollam, Russell G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wollaston, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Woodall, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Woods, Gavan D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Woods, Jerry D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Woody, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Woolard, Lynn P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Woolever, Edwin E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Woolf, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Worden, Jerry D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wright, Dennis D. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wyatt, John H. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Yamanaka, Osamu C. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Yanagihara, Peter V., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Yarborough, Thomas R. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Yeakel, Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Yoggerst, Denis M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Younce, Henry S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Young, Everett W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Young, Larry R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Young, Lee R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Young, Robert A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zalace, Stanley W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zdradzinski, Stephen F., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zeigler, Troy D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zelenski, Stanley S. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zellmer, Dennis M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zesinger, George R., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ziegler, Kenton R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zimmerman, Leon I., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zinkus, John C. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zuber, William G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zuleeg, Ralph C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zura, Gary B., xxx-xx-xxxx.

To be second lieutenant

Aakhus, Donovan E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Abair, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Accurso, Steven A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ackerman, Robert F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Adams, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Adamson, Anthony L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Agnor, Raymond M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Aikman, Rex, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Akins, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Albertini, Victor D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Algire, Richard G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Alleman, Darryl D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Alpert, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Alton, Jack W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Amato, Leonardo, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Amlicke, Bruce B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Anderegg, Clarence R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Anderson, David B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Anderson, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Anderson, Jeffrey W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Anderson, Jon A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Anderson, Russell C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Andreoli, Leopold J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Andrews, Duane P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Angel, Bernard B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Angerman, George G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Angier, Franklin E., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Anton, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Apgar, Richard, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Arnold, William R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ashbaugh, Dennis M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ashby, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ashford, Harvey M. H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Askew, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Asmus, Hans J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Atherton, Michael E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Atkinson, William B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bachelor, Robert R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Back, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Badgley, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Baenziger, Clayton M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bafus, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bagnetto, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bair, David S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Baker, Fred L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Baker, Gary H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Baker, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Baker, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Baker, Warren E., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Baki, Richard K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Balkovec, Steve L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ball, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ballard, Leroy D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ballew, Joseph E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bambury, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Banks, Calvin Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Barker, Duane A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Barnes, George A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Barranco, John R., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Barrett, Andrew J., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Barrick, Samuel L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Barry, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Barry, Steven T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Barton, John V. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Barton, Leroy H., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bates, John F. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Batie, Gary J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Battle, Jack M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Baugh, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bayless, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Beachem, Eugene R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bearley, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Beinecke, Terry A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bell, Terry R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bell, Walter D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bendlin, Gary R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Benjamin, Harry E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bennett, Charles L., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bennett, Warren A., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bennett, William R. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Benson, George G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Benten, John B. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bentley, Philip S. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Benz, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bergs, John, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Berry, Dennis J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bertram, Heinz D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bertrand, Randall L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Berty, Barry J. T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Beshore, Eric A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Besold, Barry B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Betz, William D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bevan, Steven B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bickley, Frederick L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bishop, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bishop, Stanley T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Blackburn, Michael P. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Blackman, William J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Blair, David G. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Blais, Gerard C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Blakely, Milo R. B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Blakely, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Blanchard, James R. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Blanco, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Blank, Jere F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Blanks, Randolph M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Blauch, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Blaxton, Eldon C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Blight, Clark W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bliquez, Terry O., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Block, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bloodworth, Donald B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bloom, Jay E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Boesz, Daniel L., xxx-xx-xxxx.

Bogard, Earl C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bohlmann, Richard G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bohnsack, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Boling, Rodney E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bomberger, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bortner, Jonathan J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bound, Ronald J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bower, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bowie, Claude P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bowman, Gerald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Braa, Arthur J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bradford, Barry C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brady, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Branscome, Claude E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Breen, Timothy J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brestle, Daniel J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bridewell, Alexander C., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Bridges, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brightfelt, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brigman, Marvin J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brinkley, Michael E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brittelli, Joseph L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brocato, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brody, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brotzman, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brown, Glenn R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brown, Harold R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brown, Herbert W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brown, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brown, Paul W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brown, Tommy G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brown, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Browning, Jeffrey F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Browning, Robert W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brunsting, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bryan, Edwin B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Buchanan, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Buchholz, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bumbulis, Gunars, xxx-xx-xxxx
Burke, David K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Burke, William J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Burkel, Louis A., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Burnette, Joe D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Burns, Herman W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Butchart, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Butterbrodt, Vaughn L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Button, Gary D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Buzze, Charles L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Byers, Joseph M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Byrd, Emerson E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Byrne, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Byrns, William G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Caldwell, Douglas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Calvert, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Campbell, Harry G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cardiel, Richard B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carellas, James G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carellas, James G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carman, Philip L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carnevali, Tony, xxx-xx-xxxx
Carothers, Noble E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carr, Randell E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carroll, Leo T., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Carter Lloyd L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carter, Stephen F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Caruthers, John E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cason, Benjamin B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Caspar, William D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Catherwood, Dwight W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cathey, Thomas N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cattolica, Vincent J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cawood, Harry E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cecil, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Chabot, Ferdinand J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Chandler, Edward L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Chandler, William J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Chary, Henry A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cheatwood, B. W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cherry, Eileen P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cherry, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cheshire, James C., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Christensen, Boyd J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Christon, Christopher L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Churchill, Carl R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Churchill, Carl R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Clark, Freddie W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Clark, Glen W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Clark, Milton S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Clark, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Clavenna, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Clee, John C., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Clements, Morris E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Clevesy, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Clifton, Kirby R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Clough, Fred A., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Clutter, Bertley A., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Coakley, Donald J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cole, Edward D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cole, Julian W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Coleman, Maurice A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Collins, Perry B., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Colpitts, Charles D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Comite, Carmen A., xxxx
Compton, Munson G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Comstock, Robert W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Condit, Thomas H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cone, Milton L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Confer, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Conlan, George I., xxx-xx-xxxx
Connelly, Thomas T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Connor, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Contreras, Raul, xxx-xx-xxxx
Cook, Glenn R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cooley, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cooper, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Coppock, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Corban, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Corney, John K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Corrigan, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cottam, Eleanor I., xxx-xx-xxxx
Coulter, Gary R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Courreges, Fleetwood M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cox, Bruce N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cox, James B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cox, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Coyle, Jeffrey W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Crane, Charles L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Crane, Gregory L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Crawford, Kenneth R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Croach, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cronk, Bradley A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cross, Roderick S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Crumm, William J., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Cummings, David D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Curran, Craig V., xxx-xx-xxxx
Currier, Cyrus R., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Curry, William S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Curtis, Edward E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cuthrell, Luther G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dahm, Joseph M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dahms, Arthur R., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Daluz, Antonio V., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Damron, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Danahey, James A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Daniel, William L., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Davern, James J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davidson, Dale A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davis, Chris G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davis, Gary E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davis, Marvin L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davis, Michael H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davis, Simeon B., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Dawsey, Donald J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dayton, Frank H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
DeAlmeida, Victor J., xxx-xx-xxxx
DeAscenti, Anthony F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Decker, Harry C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Deen, William K., xxx-xx-xxxx
DeGeneff, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx
DeGruccio, Stanley G., xxx-xx-xxxx
DeJong, Lloyd E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Demarest, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dempsey, Stephen A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Devers, Waynard C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dicker, James T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dickson, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dietrich, Richard T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dill, Glenn E., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Dill, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dillon, Steven M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dilworth, Robert W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
DiPentima, Richard T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dixon, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Doe, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Domina, John, xxx-xx-xxxx
Dorn, Weems C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dotson, Gary K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dow, Charles L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Downing, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Downs, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Draves, Richard P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Drewry, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Driscoll, Jack A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dudley, Edward E., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Duke, Marshall W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dunaway, Joseph H., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Dunbar, Robert F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dunn, Leif R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dyer, Brien W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dyer, Ralph W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Eastman, George M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Eaton, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ebner, Neil B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Eddins, William N., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Eichinger, Matthew S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ellef, Peter N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Engebretsen, Donald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Engels, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ennor, Timothy M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Epps, Thomas E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Eramian, Michael T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ercoline, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Erickson, Kermit A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ericson, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ernst, Billy G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Errico, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Esparza, Eduardo D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Esquivel, Arturo, xxx-xx-xxxx
Evans, Charles L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Evans, Walter S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ewan, Sherry A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ezzy, Peter J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Faber, William W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fake, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Farrell, Timothy J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Farris, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fay, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Felton, Silas, xxx-xx-xxxx
Felts, Patrick G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ferguson, Charles M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ferriel, William D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fey, Steven T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ficklen, Louis S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Field, Robin A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fischer, Lawrence J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fisher, Paul F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fisher, Robert E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fisher, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fitch, Jeff I., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fluharty, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Flynn, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Foley, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Folkeson, John R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Folkestad, Alan J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ford, Thomas K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Forrest, Douglas W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Forsyth, John F., IV, xxx-xx-xxxx
Foster, Kenneth C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fought, Stephen D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fowle, Bernard H., IV, xxx-xx-xxxx
Fowler, Robert F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fox, Thomas A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Frady, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Frank, James T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fraysher, Dorina E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Freeman, Robert O., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fresh, Herman E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Friedel, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Friedlander, Leonard, xxx-xx-xxxx
Friedman, Steven M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Frisbie, Noel F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Frisby, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fullenkamp, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fullerton, Scott L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fultz, Charles G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fuquay, Daniel M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Furches, Henry C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Furtwangler, Stephen E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gaboury, Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gallant, Paul B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gamble, Patrick K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Garcia, Alfred R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gardner, Elmo H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gardner, Ronald K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Garing, Roger L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Garrett, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Garrison, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gehbauer, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Geier, Frank J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gentry, Larry A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Georgatos, Jerry F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gerber, Lester J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gerhardt, Dana J., xxx-xx-xxxx

Giammo, Salvatore J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gibbons, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Giebink, Norman G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gird, Ronald S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Glorioso, Richard, xxx-xx-xxxx
Godman, Thomas W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gomez, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Good, Jackie R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gore, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gossner, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gould, Michael D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Graf, Nancy A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Grafe, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Grant, Leonard T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Graser, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gray, Don R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gray, Richard F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Green, Douglas L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Green, Gary A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Greenawalt, Rodgers K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Greene, Charles D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gresham, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gribble, James T., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Griffith, Frederick G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Griffith, Ronald T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Grimes, Richard T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gritzmaker, Duane W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Groggel, Dwight K., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Groshong, Phillip S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gruver, Russell M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Guadiz, Robert R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Guesno, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Guinn, Jon A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Guise, Richard S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gunter, Charles A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gustafson, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gustke, Leroy K. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Guthals, Joel E., xxxx
Gwaltney, William D., -xxxx
Haas, Frederick W., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Haas, Milton F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Haden, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hagler, Gerald H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hahn, Bertram G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Haley, Thomas E. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hamilton, Julius M. II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Hamrick, Wynne R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Handerhan, Michael W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hanfland, Lawrence W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hanisee, Thomas P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hannon, John V., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hansen, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hanson, Duane M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hardin, Donell L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hardy, Robert R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hargreaves, Thomas D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Haring, Dallas L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Harlacher, Donald S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Harmon, Frank L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Harnage, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Harper, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Harrington, Thomas C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Harris, Delbert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Harris, Jeffrey L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Harris, Michael W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Harris, Randall G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Harris, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Harris, William W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Harrold, Patrick K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hart, William L. III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Hartman, Gary E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Harvey, George C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Harwood, Paul R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hasche, Lloyd R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Haselhorst, Dale O., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hastings, Glen R II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Haury, Philip L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hawkins, Thomas R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hawkins, William A. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hawn, Steven E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hayes, Donald F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hayes, Fulton D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hays, Kervyn L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hays, Richard W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Head, Raymond L. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Healy, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Heatherly, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Heckelman, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hedegaard, Maynard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hedemark, Timothy P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Heezen, Arthur F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Heidler, Clare D., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Heidt, William S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Heining, Jan R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Helkey, Wilbur T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Helms, Lloyd H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hemmick, Donald E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Henry, Patrick M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Herider, Michael R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hernandez, Manuel R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Herrick, James W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hess, Daniel L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hickel, Clifford A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hickly, Edward M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hilbert, Anthony G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hill, Charles D., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Hill, John S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hines, Larry W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hinkle, Kenneth E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hinton, William S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hintz, Jo A. E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hipple, Herbert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hipps, Luther J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hodges, Charles G., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Hodgson, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hoffman, David A., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Hoffman, Edwin L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hogan, Donald P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Holcomb, Michael C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Holcombe, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Holland, Stephen L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Holmquist, John D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Homan, Edward L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Horner, George J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Horner, Robert T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Horning, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Houck, Douglas L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hough, Charles T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hough, William C., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Houghtby, Larry K., xxx-xx-xxxx
House, Herbert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Howard, Dennis G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Howell, Robert R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Howell, Thomas H., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Howington, Raymond G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Howman, Paul D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Howry, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hubbard, Carl J., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Hubbell, James T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hudak, Ronald M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Huff, Kent H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Huffman, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hughes, Gary L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hull, Charles I., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hull, Jonathan P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hume, Thomas W. II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Hunt, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Huntsman, Rex V., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hutcheson, Donald W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ibarra, Humberto, xxx-xx-xxxx
Ingwersen, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ireland, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Irwin, George F. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Isaacson, Theresa L. M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Isenhour, Larry W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ivan, Andrew Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jackson, Gene E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jackson, Kenneth E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jansen, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jansen, Thomas V., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jenkins, James T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jenneskens, Hubert A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jennings, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jewett, Thomas D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnson, Barry D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnson, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnson, Harry F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnson, Herbert H. II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnson, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnson, James J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnson, Joel D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnson, Paul D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnston, Kent R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnston, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Joines, Kenneth L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jones, Charles D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jones, Dale B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jones, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jones, Dwight B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jones, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jones, Raymond A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jones, Ronald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jones, Terry R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jordan, William T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jordon, Marshall E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jung, Charles, xxx-xx-xxxx
Kahl, George G. III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Kaiser, John V. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kapp, Francis L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kappock, Thomas J. III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Kaschak, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kaufman, Robert, xxx-xx-xxxx
Kay, George W. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Keller, Harris, xxx-xx-xxxx
Kelley, Ferdinand T. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kelley, Milton J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kelley, Paul R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kelly, Darby J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kelly, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kelly, William F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kemp, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kenna, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kennington, Thomas K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kennish, Jared P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kern, Jere W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kern, Marshall J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kester, Keith L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kiernan, Hayes A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kimberlin, Donald W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kimbrough, Landon L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kinego, Joseph C., xxx-xx-xxxx
King, Charles M., xxx-xx-xxxx
King, Eddie M., xxx-xx-xxxx
King, Kristofer R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kinker, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kirby, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kirkwood, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Klingner, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Knabe, Carl F., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Knebusch, Donald M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Knight, Norman L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Knudsen, William P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Konyu, Mike, xxx-xx-xxxx
Koshko, Kent D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kotlicky, Howard J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kramer, Arthur F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kruid, LeRoy G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kuczek, Ronald J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kunkel, Edward P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kurtz, Larry D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Labeau, Michael H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lacey, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lacey, Stephen W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lachman, Jerald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lafferty, Ronald N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lafko, Bruce C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Laing, Gary T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Laitinen, Roger K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lamb, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lambert, Gene F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Landers, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Landry, Louis F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Larson, Larry D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Larson, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lassanske, Paul W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lauffer, Edward W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lavanish, Paul J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lawson, Carl D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Leblanc, Marie L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Leblanc, Ralph D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lee, Joseph R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lee, Richard V., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lee, Wayne H. W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lege, Ronald P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Leigh, Charles M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Leighton, Daniel L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lemanski, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Leonard, Tice N., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lettan, Richard H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lewis, Jack P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lewis, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ley, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Leykum, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Libertore, James B. III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Lies, Richard L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lilley, Kenneth B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lind, Christopher T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lindamood, Gregg N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lindroth, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lindsey, Hugh A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Link, Joseph V., xxx-xx-xxxx
Linville, James G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Little, Charles P. III, xxx-xx-xxxx

Little, David S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lively Evelyn E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Logan, Darrell L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Loop, Glenn L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lowder, Harrington L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Loyd, Oliver H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lucas, Stevan R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lucas, Wingate H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ludwig, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lutes, Victor R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Luyendyk, Howard G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lytle, Foster M. II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Lytle, Robert P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Macdonald, Alexander E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Maddow, Robert B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Maddrey, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Maher, Gerald N., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mahl, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Malik, Paul E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Manganello, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mangnall, Richard K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Manley, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mann, Vernon R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Markham, Thomas B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Marks, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Markussen, Carl S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Marr, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Marshall, Victor H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Martin, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Martin, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Martin Thomas G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Martwig, Larry E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Marvel, Hynson H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Marzinke, David H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mascaro, Kenneth E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Maskell, Dean E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mason, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mason, James A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Masson, Dennis R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mather, Richard S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Matthes, Peter R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Matthews, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Maxwell, Mark D., xxx-xx-xxxx
McCabe, Daniel J., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
McCarty, Deryl S., xxx-xx-xxxx
McClannahan, Richard W., xxx-xx-xxxx
McClung, Larry W., xxx-xx-xxxx
McCormick, Kenneth R., xxx-xx-xxxx
McCoy, Jarell V., xxx-xx-xxxx
McCoy, Norman C., xxx-xx-xxxx
McDonald, Elden S., xxx-xx-xxxx
McElroy, Dennis R., xxxx
McEntire, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx
McEwing, William M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
McFarland, Daniel Lee, xxx-xx-xxxx
McFarland, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
McGarry, Thomas J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
McGinty, Kevin M., xxx-xx-xxxx
McGuirk, Edward D., xxx-xx-xxxx
McKaskle, Joe P., xxx-xx-xxxx
McKee, Dean M., xxx-xx-xxxx
McKie, James K., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
McKinney, James N., xxx-xx-xxxx
McKinney, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
McKnight, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Meade, Rowland H., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Mechanic, Jack H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Melberg, Raymond H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Merrell, Louis W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Merris, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Messenger, Marion J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mettler, David S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Metzgar, Dean E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Metzler, Thomas R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Meyer, Arnold A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Michalenko, William J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mielke, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Miesse, Douglas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mikeal, Jerry H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Milazzo, Robert P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Miles, George W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Millard, Terry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Miller, Duane M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Miller, Eldon H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Miller, Gene C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Miller, Herman G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Miller, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Miller, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Miller, Thomas L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Miller, Walter J., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Milliken, Kent T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mills, William B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mitchel, John H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Moe, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Moehlenkamp, Michael C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mohan, Steven D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Moles, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mood, John D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Moore, Carl P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Moore, Dennis R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Moore, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Moore, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Moore, Ronald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Moore, Steven J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Moorhead, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Moran, Lawrence L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Morgan, John G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Morganto, Joseph E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Morikado, Robert N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Morris, William F. B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Morrison, Joel T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mosher, Walter L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mott, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mount, Michael B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Moyer, Dale L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mrazek, James E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mruz, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mundy, James H. IV, xxx-xx-xxxx
Murdoch, Donald G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Murphy, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Murray, Walter B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Myers, Newton C. II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Myers, Thomas C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Naccari, Norman W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Napolitano, John, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nauful, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Neel, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nefzger, David F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nelson, Loren P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nelson, Randall W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nelson, Robert K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nemec, Ronald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nett, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Neumann, William C. II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Neuschaefer, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Newberry, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Newsome, Gary K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Newton, Raymond R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Newton, Raymond R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nichols, Stephen E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Niederauer, Christopher B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nikolai, Karl J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nimick, Richard F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nixon, Albert M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Noguchi, Russel, A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nokovich, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nordeman, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Norman, William G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Novak, Daniel L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nunn, Chester E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ohlinger, Charles T., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Oman, Barry M., xxx-xx-xxxx
O'Neal, Gary D., xxx-xx-xxxx
O'Neill, Patrick H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Osterloth, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ostermann, Thomas C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Oudens, Michael H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ousley, James F., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Overton, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pabst, Richard W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Page, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Page, Larry A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Page, Roger W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Palecek, Allan H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Palmer, Roger W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pangborn, Jon B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Parsons, David S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Patzer, Larry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pearcy, Robert K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pease, Donald J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pees, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pehan, Terry S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Perez, Rafael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Perezvazquez, Victor M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Perkins, Stephen D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Perl, Douglas R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Perry, Keith M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Perry, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Peters, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Peters, Timothy A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Petersen, Dennis L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Peterson, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Petrash, Ernest F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Philbrick, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Phillips, Anthony L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Phillips, Dean R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Phillips, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Phillips, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Picarella, Thomas D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pickard, Joseph R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pikas, Jurij xxx-xx-xxxx
Pinto, John J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Piroutek, John G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pitts, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pius, Lawrence J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Platt, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pollock, Charles D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pope, James A., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Porter, Paul W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Power, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pratt, Emory J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pries, Jon D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Priest, Gray M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Primrose, Ronnie L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Prodell, Aaron, xxx-xx-xxxx
Pruitt, Richard T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Purdy, James A. II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Quinn, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ragan, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Raines, Norman W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rainville, Paul J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ranaudo, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Raphael, Christopher H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ratcliff, David D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ratts, Larry J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rauch, James O., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ray, Hubert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ray William D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Raycraft, James B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Raymond, Neil V., xxx-xx-xxxx
Raymond, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reedy, Rodger A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reger, Charles B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Register, Perry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reichal, Joseph C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Remy, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rice, Rob R. III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Richardson, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Richey, Chester R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ricketson, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rider, Warrick W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rigby, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Riley, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Riordan, Valentine W. II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Ritter, James W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ritter, Robert J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rivolo, Arthur, xxx-xx-xxxx
Roark, David O., xxx-xx-xxxx
Roark, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Robbert, Albert A. III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Roberts, George R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Roberts, Harold I., xxx-xx-xxxx
Roberts, James W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Robertson, Herschel E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Robey, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Robinson, Clark W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Robinson, Mark, xxx-xx-xxxx
Rodenhauser, Karl J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rodgers, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Roe, Fay A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Roll, David F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rundeau, Daniel M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ross, Michael I., xxx-xx-xxxx
Russ, Thomas L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Roswell, Donald F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rubus, Gary M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rudolph, Franklin A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Runyon, David C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rupp, Kenneth D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rupp, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rupright, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Russell, Clark B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rustemeyer, William G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ruzicka, Joseph L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ryan, Thomas G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rygielski, Joseph J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sackvillewest, Arthur J., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Sams, John B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Samson, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sander, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sanders, Ernest L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sanders, George A., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Sands, Gene C., xxx-xx-xxxx

Sandstrom, Kerry R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sannes, Lydell D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sauvain, Claude R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schaad, Richard M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Scherer, David P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schindler, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schmicker, William D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schmitt, Harold R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schneider, Joseph A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schreck, Dan R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schreiber, David F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schrettenbrunner, Michael K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schryer, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schultz, Terry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schwab, Ronald P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schwertfeger, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Scoskie, Robert R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Seagroves, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Seidel, Lee F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Seitz, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Selig, Kenneth R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sert, Louis R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Setzekorn, Richard R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sharpe, Ervin C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shaw, Graham, xxx-xx-xxxx
Shaw, Gregory R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shearin, Rudolph T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sheeran, Edward J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sherman, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sherry, Robert R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shields, Edward J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shields, Kent L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shipe, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shradel, Jan M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shull, Walter B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Siers, Edwin Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sievers, Stanley E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sigler, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Silver, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sims, Theron L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sipos, Larry, xxx-xx-xxxx
Sizemore, Edward J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Skiver, Ernest H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Skluzacek, Roger J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Slattery, Neil A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Slocum, Norman M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, James O., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, James V., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Lyndell D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Norman D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smithwick, James, xxx-xx-xxxx
Soo, Raymond M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sornberger, John T. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Southwick, Larry E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sparks, Terry G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Speight, Larry N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Spell, Clyde, xxx-xx-xxxx
Spinney, Franklin C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Spitz, Frederick L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stacy, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stalnaker, Gerard W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Standish, Richard W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stanley, Andrew M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stark, Philip E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Starr, George T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stenberg, William D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stevens, Gary L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stewart, James B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stewart, Michael, xxx-xx-xxxx
Stewart, Raymond, xxx-xx-xxxx
Stewart, Warren E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stiles, Shelley I, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Stohlmann, Lyle A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stolz, Lawrence G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stone, Bruce H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stone, Michael E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stoops, Carl E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Strohm, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stromain, Roberta L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stubblefield, William G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stuermer, Thomas D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sturtevant, James S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sugarman, Carl M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sullivan, Paul J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Survillas, Roy G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Swadley, Leonard R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sweet, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Swierzbin, Ronald W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Swiney, John F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Tafs, William D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Tarbell, Terry C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Tart, Howard G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Tate, Stephen B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Tawes, John P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Taylor, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Taylor, Douglass A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Taylor, Emerson B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Taylor, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Taylor, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Teach, Everett A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Tenney, Mahlon O., xxx-xx-xxxx
Terrell, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Test, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Thomas, Donald S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Thomas, George R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Thomas, Roger J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Thomas, Ronald N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Thompson, Donald D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Thompson, Norman T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Thorey, Volker, xxx-xx-xxxx
Thornhill, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Thorpe, Jack A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Tillman, Donald E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Tillman, Luther J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Tirado, Jesus S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Toavs, Dwight V., xxx-xx-xxxx
Tockston, John G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Tomasetti, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Townsend, Jack B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Townsley, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Treadwell, Benjamin B., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Trimble, Thomas N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Tripp, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Trujillo, Henry P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Trussell, Paul, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Turk, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Turner, James F. A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Turner, Michael W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Tutt, George T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Tye, Donald M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Tyson, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Underwood, Gary R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Upchurch, James R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Uptegraph, Clarence E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Urbach, Keith J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Urban, Joseph J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Vairo, Vincent R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Valentino, Rudolph J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Vanleeuwen, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Vanotten, George A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Vanover, Fairly, xxxx
Van Wagenen, Michael D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Vaughn, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Veeder, Robert N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Vega, Manuel F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Vertenten, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Vickers, Richard N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Viers, Marion A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Vincent, Joseph P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Vliek, Bruce J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Voellger, Gary A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Vogt, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wagner, Paul D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Waite, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Walen, Darrell J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Walker, Billy F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Walker, Douglas M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wall, David N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Walls, Leonard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Walters, Charles W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Walters, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wansack, James K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ward, Theron D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Warden, Wayne E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Washburn, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Washburn, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Waters, James T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Waypa, John, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Weaver, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Weaver, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Weber, Paul R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Weber, Ralph H., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Webster, Dale D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Webster, John G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wehrle, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Weiland, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Weiss, Edward D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Weiss, Edward H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Welch, Thomas D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wells, Roger L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Welsh, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Westenbarger, Martin L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Westerbeck, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Westerfield, Melvin L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Westergom, Earl L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Weston, Joseph, xxx-xx-xxxx
Weustermann, Elsa J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wheeler, Steven L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Whipple, Larry K., xxx-xx-xxxx
White, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Whitley, Willard H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Whitman, Charles T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Whitney, Randle L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Will, Joseph H. M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Willhoite, Robert R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Williams, Charles B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Williams, John B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Williams, Philip J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Williams, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wilmoth, Harrington L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wilson, Bruce A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wilson, Charles G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wilson, David B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Windham, Thomas D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Winfield, David D., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Wise, Chesley G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wittel, Edward F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Woelfel, John G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wolf, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wolfe, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Woodard, Wendell O., xxx-xx-xxxx
Woodhouse, Dennis M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Worden, Douglas L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Woronicz, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Worrall, Gary R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wright, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wright, Kenneth L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wyper, Andrew, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Yohman, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Young, Gerald T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Zebelean, John P., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Zehr, Frederick J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Zeldin, Melvin D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Zimmerman, Paul J., xxx-xx-xxxx

The following distinguished graduates of the Air Force officer training school for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

Cummings, Howard W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Escajeda, Luis J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Foster, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Frost, Folteen F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mann, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
McGrath, Roger B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Melody, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Paquette, Edward J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schelhaas, Douglas P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Travis, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Traylor, Marvin L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Witherell, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx

Subject to medical qualification and subject to designation as distinguished graduates, the following students of the Air Force Reserve Officer Training Corps for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grade of second lieutenant, under the provisions of chapter 103, title 10, United States Code, with dates of rank to be determined by the the Secretary of the Air Force:

Abshier, Stephen E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bedrick, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Berrenberg, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fraass, Ronald G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hall, Billy J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lutz, Terry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
MacFarlane, William D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mills, Larry J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Price, Stanley C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ross, Wayne A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schultz, Alfred C., xxx-xx-xxxx

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force, under the ap-

propriate provisions of chapter 835, title 10, United States Code, as amended. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

LINE

To be captain

Aars, Rallin J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Abata, Ralph R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Abbott, Douglas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Abbott, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Abbott, Robert L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Abell, David C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Abernathy, Albert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Abt, Peter F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Achter, Gilbert J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Adams, Andrew J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Adams, Thomas H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Adams, Thomas R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Adkins, Ben F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ahern, Donald E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ahlstrom, Frank C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ahrens, Darrell J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Aitken, Douglas C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Alberts, Donald J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Albright, William F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Alderman, Jerald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Aldrich, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Alenduff, Joseph R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Alexander, William R., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Alford, Lester D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Alfred, Gerald O., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Aliano, Joseph D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Allee, William S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Allen, Charles W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Allen, Eugene D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Allen, Gerald, xxx-xx-xxxx
Allen, James S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Allen, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Allen, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Allen, Kent R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Allen, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Alley, Ronald G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Allison, Jeffrey B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Almaguer, Mario, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Almassy, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Alpers, John H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Alspaugh, Donald H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Alt, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Altenhof, Bruce D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Aman, Alroy A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ammerman, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Amos, Thomas H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Anders, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Andersen, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Andersen, Ernest F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Anderson, Carl E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Anderson, Carson E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Anderson, Gary L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Anderson, George W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Anderson, James B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Anderson, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Anderson, James N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Anderson, Kenneth A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Anderson, Norman E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Anderson, Peter J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Anderson, Reed M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Anderson, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Anderson, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Anderson, Stanley L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Anderson, Wayne R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Andreski, Philip J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Andrews, Adolphus, xxx-xx-xxxx
Andrews, Francis J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Andrews, Roland D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Anker, Peter B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Anthony, John T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Antonow, Walter, xxx-xx-xxxx
Apel, Charles L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Aplin Charles C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Arbuckle, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Areffi, Patrick A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Arey, Laird C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Armstrong, Jacob C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Armstrong, Malcolm B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Armstrong, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Arnold Roy G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Arrington, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Arshinkoff, Nicholas T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Asboth, Julius, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ash, Robert P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ashcraft, Boyd L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ashdown, Floyd A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Aspenson, Donald L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Assenheimer, Perry J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Atkinson, Larry B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Aube, Richard M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Auer, George A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Aulwurm, Henry C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Austin, Edward G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Baboyian, Hrant K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bacchieri, Roger G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Badger, Jimmy L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Baer, Lester H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bailey, George H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bailey, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bailey, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bailey, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bailey, William F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bainter, Billy D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bainter, Jimmy R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Biather, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Baker, Dan S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Baker, Doyle D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Baker, Jeffrey D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Baker, Norman D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Baker, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bakke, Karlton I., xxx-xx-xxxx
Balazs, Arthur J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ball, Henry A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ballard, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Balsamo, Salvatore R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bangs, Stephen J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bankus, Gerald K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Barber, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Barbin, Albert R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bargmeyer, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Barich, Dewey J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Barker, Edward R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Barkley, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Barlow, Frederick J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Barnes, Barry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Barnett, Glenn R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Barnett, Miles T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Barnhill, Billie G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Barrett, Billy A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Barrett, Robert P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Barrilleaux, Earl R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Barrineau, William E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Barrios, Flurencio P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Barruqueiro, Silverio A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Barrow, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bart, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bartlett, Frank R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bartlett, Michael W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bartless, William E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Barton, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Barwick, Leon S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Basden, Bruce K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Basler, Edward W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bass, David, xxx-xx-xxxx
Bassett, Rubert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Batterson, Paul N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Battista, William G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Battle, Bobby E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Baur, Byron D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bavaria, Joseph A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bayer, Curtis K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bayless, William D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Beadle, Leonard C., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Bear, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Beard, Preston S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bearden, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Beardslee, Stephen A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Beasley, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Beatty, Frederick M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bechtel, Bruce C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bechtol, Joseph J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Beck, James N., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Beck, Louis R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Beck, Paul A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Beck, Roger A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Becker, Henry R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Becker, Leo E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Becker, Walter A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bedarf, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Beddingfield, Frederick C. J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Beebe, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Beecher, John C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Begg, Ronald B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Behl, John H. III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Belardo, Dominick S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Belden, Kenneth R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Belisle, Charles A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bell, Jackie D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bell, Jeffrey, xxx-xx-xxxx
Bell, Larry A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bell, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Belmont, Paul A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bender, Thomas G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Benedict, Rettig J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bennett, Barry D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bennett, Charles A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bennett, Richard B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bennett, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Benson, Karl T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Benson, Ross E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bentley, Stewart W., Sr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Benzinger, Richard, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Berard, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Berger, Charlie T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Berry, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Berry, Leonard E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Berry, Terry M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bertram, Bruce M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Besch, Lawrence E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bevelhymer, Herbert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bevens, Stanley W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Beverly, Bobby Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bias, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Biebel, Wililam J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bieber, Robert A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Billesbach, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Billingsley, Roy C., xxxx
Billingsley, Cnarles E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bingham, Wendell R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Biniewski, Daniel J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bishop, Douglas C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bittenbinder, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bixler, Christie E., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Blackledge, Ronald G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Blackwell, Reginald T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Blair, John D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Blair, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Blair, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Blanchard, Paul D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Blankenship, Norman R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Blaylock, Arden L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bledsoe, Gleyn E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bledsoe, Peter T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Blila, Terry A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bliss, Ronald G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Block, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bloemke, Carl F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Blomberg, Dale R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Blomme, Francis M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Blummers, James J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Blume, Jay D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Blunt, Raymond S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Boardman, Harold F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Boatman, Alfred L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bobka, Ronald F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bocook, Charles R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bode, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bodrak, Gilbert C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Boergert, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Boesen, Dennis L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bogart, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bohn, Bruce J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bolen, Paul S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Boles, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Boles, John L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bollenback, George W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bolliger, Ronald E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bolt, Jerry D. S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bonar, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bonck, Lionel N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bonfanti, Harry J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bonner, Walter B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bookman, Thaddeus A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Boole, Douglas S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Boone, Jimmie A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Borgatti, Joseph L. J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bornmann, Edgar L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Boscia, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Boughn, Stephen R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Boulware, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bourne, Alan M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bourne, Robert B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bowen, Robert L., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Bowen, Ronald S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bower, Frank H., xxx-xx-xxxx

Bowersox, Terry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Box, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Boyd, Billy M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Boyett, Randall H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Boyle, James, xxx-xx-xxxx
Bradfield, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bradford, William S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bradley, Charles W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brady, Francis T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Braguglia, Raymond J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brailey, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Branch, Charles L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Branch, George H., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Brande, Wendell S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brandl, Jimmie R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brandon, Eric H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brandt, Bruce A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brandt, Ronald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brannan, Timothy J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brannon, Roger P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brant, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Branzell, Marshall E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bray, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brazy, Joseph P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brecht, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Breeding, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brekke, Ronald H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brenneman, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brewer, Michael F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brian, Elton L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brice, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bridston, Ronald K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bright, Harry W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brigman, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Briley, Wilson D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brimacombe, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brisby, Johnny M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Briscoe, Jerald D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Britt, Wayne I., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brogdon, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Broglie, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bron, Robert P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bronowski, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bronson, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bronstein, Abraham, xxx-xx-xxxx
Brooks, David H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brooks, George B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brooks, Harry W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brooks, Neil R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Broom, Thomas F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brookshear, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brothers, Alfred S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brown, Alan E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brown, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brown, Earl C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brown, Harry M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brown, Harry C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brown, Jack H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brown, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brown, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brown, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brown, Mark L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brown, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brown, Richard S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brown, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brown, Robert N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brown Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brown, Ronald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brown, Thomas P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Browning, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Browning, Ralph T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Browning, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bruce, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bruhn, Peter C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brumble, Michael R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brunello, Lawrence F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brunson, Leslie S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bryan, Dale K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bryant, Jascha M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bryant, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Buchanan, Ellis G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Buchfinck, Lloyd L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Buckey, Jerome V., xxx-xx-xxxx
Buckingham, Fredric N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Buckner, Dean T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Buczak, Stanley J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Budd, Phillip R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Buhl, Paul C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bunch, John H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bunch, Ronald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Burger, Douglas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Burgess, Floyd K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Burgess, Malcolm A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Burgett, James S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Burkard, Dick J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Burkhardt, John T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Burleson, Glynn W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Burnette, Herman C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Burnette, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Burnham, Hathorne A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Burnham Robert F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Burns, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Burr, Alan L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Burrell, Donald E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Burrell, Stephen F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Burrill, Lanny L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Burroughs, Mark M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Burton, Larry D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Busch, Jon T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Buser, Lamoyne G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bush, Dennis K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bush, Don G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bush, Howard J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bushnell, Mart H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Busse, Daniel E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Butler, David H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Butler, Jerome J.,, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Butterfly, Glenn M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Buttimer, Neil J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Buys, Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Byars, Henry W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Byrs, Arden L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Byrnside, Nicholas C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cabrera, Mark A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cachuela, Jose M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cada, Larry C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Caffarelli, Charles J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Caffrey, Dennis F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cage, Allan L., xxxx
Caldarelli, Pete D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Caldwell, Rubert O., xxx-xx-xxxx
Callanan, Anthony P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cameron, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carmeron, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Campbell, Alfred Q., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Canavan, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cannella, Salvatore T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cannon, Kirby H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cannon, Wilbert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Capillupo, Frank J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Capitano, John S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carco, Woodrow R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carey, John F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carl, Ronald W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carlson, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carlson, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carlson, Robert W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carlstrom, Fronk C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carmichael, Thomas O., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carmine, Henry E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carnaghie, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carney, John T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carney, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carpenter, Richard J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carr, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carr, Philip T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carson, Donald D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carter, Alfred W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carter, Allison B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carter, Robert W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carver, Charles F., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Cary, Lawrence E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cary, Thomas M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Case, Roger S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Casey, Francis J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Casey, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cashel, William F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Casker, Thomas W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Casper, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cassidy, Francis M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Castle, Francis M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Caswell, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cataliotti, Anthony J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Catchings, Douglas S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Catren, Gary G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cavazos, Raul R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Celec, Frederick, S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cenac, Dennis L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cerrow, Peter P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cervantes, Joaquin A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Chaddick, Gary W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Chandler, Rubert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Chandler, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Chapman, Johnny L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Chapman, Wilbur E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Charneco, Humbert R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Chasse, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Chatham, Charles W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Chesley, Larry J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Chesney, Gary W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Chin, Rodney D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Chopin, Rene A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Christen, Jerold W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Christensen, Carl R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Christensen, Roger E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Christensen, Floyd G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Christiansen, Russell V., xxx-xx-xxxx
Christie, Arthur L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Christner, Craig D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Christopher, Henry C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Christopher, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Christy, Robert R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Churan, Thomas M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Church, Ernest A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Church, Thomas C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Churchill, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Churnell, Robert F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cioffi, William P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cirak, Gene E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cirilis, Eugene, xxx-xx-xxxx
Cisler, Jan E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Claflin, Clayton J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Clark, Gary W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Clark, Larry D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Clark, Michael S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Clark, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Clark, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Clark, Thomas D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Clarke, Ronald W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Clarke, William F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Claussen, Frederick L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Clayton, Arthur A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cleary, Michael F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Clements, Marshall G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Clements, Robert F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Clemons, William T., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Clifton, Charles C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Clifton, Pat D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cline, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cluse, William T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cobeaga, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Coberly, Camden A., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Coberly, Lanny R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Coburn, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cololis, Peter K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cody, George E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cody, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Coen, James K., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cogley, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Coker, Artis B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Colangelo, Peter A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cole, Clarence W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cole, James L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cole, Michael W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Coleman, Charles A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Coleman, Glenn H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Coleman, Jack B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Coleman, William Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Collins, Douglas F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Collins, James G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Collord, Robin P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Colwell, Robert F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Combs, Jesse L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Combs, Ronald H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Comeau, Allen R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Compton, David F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Comrie, Andrew B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Comstock, Gardner V., xxx-xx-xxxx
Condon, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Condon, Stephen P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Conlon, John F., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Conner, Leland W. C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Connor, Victor J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Consoli, Angelo L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cook, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cook, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cook, Peter A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cook, Robert O., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cooper, Rolfe T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cooprider, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Copeland, Jackie L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cordano, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx

Corder, Wayne D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Corea, Anthony N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Corrion, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cortez, Robert, xxx-xx-xxxx
Cosman, Walter L., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Cote, Robert T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cote, Ronald J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cottingham ,James D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cottrell, Kit G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cougill, Roscoe M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cournoyer, Ronald C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cousin, Edwin F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Couture, Louis C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Covais, Anthony, xxx-xx-xxxx
Cowan, Carlton B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cowan, Willie D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cowell, Myron D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cowger, Ronald I., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cox, Alva R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cox, George W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cox, Juanita R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cox, Lawrence D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Crabb, Charles C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Crabtree, Hugh L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Craddock, Dabney S., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Craig, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Crandall, Winston K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Crane, Dale A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Crawford, Charles K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Crawford, Murray D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Creath, Garry S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Crecca, Joseph, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cremin, John M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cress, Ted S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Crigger, James C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Croft, Joseph W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Croker, Stephen B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cronenberg, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Crook, Kenneth L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cross, Granville J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Crouch, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Crowder, Arnold G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Crowder, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Crowder, Robert T., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Crowder, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Crowther, Gary E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Crump, Edward G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Crump, James C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cryer, Don W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cuellar, Fernando D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cuevas, Thayne H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cullers, Herbert W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Culosi, Salvatore J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Culpepper, Julius L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cummings, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cundey, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cunniff, Paul J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cunningham, Charles A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cunningham, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cunningham, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Curd, James L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Curington, Eldon B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Curp, Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Curran, Michael T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Curtis, Lewis E., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Curtis, Theodore T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cutts, John A., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Cwalina, Bruce A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cybulski, Frank J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Czech, Stanley E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Czernik, Chester E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dailey, Donald D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dakan, Dennis K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dalbey, Joseph P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dalrymple, Garry R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dansby, Jesse L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Darcy, Vincent J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Darden, Russell B. G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Darragh, Mattison D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Daugherity, Reed F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davidson, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davies, Kenneth R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davis, Charles F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davis, David C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davis, Frederick E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davis, George R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davis, Harold F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davis, James J., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Davis John R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davis, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davis, Laurens C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davis, Michael, xxx-xx-xxxx
Davis, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davis, Thomas I., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davis, Walter E. Y., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davis, Wilmer L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dawdy, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Day Max W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dayton, Hugh K., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Deakle, Carl B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Deal, Jimmy V., xxx-xx-xxxx
Deames, Billy E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dean, David, xxx-xx-xxxx
Debevec, Richard G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dechance, Richard P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Decker, Donald D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Degrella, George J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Deicke, Charles K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Deiger, Alfred E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Deken, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Delacruz, Inocencio U., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dempsey, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dengate, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Denko, John, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dennin, Thomas H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dennis, Guy S. G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Denny, Venard T., xxx-xx-xxxx
DePaul, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Derboghossian, Zaven C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dermody, Richard F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dervaes, Joseph R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Desiderio, John R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Desloge, John M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dettmar, Robert L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Devine, Jerry A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dewey, George R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dice, Ronald A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dickerson, Ivan W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dickey, William P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Diefenbach, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Diekman, Jack L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dierksen, Larry A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dilda, Stancil L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dillon, John P., XXXX
Dillon, Terrence L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dinapoli, Anthony C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dinsmore, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dirmeyer, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Disz, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dittmar, Martin J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dix, Larry E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dixon, George W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dixon, Paul W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dixon, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dodson, Allen E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dogliani, Harald D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Doherty, Francis E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dolan, George A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dole, Paul F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Donovan, Gerald, xxx-xx-xxxx
Donovan, John S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Donovan, Richard G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dooley, Dick D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dooley, Frank, xxx-xx-xxxx
Doolittle, Richard N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dooyema, Curtis C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dropplick, Thomas G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dorris, Ralph S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dorris, Ronald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dothard, Raymond D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Doty, David S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Doud, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Douglas, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Douglass, Bruce S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Douglass, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dowding, Fielder G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Downer, Lee A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Downie, Paul D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Downing, Dennis I., xxx-xx-xxxx
Drace, Donal T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Drew, Dennis M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Drewes, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Drill, Arnold G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Drinkwater, Ronald B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Driscoll, Joseph E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Drummond, Charles W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dubois, Joel R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dudzinski, Stanley J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Duerholz, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Duffy, Edward P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dula, Brett M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dullen, Ronald E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dundas, Wallace D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dundon, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dunigan, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dunivant, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dunker, Kirk T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dunlap, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dunn, Roger B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dunnegan, Clifton P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dupree, Gerald M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dupree, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Durbin, Richard W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Durick, Patrick W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Durkin, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Durst, Carl E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dursteler, Larry R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dusek, Eugene A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Duty, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dyal, Thomas B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dynes, Clifford E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dzur, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Eagan, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ebert, Gary P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ebert, Rodger B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Echegaray, Julio A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Eckert, Henry B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Eckholdt, Don C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Edmonds, Albert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Edmonston, Robert R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Edwards, David S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Edwards, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Egbert, Edward M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Eggers, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Egle, Valdis, xxx-xx-xxxx
Eichner, Walter R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Eichor, Perry R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Einertson, Arlen T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ekman, Willard J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Elder, Clarence L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Elder, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Eller, Deryck J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Eller, Johnnie R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Elliott, Lawrence J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Elliott, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Elliott, Thomas F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ellis, Charles E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ellis, Peter D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Elston, Herman N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Elwell, Bruce C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Embrey, Wallace D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Emmerich, Frank R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Emmons, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Endicott, Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ener, Ernest L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Enga, Richard H., xxx-xx-xxxx
England, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Engle, Kenneth W., xxx-xx-xxxx
English, Harry C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
English, Patrick W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ennis, Richard F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Epperly, Bruce B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Erickson, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ericson, Arthur G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Erion, Gerald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Erkkila, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ernst, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Erwin, Roy W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Evans, Bob C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Evans, Damian G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Evans, David C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Evans, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Evans, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Evans, Richard S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Evans, Thomas D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Evatt, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Everard, Jerold V., xxx-xx-xxxx
Eversmann, Joseph J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ewing, Bruce W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Faimon, Gabriel R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fair, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fairhurst, William S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fargarson, Aubrey L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Farmer, Bufford D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Farmer, George W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Farmer, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Farney, Gerald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Farra, Fredric M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fawcett, Jack C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Faye, Alexander L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Feinberg, Dennis S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Felderman, Harold J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Felix, Gerald H., xxx-xx-xxxx

Fenlon, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ferebee, George W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ferguson, David H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ferguson, James M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Fethke, William F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ficke, Wayne L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Fields, Ronald W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Fields, Vollie C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Filandro, Peter A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Filbin, Jaul W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Filiatreau, Thomas R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Fillip, Darrel L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Finch ,Samuel P., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Fine, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Finkenstaedt, Robert L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Finta, Alexander S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Finuf, Bernard D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Fiorelli, James V., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Fischel, Edward A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Fischer, Stephen R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Fisher, Douglas H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Fisher, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Fister, Bruce L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Fitzgerald, Joseph M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Fjetland, Gerald L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Flanary, Barry G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Flanigan, Ronald E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Flechsig, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Fleischhacker, Peter R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Flint, Russell L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Flood, William G., B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Flower, Terrence F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Flowers, Raymond R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Floyd, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Folz, Ronald W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Forbes, Alfred A., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Forbis, William R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ford, Beverly E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ford, John E., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Forrest, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Foster, David, XXXX
Foster, Leland C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Foster, Stephen H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Foulger, Keith H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Fowl, Gregory A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Fowler, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Fowler, Julian L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Fox, Lowry S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Foxwell, Mark B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
France, James T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Francis, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Franczak, James J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Frank, David H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Frank, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Frank, Ralph D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Frantz, Richard H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Fraser, Kenneth J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Frazee, Donald B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Frazier, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Frazier, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Freathy, Alfred L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Freedman, Harry S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Freeland, Douglas N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Freeman, Lawrence R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Freewald, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Freienmuth, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Frein, Emil C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Freisinger, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
French, Charles D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Fretwell, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Freund, Donald W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Frighetti, Vincent J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Frost, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Fullem, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Fuller, Lawrence H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Fung, Clarence T. Y., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Furlong, Robert P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Furr, Wilbur F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Furrer, Max E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Furusho, Marvin T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Futch, Harry W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gable, Donald R. O., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gaudd, Elmo D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gainey, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Galayda, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Galbraith, Lee R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gale, George E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gales, Robert R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Galioto, Fedele J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gallagher, Francis X., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gannon, Eugene J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gannon, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ganong, Gary P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Garcia, Freddie, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Garrett, Dennis N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Garrett, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gasson, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gates, Don E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gayer, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gemlich, Stephen L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
George, David W., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
George, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gerber, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gerber, Ronald H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gerhart, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gerken, Kenneth L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Germann, Anthony F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gess, William G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gester, Walter A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gettings, Raymond G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Geyer, Jerry A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ghiglieri, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gibbons, Patrick T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gibbs, Douglas L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gibbs, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gibby, Bealin E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gibney, Dean A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gibson, James G., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gideons, Edgar A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gifford, Norman L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gilbert, Mark B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gilbert, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gilkeson, Thomas C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gill, Anthony B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gill, Lawrence E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gill, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gill, Timothy D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gillenwaters, Harold R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gilliom, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gilman, Roger D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gillogly, Harry I., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gilmore, Kenneth E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gilmore, William H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gittins, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gittlein, Jerome A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Glad, Richard F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Glasser, Martin J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Glawe, Benoid E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Globokar, Frank T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Glover, Joe E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Goble, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Goddard, David C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Godsey, Elwyn A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Goehring, Henry W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Goetzinger, Thomas C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Goetzman, Gary R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Goin, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Golden, George D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Golden, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gollucci, Felix J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gonds, Andrew J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gonzales, George N., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Good, Roy C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gordon, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gordon, Jeffrey B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gordon, Wayne C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gordy, Richard R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gorrell, James H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gorski, Paul J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gossett, Kenneth D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gould, Walter D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gounaud, Roger L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gowins, Carroll E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Graber, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Graham, Donald D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Graham, James L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Graham, Ralph H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Graham, Richard H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Grahek, Gerald P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Grainger, John W., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gram, Arthur M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Grant, Jerry A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Graves, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Graves, Rodney B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gray, Edward F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gray, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gray, Richard H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gray, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx 6.
Gray, Ronald D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Grebeldinger, Nicholas, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Greece, Michael N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Green, Gaylord B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Green, Harland D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Green, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Greenberg, Harvey, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Greenberg, Robert, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Greene, Lawrence W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Greene, Raymond L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Greenlaw, Peter G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Greenly, George D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Greenup, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Greger, George D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gregg, Billy E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gregory, Frederick D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gregory, Russell L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Greve, Robert P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Griffin, Terrence M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Griffith, Evan J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Griggs, Dennis T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Grimaud, Lowell A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Grimsley, Frank, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Grimsley, Roger L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Grine, Michael H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Grubstein, Joseph A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Grucki, Vincent P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gruff, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gruhe, Russell L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Groninger, Douglas L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Grosland, Darrell R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gross, Gery L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Grove, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Crowden, Ronald V., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gruters, Guy D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Guenet, Joseph L. H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Guerin, John V., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Guerra, Carlos L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Guiberson, Francis L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Guidry, Jeffry L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gunnoe, Orville D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Gutheinz, Lee M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Guthrie, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Guyton, Ronald L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Guziec, Ronald A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Haberbusch, Alan E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Habermel, James G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hacker, Brian M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hackford, Richard H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hadley, Terry J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hagemann, Kenneth L., Sr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hagenbrock, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hagenow, Paul E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hager, Gerald T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hahn, Gary W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Haight, Robert R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hale, Edward R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hale, Jeffrey N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Haley, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Haley, Thomas E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Haley, Tommie L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Haliasz, Henry E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hall, Dean G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hall, Donald C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hall, Edward B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hall, Roger M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Haller, Carl A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hallin, William P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Halloran, Ronald P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Halsted, Ronald L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Halterlein, Paul J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ham, Howard C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hamilton, Kenneth L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hammer, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hamner, John B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hamrick, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hancox, Charles T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Handel, Vernon, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Handley, Charles, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Handrick, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Haney, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hanks, Alvin L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hanly, Frank J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hansen, Craig D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hansen, Herschel E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hansen, Vernon C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hanson, Phillips A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Harbolt, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hardin, Charles V., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Harding, Colin M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Harlan, Michael E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Harland, Bernard S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Harmon, Steven E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Harrell, Travis E., xxx-xx-xxxx.

Harrington, John P. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Harrington, James H. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Harris, Glen L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Harris, Larry W. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Harris, Maurice A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Harris, Michael H. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Harris, Richard A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Harris, Stuart J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Harshbarger, James W. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hart, Hubert E., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hart, Warren L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hartman, John H. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hartog, Rudolph H. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hartungschuster, Eckbert M. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hartzell, John V. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Harvell, John L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Harvey, Edwin L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Harwood, Larry K. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hatcher, Maxie A., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hattershire, Bond R. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hauck, Jerome C. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hauger, Jon D. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hawk, Thomas W. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hawkins, Douglas C. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hawkins, James S. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hawkins, Richard G. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hawkins, Thomas M. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hawks, Kenneth B. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hawley, Richard E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hayashi, Melvin xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hayes, John H. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hayes, Patrick G. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hayes, William A., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Head, Ruger C. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Headlam, Gerald L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Heagy, Charles F., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Healy, Donald M. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Heaney, Patrick xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hearron, Clifford D. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Heath, Robert E., II xxx-xx-xxxx.
Heavner, Lester R. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hecker, John F. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hedges, James M., III xxx-xx-xxxx.
Heifferon, John C. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Heimbach, Paul J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Heimbecker, Murray A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Heimel, Roy F., II xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hein, Donald H. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Heinrich, Arnie J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Heiser, Lee R. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Heldstab, Dale B. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Heller, Paul G. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hellier, Richard G. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Helmig, Kenneth M. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Helt, James P. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hendershutt, Jon R. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Henderson, Earl J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Henderson, Fergus xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hennessey, John B. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Henningsen, Richard F. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Henricks, Ralph K. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Henry, John M. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Henry, Larry L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Henry, Leonard O., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hepler, Wilson H. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hepner, Dennis L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Heppell, Stephen E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Herbst, Thomas R. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hermanson, James T. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Herren, George R. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Herron, Kerry G. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Herron, Philip B. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Herzberg, Allen F., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hesp, David L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hess, George M., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Heston, Robert A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Heubusch, Charles J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hewlett, Thomas W. W., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hibbs, Jerry A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hickman, David I. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hickman, Goeffrey R. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hicks, Kenneth P. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Higa, James H. xxx-xx-xxxx.
High, Richard P. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hightower, John W. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hildebrandt, Gregory G. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hill, Charles T xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hill, James S. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Himelick, Paul A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hind, Gary J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hines, James F. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hinkel, James F. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hinkle, Gary R. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hinman, Ellwood P., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hinman, Elmer S., II xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hipps, Joseph P. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hittle, George M., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hiu, Hen M. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hoadley, William F. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hocker, Richard L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hodgson, William M. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hoekstra, Sidney S. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hoff, Gary F. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hoffman, Allan G. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hoffman, John M. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hoffman, John M. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hoilman, Charles W., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Holder, Charles III xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hole, Douglas R. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Holler, James W., III xxx-xx-xxxx.
Holloway, Kenneth A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Holm, Ralph W. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Holmes, Michael J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Holsinger, Mitchell W. xxxx.
Holtzendorf, Earle B. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Holub, Robert J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Holzbach, Robert J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Honea, Willie J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Honeycutt, Larry L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Honn, Carver E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hood, Donald E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Houten, Byron R. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Horn, Michael S. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hornbeck, Jeffrey L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Horne, Gerald A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Horne, William K. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Horos, Raymond A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hosler, Ronald E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hotcaveg, Kenneth J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hotinski, Richard M. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Houle, John R. xxx-xx-xxxx.
House, Weston C. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hovde, Robert J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hovey, Thomas D. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Howard, Lloyd V. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Howe, David T. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Howe, Donald L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Howe, Frank L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Howells, Richard K. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Howells, Robert L., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Howerton, Clayton E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Howington, Marvin D. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hoxworth, Larry W. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hranicka, Thomas L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hubbard, Kenneth L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hubbard, William C. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Huber, Edward D. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hudson, Roland L., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hudson, Ronald W. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Huertas, Jose L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Huff, Charles E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Huffer, Gordon C., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hughen, Willard M. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hull, Jimmy E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hull, John W., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hull, Leros E., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hulting, Ronald E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hultman, John H. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hume, Edward C. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Humphrey, Winston R. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Huneycutt, Tyler B., III xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hunsiker, Bobbe E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hunt, Brian R. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hunter, James D. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hurley, Vincent J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Husser, Rowland E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hussey, James H. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Huston, Frank J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hutchens, Gary C. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hutchings, Bryan K. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hutchins, George S. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hutchinson, Thomas W. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hutson, Henry R. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Huxley, Donald L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hyde, Jerome N. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hyden, Larry C. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hyer, Ralph V. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hyre, Robert G., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Incrucci, Thomas P. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Inge, Kenneth W. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ingram, Dick D. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Insley, Joseph A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ireland, Charles E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Irlenborn, Mitchel J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Irvin, Charles R. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Irvine, William S., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Isaacson, Terry C. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Isaak, Robert J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Isley, Floyd W. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ivy, Lloyd M., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jack, James T. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jackson, Harold W., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jackson, John R. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jackson, Karl W. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jacobs, John R. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jaehnig, Stewart H. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jaensch, Peter J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jahnke, Lawrence E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
James, Charles T. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Janney, Michael T. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jardine, Randy B. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jaskiewicz, Matthew J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jefferson, James M. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jenkins, Bryce A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jenkins, Douglas H., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jenkins, Timothy P. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jenny, David W. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jerome, Jerome O., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jessup, Ervin L., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jewett, James T. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Joachim, Timothy K. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jobin, Robert T. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johanek, John A., II xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johns, Charles A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnsey, Gary H. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnson, Aaron J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnson, Arthur E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnson, Charles B. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnson, Dale E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnson, Dale S. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnson, David F. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnson, David F. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnson, Dean A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnson, Donald E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnson, Hugh K. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnson, Jeffrey W. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnson, John G. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnson, Larry N. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnson, Morris C. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnson, Richard B. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnson, Robert L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnson, Sharon B. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnson, Sidney L., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnson, Stephan G. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnson, Stephen F. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnson, Theodore A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnson, Virgil W. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnson, William A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnson, Willard C. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnson, William E., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnston, James D. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jojola, Raymond xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jones, Bobby A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jones, Cleveland J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jones, Eben D. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jones, George T. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jones, Harold O. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jones, Hugh B. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jones, Larry P. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jones, Robert N., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jones, Robert E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jones, William C., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jordan, Maurice L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Joyce, Kenneth G. B. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jumper, George Y., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Junkin, Grover B. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Justice, John A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Juve, Gene L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kaehler, Robert D. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kaercher, Richard L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kaesemeyer, Roy H. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kahrs, George W. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kaminski, Paul G. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kang, Alden xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kantzer, Gerald E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kapinos, Victor L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Karam, James T., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Karpowich, Walte, Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Karr, Juul J., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Karst, Kim A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Krasten, Ernst R. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Karton, Simon M. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kastanos, George xxx-xx-xxxx.

Kater, Martin L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Katon, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Katz, Milton M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kavanagh, Thomas D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kearney, Richard C., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Keating, Robert F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Keeling, Russell L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Keil, Stanley W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Keiser, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Keith, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Keller, Barron K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Keller, Kenneth R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Keller, Richard O., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kelley, Brian J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kelley, Clarence J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kelley, Gayle T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kelley, Jay W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kelly, Kraig K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kelly, Peter J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kelly, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kemp, Nicholas B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kemp, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kempi, David J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kendall, Victor S., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kender, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kenne, Don E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kennedy, Edward R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kennedy, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kennedy, Virgil C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kent, Richard P., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Keplar, Clifton L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kercher, David H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kern, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kerr, Michael S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kerr, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kessler, Paul D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Key, Kenneth, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kidd, Campbell A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kierbow, Weyman R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kiernan, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kilburn, Richard F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kichrist, Lanny F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kilgore, William P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kinder, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
King, Gerald H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kingsley, Donald M., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kinkaid, J. H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kinney, Theodore R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kinnie, Carl R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kintigh, David D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kirksey, Gonza L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kirschling, Wayne R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kishiyama, Arthur Y., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kissell, Kenneth A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kittler, Dittmar, XXXX.
Klein, Edward A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kleine, Walter J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Klett, Temple C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Klick, Jean E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kline, Timothy E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Klinger, Armand D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Klinke, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Klohn, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Klumas, Lawrence J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Knauth, Peter G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Knebel, Frederick L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Knight, James R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Knight, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Knopf, Lee R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Knoth, Henry W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Knowles, Joseph, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Knutson, Reid M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Koelm, William W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Koester, Allen R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Koger, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Koger, Perry D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kohn, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Koles, Ralph M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kommendant, Aado, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Konopatzke, Daniel L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Koppe, Thomas F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Korman, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kosnik, Stephen, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kostival, Francis, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kotter, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kozlowicz, Peter, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kramer, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kreighbaum, Jack R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Krieger, Clifford R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kries, David G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kriley, Carl E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Krobusek, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kroenlein, Thomas H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kroyer, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Krumm, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kullgren, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kulp, Richard W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kupec, Joseph B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kuykendall, Charles W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kuzmack, Michael S., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kwist, Garry R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lacey, Keith N., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lackey, Curtis S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lacruix, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lacy, Billy F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lacy, Mell J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lafferty, Daniel L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lafontaine Donald L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lagerstrom, Lloyd A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lake, Robin M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lamarca, Joseph A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lambert, Clarke, R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lambert, Clifford E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lamonthe, Eugene G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Land, Roland J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Landaiche, Allen W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lane, Edward A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lang, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lange, Maurice A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Langham, Jerome C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lanowy, Francis R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lansdale, Edward R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Larchevesque, Charles D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Laroche, Robert P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Larson, Allen L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Larson, Robert V., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Larue, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lasalle, Charles C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lash, Perry E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lasocki, Richard P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lassiter, Larry G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Latronico, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Latt, Joseph E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lauchner, Ronald E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lauducci, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lauer, John C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lauten, Gary N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lawlor, Michael C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lawrence, Kenneth R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lawrence, Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lawrence, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Layton, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Layton, John F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Leachman, William D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Leblanc, Irving, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ledbetter, Larry L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lee, Johnny O., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lee, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Leggat, Robert, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Leishman, Stephen A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Leithiser, Christopher, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lekarczyk, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lemieux, Lawrence, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lemoine, Leo, J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lemon, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lemon, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lenihan, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lennard, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lennun, Raymond L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Leonard, Jay A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Leonard, Wilson L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Leong, Fook W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lester, Benjamin, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Letellier, Patrick J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Letzelter, Cyril J., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Levi, Paul L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Levins, Robert, III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Levy, Jeffrey A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lewis, Alan R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lewis, Beacher B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lewis, Frank S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lewis, Gary E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lewis, Keith H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lewis, Neil H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lewis, Roger W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lezy, Normand G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lichacz, John, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Liebner, Manfred A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Liegl, John B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lienard, Armand R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lightner, Jeffrey L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lindabury, Tryon S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Linden, Robert B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lindenfelser, James J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lindquist, Erik J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Linkner, Herbert L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Linville, George D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lippincott, Edwin W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lippincott, Roger H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lipsitt, Joel, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Little, Jon T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Little, Robert G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Liverpool, Hen C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Livingston, Ronald D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Locascio, Gary R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lodge, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lofiin, Charles E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Logan, Lee H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Logan, Marlin L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Logue, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lohr, William F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Long, Jon C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Long, Lewis W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Longo, Raymond E. A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Loos, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lopresti, Peter, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lorber, John G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lord, Clark B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lorenzen, Edward V., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lorusso, Paul M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lotter, Kenneth L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Louk, Frederick A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Loulis, Paul T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lovelace, Cary A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lovell, Ernest T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lowe, Donald W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Loya, George, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lucas, David V., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lucas, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Luchtel, Keith E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lueck, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Luisi, Carmen A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lukasik, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Luken, Lawrence D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lund, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lunt, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Luper, Connard A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lutkenhouse, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lybarger, William A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lyle, Clayton B., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lynd, William W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lyon, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lyon, William K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lyons, James D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Macaluso, Salvatore J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
MacInnis, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
MacPherson, William K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
MacRae, Aulay S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Madden, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Maddox, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Maderia, Patrick F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Madl, Dennis D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Madsen, Ronald W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Madura, John T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Maguire, Joseph J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mahan, Thomas P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mahoney, Edward W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mahoney, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Main, Davis L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Majors, James S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Makinen, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Malagarie, Frank M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Maldonado, Antonio, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Malik, John J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Malinsky, Joseph G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mall, Vance A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Malley, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Malmstrom, Frederick V., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Maloney, Michael R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Manekofsky, Harvey, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mange, John P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mangum, Dennis R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Manning, James D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Manosh, James N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mansfield, Thomas D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Manzari, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Marikle, Peter A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Marino, Lawrence A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Markette, Francis N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Markham, Roy N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Markle, Roy, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Maroon, William F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Marqua, Francis C., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.

Marshall, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Marshall, John R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Marshall, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Martin, Bruce A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Martin, Cecil E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Martin, Elmond J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Martin, Everette S. G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Martin, Fred W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Martin, Harry G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Martin, Jimmie D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Martin, Larry N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Martin, Rodney L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Martin, Roger A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Martinez, Donald E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Martinez, Emilio, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Martinez, Raymond B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Martinson, Brice M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Marx, Donald L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Marzahn, Edward L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mason, Lassite A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mason, Morris C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Massey, Harmon O., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Massey, Rastus O., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Masztak, Chester W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mateczun, Alfred J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mathews, Jack S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mathis, Harry M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mathison, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Matson, Eric K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mattey, James G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Matthes, Gary W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Matthews, Gerald L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Matthews, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Matthews, Paul M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mattina, Larry J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Matulis, Raymond G., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Matus, Jerome F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Maughan, Peter K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mauldin, William T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mavrotheris, Theodore N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Maxwell, Charles L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Maxwell, Walter B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
May, Harold D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
May, Robert A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mayer, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mayers, Russell S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mayo, Stephen K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mazer, Ronald G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McAdoo, Patrick G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McAlear, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McAllister, Robert J., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
McArtor, Trusten A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McAuliffe, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McBride, Donald L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McBride, Larry B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McBryde, Garrett E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCaffrey, Edward T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCain, Harvey G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCann, Thomas M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCarron, Donald E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCarthy, Francis J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCarthy, Lawrence J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCaslin, Patrick D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCauley, Henry E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McClintock, Fred V., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McClinton, Harry J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCloud, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McComsey, James T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McConnell, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCord, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCord, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCormack, Thomas F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCormick, Clyde R., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCormick, Gerald, xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCormick, James B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCoy, Kenneth B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCreary, Hugh B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCurdy, Stuart B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McDermott, James F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McDonald James J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McDonald, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McDonough, James K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McDowell, Theddore C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McElroy, Charles L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McEuen, Billy G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McGehee, Jarrett B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McGhee, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McGiffin, Douglas A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McGill, Forrest G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McGowan, Samuel M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McGraw, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McGrew, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McIlree, Alexander, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McInerney, Michael B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McIntosh, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McIntyre, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McIntyre, William H., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
McKee, Richard H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McKee, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McKelvey, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McKenney, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McKenney, William A., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
McKeon, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McKinley, Charles M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McKinney, Clay C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McKinney, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McKinney, Thomas W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McKinnon, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McLain, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McLeaish, Jock A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McLean, John N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McLean, Theodore R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McLoughlin, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McManus, Kevin J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McMaster, David K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McMaster, Larry L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McMaster, Samuel P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McMillan, John W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McMinds, Donald L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McMullen, Emerson T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McMullen, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McNally, William R., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
McNish, Thomas M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McRae, William C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McVay, James L., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
McWilliams, Howard H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mead, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mechenbier, Edward J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Meeko, Joseph G., IV, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Meffan, Edward J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mehew, Edwin W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mehling, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mehnert, Allen E., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Melikan, Mark G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mellott, Jerre K., xxxx.
Mellott, Virgil J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Melton, Bruce L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Melvin, Ronald M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Menzel, Jon M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Merchant, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Merrill, John K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Merrill, Richard H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Merson, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mertz, Reinard E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Meschter, Charles A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Messerli, Glenn E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Metsala, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Meonier, Barry, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Meyer, Charles L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Meyer, Roger D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Meyer, Thomas W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Meyers, Donald S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Michael, George W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Michaud, William N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Middlebrook, Billy J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Middleton, Robert B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Midnight, Francis B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mietz, Lee A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miheve, Georgory J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mikels, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Millar, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, Ernest E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, Gayland G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, Howard H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, Kenneth L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, Mel R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, Michael E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, Terry D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, Thomas J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, William W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Milligan, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Millington, Walter S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mills, Dean W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mills, Jerry R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mills, Leroy, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mineau, Kristian M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miner, Thomas G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mink, Lawrence J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Minnis, Thomas L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Minter, Paul E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mitchell, Joseph R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mitchell, Malcolm G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mitchell, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mitchell, Will D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mixer, Kenneth D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moccia, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moening, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Molinet, Fausto E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mollenkopf, Dale L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Monnett, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Monroe, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Monsour, Lawrence F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Montana, Joseph J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Montgomery, Dennis W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moody, Ira A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moon, Albert J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moon, Ross A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moore, Herff L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moore, James H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moore, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moore, Roy E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moran, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morehouse, Daniel O., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moreland, Earl L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morey, James N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morey, Kent W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morgan, George T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morgan, Guy A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morgan, Guy H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morgan, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morilak, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morin, Lawrence A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morrill, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morris, James K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morris, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morris, William P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morrison, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morrison, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morrow, Paul E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morss, Dean A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mounkes, Donald C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mount, Michael H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mudge, Michael S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mueh, David C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mueller, David N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mugg, Steven C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mullen, Robert P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mulvaney, John Q., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mummert, Thomas C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Murata, Ned T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Murden, William H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Murphy, John S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Murphy, Patricia M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Murphy, William P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Murphy, William T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Murray, James E., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Murray, John E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Musick, Martin D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Musselman, Gerald W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Myers, Glenn L., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Myers, Porter C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Myers, Ross J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Naidl, George E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nameth, Joseph L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Narbut, Joseph, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Natal, Pete M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nauton, Leroy C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nawrocki, Dennis L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Neal, Arlie W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Neal, Lawrence L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Neeland, Roger P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Neill, Norman S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nelson, Ben, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nelson, Clarke A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nelson, Curtis V., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nelson, Donald W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nelson, Gary K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nelson, Jacob M., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nelson, Michael W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nelson, Vernon A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nemetz, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Neri, Michall S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nesbitt, Edward H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nester, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Neuens, Martin J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Newman, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Newsom, Phillip D., xxx-xx-xxxx.

Newton, David G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Newton, George H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Newton, Terry J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nichols, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nicholson, Jon E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nicholson, Michael B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nicholson, Tom E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nicholson, Voy J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nickerson, David E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nicks, Paul H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Niehaus, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Niemoller, Arthur D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nieto, Donald E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Niles, Peter J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nix, Jerome W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nixon, Harvey L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Noe, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Noel, Martin A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nolan, Charles J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Noll, Herbert, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nonte, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Norris, Richard H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Norton, Paul W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Norton, Robert L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Norvelle, Frederick D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Novak, Walter E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Noy, Thomas W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Noyes, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Noyes, Peter M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nozynski, Raymond J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nugent, Edmund B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nutter, Steven M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nuzum, William T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Oates, Fred D., XXXX.
Oates, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
O'Brien, David F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
O'Brien, Harry G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
O'Brien, John N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
O'Brien, Thomas E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
O'Brien, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
O'Bryan, Carey L., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
O'Connor, Mark, xxx-xx-xxxx.
O'Connor, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Odland, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
O'Hare, Norbert A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
O'Keefe, Emmett J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
O'Keefe, Paul J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
O'Keefe, Timothy F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Olds, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
O'Leary, Denis J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Olender, Raymond A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Olin, Gary S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Oliver, Cregg R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Oliver, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Olivier, Michael G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Olmstead, David N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Olmsted, Frederick S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Olsen, Stephen R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Olson, Dennis D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Olson, Edwin A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Olson, Merrill H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
O'Malley, Alfred J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
O'Malley, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
O'Mara, Raymond E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ombrello, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Oneill, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Oneill, Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Opperman, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Opperman, Larry D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Orland, Burton A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ormond, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Orr, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Orsini, John V., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Orton, Steven L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Osborn, Don H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Osborn, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Osborne, Peter R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Oswood, Delivan B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ott, Gunter E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Outwater, Morris H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ovalle, Ralph A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Owens, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pabst, Eugene M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Padden, David T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Padgett, Jerry L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Padgett, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Page, Jerry D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Page, Raymond, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Palky, Donald L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Palucci, Kenneth J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Palumbo, Samuel R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Panzica, Richard V., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Paolucci, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Paquette, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pardini, Edward A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Parham, Chester, III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Parish, John I., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Parker, Ellis G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Parker, Frank A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Parker, Joseph Y., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Parker, Robert K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Parks, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Parmeter, John S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Parry, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Parsons, Bruce A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Paton, Thomas D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Patterson, Freddi, R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Patterson, Kenneth O., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Patterson, Robert A., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Patton, Barbara A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Patton, David B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Patton, Jerry V., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Paulsen, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pavich, Michael D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pearce, Edwin P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pearce, Frank M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pearce, Harry J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pearson, Jack T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pearson, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Peck, Peter E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pedersen, Jimmie L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Peebles, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pegg, Edward T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pennington, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pepper, Charles D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pereles, Jose D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Perez, Guillermo, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Perkins, Harold D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Perras, Henry A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Perrizo, Jerry J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Peters, Martin H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Petersen, Edward A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Petersen, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Peterson, Charles P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Peterson, Dennis A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Peterson, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Peterson, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Peterson, Lawrence D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Peterson, Ralph W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Petregal, George N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pett, Bernhard R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pettigrew, Thomas P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pettit, Alan L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pettit, David K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Petty, Lasalle, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Peura, Edwin W. A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pfeffer, Gene J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pfister, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pfleiger, Gary J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pharmer, Joseph S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Phillips, Antoine A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Phillips, Walton S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Phillips, Wendell, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Phillips, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pickens, Lindsay L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pickens, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pierce, David P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pierce, James B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pierce, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Piet, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pinell, Wally J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pinkerton, Harlan S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pipkins, Daniel W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pippin, Ernest H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pitt, Ronald E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Plante, Ronald E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pluchinsky, Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Plummer, James T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Plummer, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pogacar, Francis J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Polk, Albert C., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pollari, Ray W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pollock, Eugene J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pontiff, Gary J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Porter, Donald D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Porter, George H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Porter, Mike R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Porter, Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Porter, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Post, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pothier, Harvey G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Potsic, Curtis J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Potter, Paul D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Potter, Richard M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Potts, Paul J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Povich, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Powers, Duane P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Powers, Steven T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Prahm, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Prater, Gladstone J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Prater, John S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Prather, Roger L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pratt, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pratt, Everett H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pratt, Harry D. A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pratt, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Prenez, Jon E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pressburg, Joel E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Prevatt, Banks G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pribula, Stephen J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Price, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Price, Joseph A., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Prince, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pringle, Sammie, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pritchard, Harley H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Profitt, Glenn A., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Prust, Allan E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pucik, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pucilowski, Louis A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Puckett, Jay R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Puckett, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Puhrmann, George C., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pumroy, Frederick L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Purcell, Alex H., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Purcell, Michael B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pusey, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Puype, Maurice W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Qualey, James P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Quinn, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rachuy, Larry A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Radowski, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Raezer, David P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ragland, Everett L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rainwater, Elbert L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rakestraw, Pat W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rambin, Frank L., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ramsay, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ramsey, Boyd H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ramsey, Joseph C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ramsey, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Randall, Lawrence G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Randle, John A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Randmaa, Juri, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rankin, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ransom, Leland B., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rapp, Charles G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Raspberry, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rasimus, Edward J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rasinski, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rassier, Patrick J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rau, Edward C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rauch, Donald E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rauk, Thomas T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ravenel, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rawlins, Add C., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ray, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ray, Thomas M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rayko, John C. B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Raymond, Carlyle, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Raymond, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Reaves, Cato L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Reavis, Radford L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rechkemmer, David D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Reckling, Larry E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Redden, Joseph J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Redding, Dennis R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Redmann, Leslie G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Reeber, Henry E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Reed, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Reed, Dorman R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Reed, Grady H., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Reed, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Reeder, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Reedy, Milton G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Reese, Charles H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Reeser, Roger W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Reeves, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Register, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Reilly, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Reinarts, Ronald W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Reinhard, Ralph R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Reinhardt, Richard K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Reisinger, Robert P., xxx-xx-xxxx.

Reiter, Richard T. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Renfro, Paul N. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Renouf, Ronald R. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Reppe, Ronald J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rest, David W. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Reule, Fred J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rexford, John F. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Reynolds, Patrick J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Reynolds, William R. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rhoades, John W. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ribbentrop, Richard T. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rice, Ben B. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rice, George B. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Richardson, Charles L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Richardson, Roger E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Richart, Hugh M., III xxx-xx-xxxx.
Richmond, James A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Richter, Stephen L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rickel, David J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ricks, William R. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rico, Juan M. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rider, Larry V. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rider, William M. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Riegel, Richard A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rigel, Raymond L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rigoli, Daniel xxx-xx-xxxx.
Riley, James M. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rinebarger, Teddy E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Riopelle, Robert A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ripko, John C. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rippy, Douglas V. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ritchie, Adrian A., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ritchie, Richard S. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ritter, Joe B. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rively, Joseph C. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rizzi, Anthony M. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Robbins, Michael R. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Robbins, Richard A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Robbins, Robert E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Roberto, Mario M. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Roberts, Philip A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Roberts, Ronald C. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Robertson, Martin L., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Robertson, Michael G. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Robinson, David A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Robinson, David E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Robinson, Douglas C. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Robinson, James R. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Robinson, James E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Robinson, Larry A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Robinson, Lawrence R., III xxx-xx-xxxx.
Robinson, Robert J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Robinson, Robert W. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Robinson, Terry S. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Robishaw, Howard C. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rocap, Pember W. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rodero, Joseph S. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rodgers, Raymond E., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Roe, Daniel xxx-xx-xxxx.
Roehling, Edwin A., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Roels, Timothy J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rogers, Alan V. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rogers, James R. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rogers, John R. xxxx.
Rogers, Robert M., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rogness, Norman D. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rohleder, William J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Roject, Gerald xxx-xx-xxxx.
Romeo, Pasquale R. F., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Romines, Jackie A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rooch, Melvin R. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Roohms, John W. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Roscoe, John H. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rose, James W. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rose, Phillip E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rose, Richard J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rose, Roger L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Roser, Thomas M. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rosevold, Hanley N. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rotella, Raymond D. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rothe, William D. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rothrock, John E., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rotman, Douglas A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rouse, Richard J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rovegno, John F. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rowe, Stephen H. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Roy, Raoul F. W. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Royster, Jack A., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rozea, John M. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rozmarich, Thomas A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ruane, James J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rubenstein, Larry J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rubin, Alan J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rucoba, Reginald xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ruddell, Richard L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rudeen, Karl H. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rudgis, Robert xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rudisill, James K. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rudmann, Ronald J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ruffner, Jay S. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rule, Carl W. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Running, Ronald N. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rush, Randy G. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Russell, Carlton, Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Russell, John C. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Russell, Patrick D. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Russell, Robert H., II xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ruth, Richard E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ruthledge, James P. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rutter, Kenneth M. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rutter, Milton R. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Rye, Gilbert D. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ryser, Gary C. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Saar, Paul xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sabo, Kathleen F. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sabourin, Larry P. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Saddler, Thomas M., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Saffle, John C. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Safford, Arthur T., III xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sager, Ronald W. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Saito, Theodore T. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sakahara, William T. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Salas, Robert L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Salcido, Henry A., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Salewski, Robert J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Salzarulo, Raymond P., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sammer, Dennis C. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sampson, Kenneth B. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Samuel, David B. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Samuels, Jon M. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sandera, Robert E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sanders, Bruce A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sanders, Donald E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sanders, Emmett W., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sanderson, Gary F. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sandmore, Peter C. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sandstrum, Cary V. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sanford, David A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sansom, Robert L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sapp, Bowen xxx-xx-xxxx.
Savage, Richard C. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Savoie, Carroll P. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sayles, Rodney J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Scalise, Thomas E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Scammon, Richard J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Scanlon, William A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schaal, Gary L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schad, Joseph G. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schaefer, Laird W. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schaefer, Philip H. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schafer, Donald J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schattner, Elisabeth xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schell, Daniel P. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schell, John F. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schenck, James L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Scherer, Charles L., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schertz, John H. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schettler, Charles B. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schlegel, Gerard K. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schloemer, Ronald F. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schmidt, Albert R. L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schmidt, Edwin A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schmidt, Nolan W. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schmitz, Joseph A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schnabel, James E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schneider, Bernard G., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schneider, Donald K. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schneider, John A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schnelzer, Garry A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schoenborn, Carlton M. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schofield, Thomas J., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schooley, Max C. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schoot, Cedric E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schorzman, Craig A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schroeder, David C. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schroeder, James A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schue, Howard K. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schuhmacher, John E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schuley, Richard S. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schultz, Kenneth E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schultz, Ronald J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schulz, Ronald E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schulz, Usto F. E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schulze, Charles E., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schmacher, Ronald W. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schmack, Thomas A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schur, Morris J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schuyler, Donald L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schweitzer, James J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schwinkendorf, William E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Scifres, James H. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Scott, Darrell J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Scott, John C. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Scott, Kenneth L., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Scott, Robert L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Scott, Rodney G. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Scott, William V. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Searcy, Jerry W. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sears, Carver L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sears, James F. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Seavers, Victor C. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Seebacher, John A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Seehafer, Gary D. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Seger, Francis M., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sehorn, William T. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Seibel, Gerald W. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Selander, James G. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Selheimer, Howard E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sellers, Donald R. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sellers, Michael T. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Selvidge, Philip L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Senko, Robert M. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Setchell, James F. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sevier, George S. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Seviola, Chester R. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sexton, Michael E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Seymore, Lesley L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Shackelford, Robert S. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Shaefer, Richard P. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Shaffer, John R. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Shanafelt, Ronald L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Shanman, James A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sharp, Jerry K. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sharp, Paul R. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Shaw, John E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Shearer, Donald R. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Shearer, Richard L., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sheldon, Earnest L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sheldon, Stanley M. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Shelhammer, Donald E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Shelton, Jerry L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Shelton, Maurice L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Shepard, Stephen xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sheppard, James G. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sheridan, Robert P. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Shertzer, Ronald R. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sherwood, Marion P., III xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sheward, Clarence W. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Shiomi, Brian T. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Shively, James R. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Shoemaker, Corydon D. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Shorb, Brian H. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Shorey, Gerald M., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Shumate, Ethan C. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Shy, James D. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sieg, William D. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Siler, Chester H. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Silva, Joseph xxx-xx-xxxx.
Silverman, George xxx-xx-xxxx.
Simms, Orion O., III xxx-xx-xxxx.
Simondi, Thomas E. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Simonsen, Martin H. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Simonton, Sammie C. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Simpson, Charles A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Simpson, Merlin C., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Simpson, Raymond xxx-xx-xxxx.
Simpson, Robert C. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Siravo, Robert A. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sisney, Vernon V. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Skaer, William K., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Skalicky, James R. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Skelton, Robert H. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Skey, Anthony F. M. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Skidmore, John B. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Skidmore, Rance W. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Skinner, Toby L. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sklute, Nolan xxx-xx-xxxx.
Skrenes, Norman D. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Skypeck, Thomas J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Slaughter, John W. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Slaughter, William G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sloan, William D. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Slocumb, Tyler H., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.

Slye, Richard H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Smit, Gene A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Smith, Cammie D., III xxx-xx-xxxx.
Smith, Charles, III xxx-xx-xxxx.
Smith, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Smith, Donald B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Smith, Gary F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Smith, Gary M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Smith, George A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Smith, George G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Smith, Gerald E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Smith, Gordon C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Smith, Hallie W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Smith, Harlan F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Smith, Herbert S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Smith, J. D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Smith, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Smith, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Smith, Joseph M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Smith, Larry N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Smith, Manning D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Smith, Mark H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Smith, Robert B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Smith, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Smith, Ronald H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Smith, Ronald D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Smith, Tommie S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Smith, Turner, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Smith, William H., III xxx-xx-xxxx.
Smith, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Smyk, Alexander E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Smyth, Charles W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sneed, Charles L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Snyder, Derle M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Snyder, Donald L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Snyder, John G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Solem, Richard H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Somerville, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Souder, Larry C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sousa, Paul E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sowers, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Spadinger, Jay J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sparkman, Simeon C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Spear, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Spears, Phillip D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Speight, Joseph D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Spelius, Wayne C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Spellman, Arthur N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Spencer, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Spenrath, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Spinelli, Leo V., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Spoon, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Spure, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Spreen, Darrell E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Spurger, George A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Spurger, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stackelhouse, Sheldon, J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stackhouse, Will, III xxx-xx-xxxx.
Staderman, William P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stadjuhar, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stafford, Charles B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stafford, Fred P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stafford, Stephen W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stafford, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Staloch, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stanforth, David H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Staniszewski, Henry J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stankosky, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stanley, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stanley, Page B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Staringer, Lawrence J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Starr, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stayton, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Steffan, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Steffen, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stein, Lowell L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stemp, Claude, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stenger, Douglas R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stephens, Collins C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stephens, Randall C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stephens, Waymon J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stephenson, Jacland M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stephenson, Thomas W., III xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stephenson, Walter J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stetson, Craig L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stevens, Harvey B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stevens, Henry A., III xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stevenson, Charles E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stevenson, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stewart Clayton V., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stewart, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stewart, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Steyer, Harold C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stierman, Tyrone M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stiles, Dennis W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Still, Kenneth E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stine, Alan C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stockton, Donald W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stockwell, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stokes, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stokes, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stokes, Montford Y., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stolp, Durward D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stone, Charles M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stone, Jack T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stone, Robert P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stoner, Tommy C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Strandlie, Michael D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Strand, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Street, Phillip O., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stripling, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Strolla, Carmine, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stroud, Tommy R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Struck, Stephen H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Strove, Roger L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stupar, Rudolph A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stutz, Leroy W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Suchecki, Theodore J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sudmalis, Laimons, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sue, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sullenger, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sullivan, John L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sullivan, Richard P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sumner, Hayward G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sutherland, Jeffrey V., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sutton, Larry E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sutton, Raymond V., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sutton, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Swartz, Thomas W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Swartzmeyer, Elmer G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Swasey, Irving L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Swayze, Gordon B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sweeney, John J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Swenson, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Swepson, David G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Swigart, Gary A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Swindell, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Swinney, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Switzer, Barton B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Swupe, Richard T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sylvester, Deland J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Syms, George A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Szostak, John D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tabata, Hiroshi, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Taber, Lynville E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tabler, Roy T., xxxx.
Talley, James T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tande, Ronald M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tashner, Richard, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Taylor, Anthony H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Taylor, Dan L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Taylor, Elden C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Taylor, Howard E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Taylor, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Taylor, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Taylor, Philip A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Taylor, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Taylor, Thomas W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Taylor, Wendell H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Teaff, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tedesco, Frederick P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Telesio, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tenoso, Edwin E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Terry, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Terry, Marvin L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Terry, Phillip A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thede, Allen L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thiem, Gary R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thies, Mack, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thomas, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thomas, Alfred, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thomas, Arnold R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thomas, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thomas, Joseph L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thomas, Kenneth H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thomas, Luther L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thomas, Raymond M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thomas, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thomas, Terry A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thompson, Charles W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thompson, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thompson, Lowell W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thompson, Lynn L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thompson, Robert K., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thompson, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thompson, Russell D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thompson, Thomas M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thompson, Weldon C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thompson, William F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thompson, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thornton, William T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Throckmorton, George E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thurber, Karl T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tiahrt, Jerry R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tibbitts, Loel B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tidwell. Cam J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Till, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tiller, George W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tilmon, Ronald I., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tiplady, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tobin, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tomasovic, Richard P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tomlinson, William V., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Torgler, Ronald R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tornow, Robin G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tourino, Ralph G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Town, Edward A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tractenberg, Julius F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Trahan, Gayle J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tramposch, Helmut, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Trautsch, Rolf A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Trayler, Andrew N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tremmel, Lloyd A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Trent, Alan R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Trial, Daniel S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Trombly, Dennis J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Trout, David T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Troutman, Vance G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Trower, William W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Troy, Stephen R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Trujillo, Joe E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tuck, Alan O., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tucker, George L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tucker, Jerome W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tucker, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tucker, John M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tucker, Larry M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tudor, Ray G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tuffey, Patrick J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tuntland, Darrell I., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Turner, Frances S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Turner, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Turner, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tyl, Charles, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ubl, Marlowe E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Uksti, Thomas M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ulrich, Charles C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Underhill, Greg L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Underwood, Maurice E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Upchurch, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Uridel, Richard K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vaeth, Randall W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Valasek, Jon E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Valerian, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Valko, Jerry C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vanbennekum, Jan G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vance, Cyrus B., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vance, Richard R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vanderhider, Carl R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vanderwerf, Howard T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vandette, Michael A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vanpelt, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vansickel, Jerry D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vantilborg, Dale W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vargas, Santiago, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vaughn, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vedvick, Lars V., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Veilleux, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vergamini, Michael G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vergho, Gary L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Verstreate, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Veteikis, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vick, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vick, Jonathan C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vick, Russell W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vickerman, Bruce E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vincent, Cecil E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vinkels, Gunars, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Violette, James G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vlasak, Stanley J., xxx-xx-xxxx.

Vogler, George J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Volberding, Elroy W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vopalinsky, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vycital, Mark A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Waddington, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wade, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wagner, Frederick H., IV., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wagner, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Waitman, Lemuel R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wakeham, Ernest W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Waldon, Jesse J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walk, Wayne D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walker, Elbert S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walker, Fred W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walker, Jerry L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walker, Joseph P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walker, Lester L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walker, Michael S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walker, Ralph J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walker, William H., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walks, Ronald E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wallace, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wallace, Gary H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wallace, Jere T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wallace, Luther E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wallace, Thomas G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Waller, Thomas S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wallerstedt, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walls, Charles N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walls, Leonard J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walsh, Edward M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walsh, Edward F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walsh, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walsh, Thomas H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walter, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walters, Charles M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walters, William T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walterscheid, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wampler, Howard W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wankerl, Max W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wanless, Ronald H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wanner, Thomas D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ward, Alan A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ward, Stephen E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ward, George H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ware, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wargo, Joseph P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Waters, Joseph G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Watkins, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Watson, Frank C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Watson, Brian D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Watson, Wilbur W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Watson, Harold E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Watts, Wayne E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Weatherly, Stephe G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Weaver, Windol C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Webb, Francis R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Webber, John S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Webster, Edward R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Webster, Kenneth I., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Webster, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Webster, Thomas L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wecker, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wees, Edward L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wege, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Weinberg, Lawrence, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Weiner, Sigmund T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Welch, David N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Welch, Richard E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Welliver, George H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wells, Hewett S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wells, Rodney A., xxxx.
Welsh, Jay B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Welshan, John T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Welter, Clarence J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Welty, Terrence A., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wendfeldt, Larry S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wenker, Kenneth H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Werner, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
West, Hirum E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
West, Hugh C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Western, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Westover, Timothy O., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wetterstroem, Albert, III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Whatley, Hugh C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wheatley, Robert L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wheaton, Eric E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wheeler, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wheeler, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wheeler, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Whitaker, Fred H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
White, James B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
White, Lawrence L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
White, Louis E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
White, Neil W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
White, Raymon M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
White, Robert A. M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
White, Walter E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
White, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Whitehead, Charles W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Whitehead, Charles L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Whitehead, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Whitehurst, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Whiteley, Andre B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Whitney, Donald K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Whitney, Raymond J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wicks, Kenneth P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Widger, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Widic, Frank A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Widmayer, Karl C., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wieck, Gary M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wiedemeier, Dennis W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wiegard, Don W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wiener, Dale O., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wiess, Martin P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilbert, Jan J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilburn, William N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilcox, Joel G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wild, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilder, Richard H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wildes, James S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilen, John G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wiles, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wiley, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilfung, Richard N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilkerson, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilkinson, Peter R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilkinson, Roger K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Willems, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williams, Clifford E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williams, David H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williams, Donald E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williams, Douglas C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williams, George B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williams, Henry M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williams, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williams, John U. S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williams, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williams, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williams, Jonathan D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williams, Jonathan F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williams, Norman R., Sr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williams, Richard T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williams, Richard M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williams, Ronald M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williamson, Charles A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williamson, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Willis, Arthur J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williss, William B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilson, Charles L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilson, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilson, Charles H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilson, Ernest C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilson, Scott C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilson, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wiltsie, Theodore E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wimer, Glenn C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wimer, James K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Winburn, Edwin G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Windedahl, Layne C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Windham, James E. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Winegar, Rodger A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Winkelmann, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Winkler, Frank P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Winkler, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Winn, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Winters, George R., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wisdom, William A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wise, Anthony C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wisely, Donald E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wiseman, Omar R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wisler, Walter D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wistrom, William W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wiswell, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Withrow, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wittenberg, Frederick F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wittress, William M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wohnsigi, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wojnaroski, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wold, Hal W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wolfe, Dale E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wolfe, Thad A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wolfrom, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wolniewicz, Richard, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wonner, Michael H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wood, Bruce D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wood, Donald J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wood, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wood, Phillip D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Woodbury, Elmer E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Woodrow, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Woodruff, Dennis P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Woods, Robert V., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Worgo, Ronald T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Workman, Allen L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Worley, Gary G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Worth, Arthur L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wozniak, Frederick J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wrede, Harry, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wright, Donald E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wright, Dwain C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wright, Lynn P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wright, Peter W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wright, Thomas P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wright, William C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wright, William W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wrigley, Miles N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wurzburger, Nils L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wyatt, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wyatt, Milton R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Yager, Charles A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Yagley, John A., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Yajko, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Yax, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
York, Ernest D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Young, Barclay B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Young, Edward A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Young, James R., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Young, Truman R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Young, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Youngblood, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Younginger, Jacob M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Younkin David L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Yuknas, Joseph A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Yurkiewicz, Joseph A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zaiser, Alan R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zambo, Leslie J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zamboni, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zaniboni, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zazworsky, Raymond M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zeigler, Gary S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zella, Kenneth B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zeller, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zenkus, Joseph A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zertuche, Leopoldo Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zgonc, Frank, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ziccardi, Vincent A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ziemniak, Edward M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zimer, Milan, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zimmer, Karl E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zimmerman, Carl S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zimmerman, Lynn A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zimmermann, Hanspeter, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zionic, Gerald A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zolondek, Leonard D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zucchetti, Sergio, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zutell, Eugene G., xxx-xx-xxxx.

CHAPLAINS

Arnold, Charles L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bogaard, Calvin L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brodeur, Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Drag, Rayner R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Fruechte, Leland L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Grusse, David G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Holtzclaw, Morris J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hunter, Donald E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kelly, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kennedy, Clayton M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Luck, Robert O., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Midile, Anthony R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Millsaps, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Oatis, Stephen J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Scherf, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schuermann, William S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Solano, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Stephenson, Norman D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wiegele, Lloyd W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilson, Donald L., xxx-xx-xxxx.

DENTAL CORPS

Anselmo, Joseph A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Curtis, Howard F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Dufrane, Michael H., xxx-xx-xxxx.

Federico, Roland A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lowery, Huey P., xxx-xx-xxxx
MacDonald, Gerald B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Noren, Gaylord D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Paetz, Bill L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Parsley, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Strosnider, Roger K., xxx-xx-xxxx

MEDICAL CORPS

Adams, Michael, xxx-xx-xxxx
Behringer, Blair R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dean, Gilbert O., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Denmark, Thomas C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fruelicher, Victor F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Galbert, Michael W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gates, George F., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Giller, Walter J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Harris, Gary D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hauth, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hrumyak, George F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ingram, James C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jackson, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kocher, David B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Maulsby, Gilbert O., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mitchell, Dun Q., xxx-xx-xxxx
O'Connell, Leo P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Risch, Edward D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rogers, Woods W., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Hugh N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Warren, M. Charles, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wicks, Dennis R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wiley, John K., xxx-xx-xxxx

NURSE CORPS

Adams, Annette J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Andino, Maria I., xxx-xx-xxxx
Andrews, Kay E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Auvil, Mary L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ayers, Lowell E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Beahan, Alice L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Blanchard, Charles C., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Blasczyk, Luis K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bradley, Dawn R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Breasure, Margaret E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brigham, Joyce A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brooks, Barbara M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Byrk, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Casey, Kathleen F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Connelly, Judith A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Corrado, Vivien P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Deemer, Mary T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dehaemers, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Farnham, Marcel M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Feneley, Patricia A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fletcher, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Galford, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gartside, Leona G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Geberl, Helen H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Goldman, Sheila A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gruber, Edward P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hall, Jerrie J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hardy, Mary P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Harrison, Laquita A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hartwick, Rayna L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Heaney, Sylvia A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kerr, Nancy J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kiszonak, Loraine E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kuhn, Larry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lambert, Margaret A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Last, Geraldine M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Latham, Bessie W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Legault, Albert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Leiby, Jo Ann, xxx-xx-xxxx
Lucisano, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Luttman, Phyllis A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Manucy, Judith M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Marick, Thomas D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Marshall, Frances L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Matt, Lois A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Meier, Karen A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mitchell, Marguerite A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Murphree, Kay R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nixon, Mildred D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ollino, Tiiu, xxx-xx-xxxx
Peake, Ruth A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reynolds, Zelma W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Robertson, Theresa M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Scardina, Anna V., xxx-xx-xxxx
Segura, Charles F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shelton, Patsy R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Elaine R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Martin O., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stange, Melba J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Tanida, Kathleen R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Teesdale, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Tesoriero, Lynn, xxx-xx-xxxx
Trugillo, Lee E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Walsh, Mary C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Waring, Richard I., xxx-xx-xxxx
Weatherford, Sara E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wilson, Charles L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wiseman, Patricia J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wolf, Carol A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wyman, Craig A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Yamasaki, Joyce T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Yamashita, Agueda C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Yates, Donna M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Yonker, Barbara J., xxx-xx-xxxx

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Anzai, Rodney K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Armstrong, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Chasen, Marvin H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Collier, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Covey, Richard W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dressler, Forrest G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ellis, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Grinstaff, Harold W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hanify, Edward B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hummer, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnson, Gerald A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Krewson, Charles F., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Lembke, Russell W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Leuthold, Peter P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lombardo, Raymond B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Madory, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
McClean, Raymond R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Miller, Roger T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Moncrief, Hugh, xxx-xx-xxxx
Muser, Dennis J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Oatley, Theodore W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rheinscheld, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Richey, Wayne L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sarbach, Douglas L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Satterfield, Glenn T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schindel, Donald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schmigel, Donald P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shoffner, Robert F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Collins E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Trezza, Anthony, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Velthuis, Philip B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wylie, John V., xxx-xx-xxxx
Zizzi, Martin E., xxx-xx-xxxx

VETERINARY CORPS

Adams, George E., xxxx
Amster, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davis, Jerry W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ekstrom, Merlin E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cardin, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Heading, Thomas D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hubbard, Gene B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lance, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Myers, Ronald D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Obeck, Douglas K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rogers, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sullivan, Raymond E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Tate, Samuel W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wilson, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx

BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES CORPS

Birch, Shelton R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bomar, John B. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bullock, Charles W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Collins, David H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Curtis, Harry G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davis, Dauglas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dobbs, Melvin B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Genco, Louis V., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hunter, John S. III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Ladd, Sheldon L., xxx-xx-xxxx
MacNaughton, Mich G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ohearn, Thomas P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Parker, Frank M. III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Pettit, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Provines, Wayne F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reid, Reford G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Riccardi, Richard M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ryan, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stone, Kenneth M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Thornell, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Tremblay, Roland A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Welsh, Kenneth W., xxx-xx-xxxx

Yale, L. Klugman, xxx-xx-xxxx for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grade of major, under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with a view to designation under the provisions of section 8067, title 10, United States Code, to perform medical duties, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

Thomas, D. Edmonds, xxx-xx-xxxx a distinguished graduate of the Air Force Officer Training School, for appointment in the Regular Air Force in the grade of second lieutenant under the provisions of section 8284, title 10, United States Code, with date of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force.

IN THE ARMY

The following-named person for appointment in the Regular Army, by transfer in the grade specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283 through 3294:

To be captain

Tate, Alice M., xxx-xx-xxxx

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283 through 3294 and 3311:

To be major

Cook, Kenneth E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Walker, Wiley W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Zandiotis, Angelo T., xxx-xx-xxxx

To be captain

Alexander, Richard R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Assenberg, Harry J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Barnard, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bell, Kenneth D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bierbaum, Carl R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Booth, Van D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Branson, Robert V., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brooks, Ronald A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cates, William E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Conte, Ronald D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cramer, Carl L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dahl, Hans E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dick, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dougherty, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gall, Frank, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gifford, Ronald M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Grant, Clarence, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hawley, Robert I. C., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Hinson, Joel H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hood, Charles M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnson, Wallace, xxx-xx-xxxx
Joy, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kennedy, Albert G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kyle, Walter F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
McConnell, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx
McFadden, William W., xxx-xx-xxxx
McGlone, Mark E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Moe, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Monsees, Stephen K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Morkovsky, Paul E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Morton, Arthur R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nardi, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Norman, James F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ramos-Acosta, Francisco E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Remick, Lawrence E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rivera, Morales Aida L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Robinson, John R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rogers, Mark W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Storey, Thomas P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sullivan, Roger J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wallenborn, Frederick R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Young, Frank R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Zynda, Gerald I., xxx-xx-xxxx

To be first lieutenant

Anderson, Jerry F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Armstrong, Douglas W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bagbey, Stanley R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Baker, Ralph K., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Barnes, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bentz, Curtis L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Blue, Donald G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Braze, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Briggs, James B., xxx-xx-xxxx

Briggs, Roderick C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brown, Joseph E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Campbell, Edward P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Casper, Charles S., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Chung, Norman K., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Clements, Donnell S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cox, Floyd D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Croy, Roy D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davis, Richard N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dull, Dolan J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Evans, Thomas C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fisher, Jon G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Forbes, Gary L., Sr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Frazier, Willie, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Frenn, Gary A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Froderman, Theodore H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gaines, Rodney R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gentilini, Raymond E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Glass, Mavin F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Goodridge, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Godownes, Fowler L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Green, Alex C. II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Hall, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hanna, Jerry N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hardee, Forest E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Harasym, Myron, xxx-xx-xxxx
Harvey, Thomas D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Higginbotham, Norman D., xxxx
Hoffelt, Donald J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hopper, Allan D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Howell, Kent P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnson, Donald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Joiner, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jones, Jackie G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kelley, Michael P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kraemer, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx
La Bounty, Gary L., xxx-xx-xxxx
La Nasa, Francis M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lane, Carl D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Leavitt, Ronald N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lewis, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lindfors, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mackey, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Martino, Louis A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mason, Louis G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mayhue, Norman L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Maxfield, Douglas L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Milkowski, Stanlis D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Miller, Gary E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mills, Thomas C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Moore, Richard N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mullis, Richard L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nickerson, Robert F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Norton, Frank, xxx-xx-xxxx
Novak, Leo C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Okeefe, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Person, Bruce P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Phister, Leonard P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reichert, Herbert W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reifsynder, Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Richardson, Harold N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Roberson, Hugh B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Roberts, Francis H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rodrigues, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rollins, Gordon C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schiller, Arthur A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schweppe, Howard B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sherrod, Susie M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shovar, George P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shutty, Bernard J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Simpson, Kenneth W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Alan C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Carlton H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Staber, Daniel E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Steffensen, Lynn A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stevens, Douglas L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Terrell, George H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Thomas, Buddy G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Todd, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Trawick, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Trent, Alexander B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Trujillo, Arthur H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Vail, Richard H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Waldrop, Gerry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Waters, Steve R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Watson, Harvey D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Weise, David G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wheeler, Louis O., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wheeler, Thomas H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Whitney, Robert C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Williamson, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Windle, Joseph C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Zeiner, Sharon A., xxx-xx-xxxx

To be second lieutenant

Bruns, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bryant, Scott A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Crocker, Stanley A. J. W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Green, Bernard W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Keith, Lewis C., xxx-xx-xxxx
La Comb, Augustus J., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Lawless, Patrick B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Link, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Macias, Julian G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Menasco, Michael B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Merkel, John, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mochow, Charles M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Morbitzer, Christopher G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reed, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Spearman, Johnnie J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Tackaberry, Burt S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Tackaberry, Kief S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Thornton, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Vinci, James D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wynne, Oscar B., III, xxx-xx-xxxx

The following-named distinguished military students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grade of second lieutenant, under provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 2106, 3283, 3284, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

Acker, Charles D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Albert, Michael R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Aldridge, George W., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Appleby, Charles C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Arroyo, Amauri A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Austin, Joe N., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Back, William W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Baker, Donald C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Becker, Kenneth S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Birden, Larry R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Biser, Kenneth M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Booth, Bernard M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Boston, James D., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Bradley, Layne C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bratton, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brownlee, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bux, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carden, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carden, Kenneth D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carmichael, Paul D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Childers, Melvin L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Childs, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Courtney, Patrick J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Crissey, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Crosby, Stephen K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dawson, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dickson, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Diggs, Mark D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Eichorn, Raymond M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Esto, David H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gautreaux, Colbert T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gibson, Lee P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gile, Douglas L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Goldsmith, Edward A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Grace, William V., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Groom, Charles H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hagan, Richard G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hamrick, Gayle B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hatrak, George M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jones, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kachline, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Keeley, Virgil D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kovacic, Charles R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kringle, William F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kuper, Hans D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mackelprang, Ronald B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Madden, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Maddox, William T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Martinez, Jose M., xxx-xx-xxxx
McClintock, Darius G., xxx-xx-xxxx
McKnight, Calvin C., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Mele, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Moore, Larry D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Myers, Russell F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nerren, George N., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Newsome, Kenneth A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Obrey, Stanley L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Osborne, Samuel C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Owen, Peter W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Owens, Seth M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pace, William T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Parker, David D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Parker, Joe R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pearson, Larry D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pendrak, Gary A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Percy, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Porzak, Glenn E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Prendergast, Charles F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pucci, Louis A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Radau, Gene S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Regan, David, xxx-xx-xxxx
Reilly, Kenneth J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ricer, Terry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Richards, David F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rowlette, Ronald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ruth, Henry C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Salzman, Jeffrey J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Scianna, Philip P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Self, Robert R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Snyder, Philip H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Spaker, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Spence, George F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stanton, Shelby L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Staples, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Strohbusch, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Taucher, John H., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Thornton, Richard G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Timmons, Ronald D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Tindall, Dan S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Turney, Jerry D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Underwood, Charles C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wiley, William S. III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Winfrey, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Young, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ziegler, Fritz B., xxx-xx-xxxx

The following-named scholarship students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 2107, 3283, 3284, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

Bond, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Casey, Michael P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ellis, Lehman L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Holmes, King D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jew, Michael D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Maddrey, Kenneth D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nichols, James H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ozolek, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Tichenor, Arthur H. III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Woodruff, Martin B., xxx-xx-xxxx

IN THE ARMY

The following-named persons for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in the grades specified, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3283 through 3294 and 3311:

To be lieutenant colonel

Kurata, Joseph Y., xxx-xx-xxxx

To be major

Bankit, Paul, xxx-xx-xxxx
Frownfelter, James O., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gibbons, Bruce H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hacking, David, xxx-xx-xxxx
Jackson, Paul E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jones, Bernard P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kuykendall, William K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Little, Ronald W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mathias, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schmidtke, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Walter, Milton H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wetherbie, Robert F., xxx-xx-xxxx

To be captain

Acree, Charles D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Allen, Carl R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Antopol, Michael R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Arsenault, Philip N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Badzinski, Richard V., xxx-xx-xxxx
Baird, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ball, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Barbour, Martin W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Beattie, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Beieler, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Blackwell, Philip A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Boyd, Thomas C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Burch, John T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Burlton, Rogers C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Chier, James K., xxx-xx-xxxx

Cornell, Gerald, [redacted].
Cotner, Jimmy W., [redacted].
Doyle, Bernard K., Jr., [redacted].
Farris, Billy D., [redacted].
Ferguson, Donald W., [redacted].
Finkbeiner, Ronald J., [redacted].
Finn, John M., II, [redacted].
Fox, Brian K., [redacted].
Fremstad, Clifford, [redacted].
Givetz, Stanley S., [redacted].
Grobe, Leroy L., [redacted].
Hagan, Jerome D., [redacted].
Hamilton, Victor A., [redacted].
Hammons, Richard D., [redacted].
Harris, Arnom H., Jr., [redacted].
Hasslinger, John B., [redacted].
Hempel, Donald R., [redacted].
Holloman, Lyndon E., [redacted].
Hughes, Billie L., [redacted].
Hunter, William W., Jr., [redacted].
Jungck, Robert R., [redacted].
Kays, John M., [redacted].
Kummer, David W., [redacted].
McKesson, Edward L., Jr., [redacted].
Merrill, Pauline D., [redacted].
O'Shea, Robert W., [redacted].
Porter, James W., [redacted].
Schindler, John C., [redacted].
Sewell, James W., [redacted].
Short, Joseph F., [redacted].
Silsby, Harry D., [redacted].
Swofford, Ralph P., III, [redacted].
Theisen, David J., [redacted].
Thompson, Kenneth G., [redacted].
Trocki, John A., Jr., [redacted].
Walker, Reuben P., [redacted].
Watson, James D., [redacted].
Williams, Daniel H., [redacted].

To be first lieutenant

Adams, Richard M., [redacted].
Alishouse, Harvel F., [redacted].
Andersen, Timothy W., [redacted].
Austin, Andrew L., [redacted].
Azuma, Eric K., [redacted].
Ballard, Joe N., [redacted].
Barbone, Anthony F. Jr., [redacted].
Bates William M., [redacted].
Bentz, Kenneth Jr., [redacted].
Berganini, Steven J., [redacted].
Boggs, David L., [redacted].
Bolin, Harold E., [redacted].
Bonney, Charles E., [redacted].
Bowman, William J., [redacted].
Breeden, Linda J., [redacted].
Brodie, Michael A., [redacted].
Brohm, Gerard P., [redacted].
Brown, Floyd L., [redacted].
Bunch, James S., [redacted].
Burnside, John G., [redacted].
Butler, Steven M., [redacted].
Callaghan, John J. III, [redacted].
Carden, Joe B., [redacted].
Carlisle, Eddie L., [redacted].
Carr, Terry A., [redacted].
Chafen, Less T., [redacted].
Christman, Laurence M. Jr., [redacted].
Church, Zaidos N., [redacted].
Clark, James W., [redacted].
Cobb, Douglas, H., [redacted].
Coleman, James P., [redacted].
Collins, Philip R., [redacted].
Cooke, John R., [redacted].
Cooper, James P., [redacted].
Cottrell, Peter J., [redacted].
Crean, Thomas M., [redacted].
Dacey, Richard P., [redacted].
Damron, Ronald K., [redacted].
Daniels, William E., [redacted].
Davis, Burrell T., [redacted].
Dean, Byron K., [redacted].
Deloatche, James L., [redacted].
Dennis, Ronald L., [redacted].
Desrosiers, Henry P., [redacted].
Drake, James M., [redacted].
Dunlap, Elijah T. Jr., [redacted].
Edson, Paul R., [redacted].
Ely, Joseph T. Jr., [redacted].
Endrijonas, Audris A., [redacted].
English, Lamont B., [redacted].
Estep, Robert L., [redacted].
Eversman, James F. Jr., [redacted].
Farmer, David E., Jr., [redacted].
Feuerborn, Thomas L., [redacted].
Fields, Clifford L., [redacted].
Fitzgerald, John D., Jr., [redacted].
Ford, Jerry D., [redacted].
Fowler, Zachary S., [redacted].
Frazier, Edwin M., [redacted].
Freedman, Gary M., [redacted].
Gecowetts, Bernard E., [redacted].
Gibson, Ronald H., [redacted].
Ginn, Richard V. N., [redacted].
Goligoski, Josephine A., [redacted].
Gordon, Stanley J., [redacted].
Haley, Richard L., [redacted].
Hall, John E., [redacted].
Hamel, Eric P., [redacted].
Harp, William J., [redacted].
Harrison, Bruce, [redacted].
Hartsell, Carroll F., [redacted].
Hassen, David E., [redacted].
Hauck, Robert L., [redacted].
Hawbaker, John W., [redacted].
Hazer, Kaleem, Jr., [redacted].
Hedges, William T., Jr., [redacted].
Heil, James R., [redacted].
Hembree, Stephen C., [redacted].
Hengen, Orville J., Jr., [redacted].
Heyer, Paul J., [redacted].
Hickok, Stephen W., II, [redacted].
Higbee, James W., [redacted].
Howard, Thomas W., III, [redacted].
Huett, Judson L., Jr., [redacted].
Hurley, Robert D., [redacted].
Jackson, Jerry F., [redacted].
Jenkins, Joseph S., [redacted].
James, Larry R., [redacted].
Johnson, Kenneth R., [redacted].
Jolet, Earn A., [redacted].
Kavanaugh, Kenneth J., [redacted].
Keenan, James N., [redacted].
Kelsey, Arthur W., [redacted].
Kennedy, Leslie D., [redacted].
Kerr, Laurence M., [redacted].
Kessler, Kenneth C., [redacted].
Koy, Kenneth C., [redacted].
Kirkman, Elaine M., [redacted].
Kornreich, Leonard M., [redacted].
Kunstel, Kenny J., [redacted].
Latta, Jerry B., Jr., [redacted].
Lawrence, Roy G., Jr., [redacted].
Lind, Herbert E., [redacted].
Long, Rayburn E., [redacted].
Lowery, Sammy L., [redacted].
Manning, James G., Jr., [redacted].
Mauldin, George R., [redacted].
McGregor, Stewart K., [redacted].
McLean, John M., [redacted].
Michaud, Robert R., [redacted].
Miller, Gene L., [redacted].
Mirgeler, Frank R., Jr., [redacted].
Moberley, Ben E., [redacted].
Mrozinski, Joseph D., [redacted].
Muhlethaler, Robert C., [redacted].
Newton, Lud A., [redacted].
Noyes, James L., [redacted].
O'Connell, Paul V., [redacted].
O'Connor, David E., [redacted].
Ortiz, Luis R., [redacted].
Pavulak, Paul E., [redacted].
Pickens, Joe A., [redacted].
Prather, Ted W., [redacted].
Priest, Robert W., [redacted].
Puckett, Michael R., [redacted].
Purcell, John P., Jr., [redacted].
Quisenberry, James D., [redacted].
Rickman, Alfred C., [redacted].
Rittenhouse, David L., [redacted].
Roach, Frank L., [redacted].
Russell, Richard D., [redacted].
Sapp, David C., [redacted].
Sater, Derrol H., [redacted].
Scharding, John H., [redacted].
Schmidt, James E., [redacted].
Seaton, James A., [redacted].
Shepard, Stephen E., [redacted].
Socky, Lloyd, [redacted].
Sparks, William T., [redacted].
Specht, William T., [redacted].
Stanley, Richard A., [redacted].
Stevens, James E., Jr., [redacted].
Stirling, William W., [redacted].
Sullivan, Thomas J., Jr., [redacted].
Thomas, Clifford M., [redacted].
Thompson, Grover F., [redacted].
Tiggle, Charles B., [redacted].
Turk, John D., [redacted].
Uhler, Karen T., [redacted].
Urban, Dennis E., [redacted].
Vanderpool, Jack R., [redacted].
Vollman, Dennis E., [redacted].
Wagner, Jimmie R., [redacted].
Warren, Stephen F., [redacted].
Webster, Jimmy N., [redacted].
Wentz, William G., [redacted].
Wilson, William F., [redacted].
Yates, Theodore W., [redacted].
Young, Robert H., [redacted].
Youngblood, George L., Jr., [redacted].

To be second lieutenant

Carbone, Joseph D., [redacted].
Dionne, Raoul B., [redacted].
Doherty, Thomas, [redacted].
Drain, Cecil B., [redacted].
Eggers, John L., [redacted].
Everette, Kirby L., [redacted].
Forshey, David L., [redacted].
Gustine, James E., [redacted].
Henderson, John H., [redacted].
Hesson, Philip A., [redacted].
Hiner, William O., Jr., [redacted].
Hollar, Reinhardt, [redacted].
Holmes, Frederick T., [redacted].
Hopkins, Johnny L., [redacted].
Hunter, Cardell S., [redacted].
Jeter, Manning T., III, [redacted].
Johnson, Ronald A., [redacted].
Kling, Gary L., [redacted].
Kray, Jerome G., [redacted].
Lindley, Richard B., [redacted].
Ludlam, Louis C., [redacted].
Mason, Daniel O., [redacted].
Newton, John H., [redacted].
North, Teddy R., [redacted].
Owen, Kenneth A., [redacted].
Parrish, Maurice B., [redacted].
Stephenson, Michael T., [redacted].
Vibbert, Dallas M., [redacted].
Wilson, Thomas A., [redacted].

The following-named scholarship students for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States in the grade of second lieutenant, under provisions of title 10. United States Code, sections 2107, 3283, 3284, 3286, 3287, 3288, and 3290:

Brown, Bryan R., [redacted].
Egan, Michael C., [redacted].

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Aabye, William Walter
Adams, David Earl, Jr.
Adams, Dennis Jack
Adams, James Leo
Adams, Joe Richard
Adams Loran McLean
Adamson, John Chauncey
Ahern, Richard Terry
Alasin, Ronald Alexander
Aldridge, Randolph Clay
Allbert, Eugene Lee
Allen, Charles Luther, Jr.
Allen, George Tyler
Allen, Kenneth Eugene
Allen, Robert Ripley
Allen, Terry Jon
Alley, Lindsey Davis
Alley, Ronald Dean
Almy, John Hale, II
Amidon, Robert Bruce
Anderson, Gary Keith
Anderson, Jon Eric
Anderson, John Frederic, Jr.
Anderson, Randall Montgomery
Anderson, Stephen Gary
Appleyard, Russell Loring
Arcana, Stephen Michael
Arlett, Stephen McLean
Arneson, Robert Jeffrey

Arnold, James Laurence
Arnold, Joe Gary
Arnold, Thomas Edward
Arnow, Fredric Grant
Anderson, John Frederic, Jr.
Asmus, Lawrence James
Atchison, Donald Lee
Atkins, Terrence Grant
Ayd, Edward Harold
Back, Ronald Clayton
Bacon, Garwood William
Badman, Fred Sweet
Bahringer, James Paul
Bailey, Chester Hinton
Bailey, Robert Chalmers
Baity, A. Thomas
Baker, Clyde Ernest
Baker, Donald Charles
Ball, Michael Ernest
Bambenek, Charles Lee
Banks, Stephen Anthony
Bannister, Clarence Quincy
Barabash, Jay
Baran, Robert Austin
Barasha, Lewis Michael, Jr.
Barber, James Walter
Barber, Leland Ray
Bardal, David Lavern
Bargar, William Lamont
Barlow, Terrell Wayne
Barnes, John Brooks
Barnes, Larry Ronald
Barrett, John Graham
Barrett, John David
Barron, Floyd Archie
Bartlett, Paul Robert
Barwick, James Francis
Basquin, Philip Ward
Bast, William Victor
Bates, Charles Kirk
Baugh, Frederick Henry
Baum, Julian Elwood, III.
Baum, Raymond Ernest, Jr.
Bauman, Ronald Bruce
Bayer, Frederick Barnhart, III
Bayer, Ronald Keith
Beabout, Robert Franklin
Beakley, James Edwin
Beam, Alan Robert
Beaty, William Everett, III
Bechtel, Richard Craig
Beck, Scott Arthur
Becker, Gerard Frederick
Becker, John Joseph, Jr.
Becker, Peter Joseph
Beckwith, Robert William
Beedle, Darvin Elno, II
Beliech, Dewey Eldridge, Jr.
Bell, John Franklin
Belitz, William Russell
Bender, Richard James Alexande
Bennett, Richard Wayne
Berg, Richard Paul
Berg, Robert Dewayne
Berg, Sigval Manford, Jr.
Bergner, Jon Clark
Berning, Ronald Charles
Berns, Thomas Herbert
Berry, Carl Thomas, Jr.
Beverage, Parker Joy
Bibbo, Peter Paul
Bieger, George Robert
Bierbower, William Bruce
Billones, August John
Bishop, Donald Clifford
Bishop, George Robert, Jr.
Bishop, Kenneth Ralph
Bishop, Peter Birney
Black, Gerald Lee
Black, Harold David
Black, Roy Willard
Black, Terrence Wade
Blackburn, William Rockwell
Blackwood, Donald William
Blair, Dennis Cutler
Blair, William Allen
Blake, Frank J.
Blake, Richard Earl
Blanchard, Robert Charles
Bland, Richard David
Blank, Vincent Earl
Blankenship, Leroy William
Blankenship, Mark Russell
Blatt, Norman William
Blenkle, William George
Bliss, Albert McChesney
Blodgett, George Richard
Blume, George Herman, II
Board, George Robert
Bobo, Ronald Brown
Bodenhorn, Gregory Stuart
Boehler, Don William, Jr.
Boger, Dan Calvin
Bogert, James Arthur
Boggs, H. Glenn, II
Bogle, William Thomas Randolph
Bohlig, James William
Boire, Paul Maurice
Bomarito, Douglas Michael
Bonas, Gerhard Hubert, Jr.
Bonny, Ross Frederick, Jr.
Booher, Stephen Reed
Boorom, Robert Francis
Boorum, Peter Galloway
Booth, Robert Walter
Born, John Julius
Borowiec, Richard Raymond
Boswell, Charles Maurice
Bott, Robert Francis
Bowden, John Robert
Bower, Duane Bruce
Bowers, John Courtney
Bowers, William Charles
Boyce, Michael Thomas
Boyd, David Edwin
Boyd, Richard Allen
Boykin, William Swift, Jr.
Boylan, Harold Gerard, Jr.
Bradford, James Charles
Bradley, Fred H., Jr.
Bradley, John Earl, Jr.
Bradley, Samuel A.
Brady, Donald Robert
Bramblett, Jack
Brandon, David Randall
Brandt, Robert Eugene, Jr.
Bratsch, Roger Donley John
Bratzler, David Karl
Bray, John Kenneth
Breeden, George Leakin, II
Brengle, James Kenneth
Brennan, Edward Joseph
Brennon, Roy Leslie, Jr.
Brett, Joseph Donnis
Brewer, Norman Kent
Brickler, Gilbert Jerome, Jr.
Briscoe, James William
Brletich, Frank Richard
Broadhead, Joseph James, III
Brodeur, Joseph Paul
Brooke, John Richard
Brooks, Clinton Walter, Jr.
Brotherton, James Douglass
Brown, Gerald Allen
Brown, James Willard
Brown, James Michael
Brown, Richard Mitchell, III
Brown, Robert Leslie
Brown, Robert Edward
Brown, Roger Conway
Brown, William Andrew
Bryant, Gary Ward
Bryant, Kenneth Paul
Bryden, Kenneth Chester
Buchanan, Richard Alan
Buck, Steven Lee
Budney, Albert Joseph
Bulkeley, Peter Wood
Bulman, Melvin John
Burda, Alois John, III
Burger, Gary Conrad
Burgess, Benjamin Franklin, III
Burin, James Michael
Burkett, Jerome Phillip
Burks, John Smeallie
Burnett, David Silas, Jr.
Burns, Charles Alan
Burns, Richard Francis, Jr.
Burrow, Barry Vaile
Busby, Douglas Lee
Busby, John Carroll, III
Buss, Phillip Terry
Butler, William Henry
Butler, William Russell, Jr.
Buzhardt, Harry Olin, Jr.
Buzzell, Richard Howard
Byam, John Winthrop, Jr.
Byars, Mark Long
Byrd, Carroll David
Byrd, William Joseph
Cahill, Michael Joseph
Cahn, Robert Solomon
Caldwell, Ellis Alton
Caldwell, Joseph Wallace
Caloway, Grover Randolph
Camp, Richard Michael
Campbell, Darrell Wayne
Campbell, Jay Alan
Cannon, William James
Carlin, William Philip
Carlson, Robert Stanley
Carman, Ernest Westervelt, II
Carmody, James Albert
Carpenter, Harold Francis
Carpenter, Lee Allan
Carroll, James Chester
Carron, Michael Joseph
Carter, Lynn, II
Carter, Richard Bruce
Carter, Robert Keith
Cartwright, John Beck
Cartwright, William Fuller
Casey, James Francis, Jr.
Catania, John Jacob
Cates, Clifton Bledsoe, III
Cavanaugh, Michael Patrick
Celmer, John Anthony
Center, William Dillard
Cepeda, William Lohr
Chaisson, James Edgar
Chaloupka, Allan Bischof
Chaney, Dennis Allen
Charuhas, Richard Brian
Chatham, Howard Maitland
Chavez, Angelo
Cheek, Manson Harold
Chernegie, Michael Alexander
Chesnut, Wilbur Eugene
Chester, Robert Allen
Chisholm, Christopher Ian
Christopher, Angelus Demetri
Church, John Henry, Jr.
Church, Michael Arthur
Clabaugh, Cecil Allen
Clapp, William Reynold
Clark, James Samuel
Clark, Philip Spratt, Jr.
Clark, William Stanton, Jr.
Clarke, Edwin Alfred
Cleal, Stephen Roger
Clefton, Gordon Allen
Clements, Jerry Allen
Climer, Clyde Hollis
Clover, Richard Samuel, III
Coats, Michael Loyd
Cobb, William Wilson, Jr.
Coble, Melvin Alan
Coffey, Philip George, III
Cohen, Jay Martin
Cohlmeyer, Chris Harold
Colbourn, Thomas Adams
Cole, Frederick Byron
Cole, Peter William
Cole, Richard John, II
Cole, Richard Ward
Coleman, Richard Lewis
Coles, Julian Ralph
Collins, James Lloyd
Collins, William Thomas, Jr.
Colvert, Robert Gary
Comer, Thomas Arthur
Conaway, Robert Michael
Connellan, Joseph Peter
Connelly, John Thomas
Connors, Bruce Hartmann
Conrad, Raymond Paul
Conway, Joseph Vincent, Jr.
Conyers, Robert John
Cook, Jeffrey Alan
Cook, Ronald Earl
Cookinham, James Bryan Hulburd

Cooley, George Cornelius
Cooley, John Sharpe
Cooper, Bruce Paul
Cooper, Harold Lambert
Cooper, William Richard
Corey, Robert Orrin, Jr.
Cornett, Ronald Jerry
Corr, Howard Alan
Corrigan, Gerard Michael
Cosgrove, John Patrick
Cosgrove, Robert Michael
Costlow, Allan James
Cottle, William Thomas
Couch, Charles Andrew
Coumatos, Michael James
Courville, James Dewey
Cowan, Robert Lee, Jr.
Coyle, Daniel Charles, Jr.
Crabtree, Michael Calvin
Craig, David Michael
Craig, James Robert
Crapps, Clark Peat
Crawford, Jerry Wayne
Crawshaw, Robert Ord
Crego, Howard Lawrence
Cristina, Anthony Edward
Crotteau, Robert Allen
Crumrine, James Everett
Cullen, James Stephen
Cummins, Eugene Joseph, Jr.
Cunningham, Reed Ligon
Cunningham, Kenneth Newton
Cunningham, David Lynn
Curran, William Maurice
Curtis, Lee Ross
Curtis, Philip James
Curtis, Richard Mark
Cyrus, David Eugene
Daigle, Noel Anthony
Dale, John Lipscomb
Daly, Thomas Milton
Dam, Allan Scott
Danberg, Robert Benell
Danesi, Michael Edmund
Danna, Richard John
Dantone, Harold Brelsford
Dantzler, Herman Lee, Jr.
Dare, James Ashton, Jr.
Darsney, David Paul
Daughenbaugh, John Stewart
David, King Jack
Davies, Gregory John
Davis, Dudley Leroy
Davis, Edward Lyle
Davis, Gary Malcolm
Davis, Henry Louis
Davis, John Philip
Davis, Robert Glenn
Davis, William Randall
Davis, William Aaron, Jr.
Dawson, James Seth, III
Deholl, Robert Arbuthnot
Deimler, James Dennis
Delaney, Kevin Francis
Deleeuw, William
Dempsey, John Garrett
Dengler, Frank Gavin
Dennis, Jackie Lee
Derry, John Harry, Jr.
Desautels, Jeffrey Henry
Desilets, Robert Auguste
Dettmann, Terry Robert
Devlin, Joseph Vincent
Devries, James Floyd
Dew, John Robert
Dexter, Donald Nelson
Dibiase, Gene Frederick
Dickinson, John Duff
Dickover, David George
Diefendorf, Peter Barry
Diffley, Peter
Dilley, Dennis Patrick
Dilley, Robert Thatcher, II
Dimock, James Robert
Dinkelspiel, Robert Louis
Dinwiddie, Hugh Norman
Divine, Thomas Frank
Dix, Richard Jack
Dixon, William Paul
Doctor, Laird Ashley
Dodd, James Lee
Dodson, Timothy Joe
Doe, James Ernest
Donga, John Leonard
Donlon, Thomas Francis, Jr.
Doolin, Edward Hamilton, III
Dormer, James Warren
Dorratcague, Dennis Eugene
Dorsett, Lawrence Preston
Doss, David Leon
Doty, Anthony Orr
Dougherty, Anthony W.
Douglas, Charles Owen
Douglas, Robert Eugene
Dow, William Craig
Downey, John Bernard
Downing, William Milnor, IV
Doyle, John Stuart, Jr.
Doyle, Robert Charles
Dozier, Edward Chris
Drain, Jesse Cyrus, III
Drake, Frank David
Drake, John Oliber, Jr.
Dranchak, John Charles
Drew, Richard, II
Drew, Ronald Lewis
Drury, John Lee
Dry, Melvin Spence
Dudderar, Raymond Albert, Jr.
Duecy, Charles Patrick
Duensing, James Allyn
Dufford, George Chester, Jr.
Duffy, Timothy William
Duggan, Robert Francis
Duke, Clinton Harrison, Jr.
Dumas, Jeffrey Mack
Duminiak, Robert Francis
Duncan, John Hollis
Duncan, Michael Joseph
Dunker, William Lawrence
Dunn, James Thomas
Durgin, Harlan Michael
Dusa, Ronald John
Dutton, Hubert Langston, Jr.
Dwyer, Kevin Richard
Dwyer, Stephen Michael
Dyckman, Dennis Vincent
Earle, Otis Keener
East, Richard Hackett
Easterling, Lael Ray
Eastman, Guy Arthur
Eastman, Jon Andrew
Eaves, Robert Arthur, Jr.
Eberth, Robert William
Edwards, Arthur Lee
Edwards, Brian Alfred
Edwards, David Anthony
Edwards, Robert Andrew
Edwards, Wilbur Everette, Jr.
Eiserloh, Philip Lawrence
Eisold, John Francis
Ekstrom, Robert Harry
Eldred, William Lester
Elliott, Lawrence Bruce
Elliott, Richard Francis
Elliott, Robert Russell
Elliott, Ross Tompkins
Ellis, Charles Eugene
Ellis, Howard Dorf
Elmendorf, Jon Rice
Elsner, James Allen
Emery, Sidney Williams, Jr.
Enderlein, William Phillip
Engle, Edward Charles
Englebretson, Ronald Earl
Enright, Thomas Howard
Ensminger, Gerald David
Erb, Robert Stephen
Erickson, Richard Clark
Errickson, Wayne
Escajeda, Ruben
Eskew, John Daniel
Esposito, John Philip
Etter, Steven Milton
Evans, Patrick Lewis
Evans, Robert Stacy
Evert, Richard Downey
Every, Robert Eugene
Ewers, Benjamin James, Jr.
Fagyal, Edward Alexander, Jr.
Fal, James Stanley
Farina, John Francis
Farrell, Frank John
Farrell, James Peter
Fastabend, Gerald Earl
Fates, Richard Janney
Faulkner, George Pruitt, Jr.
Fawcett, Peter Formanek
Fedie, Michael Lee
Felger, Herman Victor
Fellner, William Stolk
Fenton, John Ward
Ferenchick, Richard John
Ferguson, Robert Andrew, Jr.
Fernandez, William, II
Ferrell, David Michael
Ferris, Richard Lee
Fessenden, Richard Mial
Felter, Gregory Philip
Fetterly, Larry Robert
Finney, Edwin Carlton, Jr.
Fischer, Edward Bussey
Fischer, Edward Francis
Fisher, Mark Wayne
Fishman, Gary Lance
Fish, Stephen Wallace
Fitzgerald, John Stephen
Fitzgerald, Michael Joseph
Flaherty, Dennis James
Flaherty, James Thomas
Flaherty, Michael Bart
Flanagan, Nathan Barney
Flandreau, Mark Endicott
Flarey, Anthony James
Fletcher, Michael Henry
Flick, Hugh Meredith, Jr.
Folker, Cecil Jackson
Folker, Stanley Frank, Jr.
Fontanier, Charles Eugene
Fontz, Charles Roy
Forbes, Jimmy McMillan, Jr.
Forbes, Keith Cary
Fossum, Anton Phillip
Fossum, Leon Keith
Foulsham, Charles Kenneth
Fowler, Jonathan Peters
Fowler, Michael Dulany
Fox, James Richard
Fox, Steven Merritt
Foye, Brian Asa
Francis, Gary Edward
Frank Joe Lee, III
Frank, Timothy Michael
Frederick, Ronald Jon
Freeland, Charles Douglas
Freeman, Floyd Eugene
Freeswick, Douglas John
French, Richard Wayne
Freudenthal, Paul Edward
Froggett, Stephan John
Fromme, Benjamin Charles
Frostad, Theodor Bernard
Fry, Eldon James
Fry, Joseph Francis
Fry, Robert Marvin
Fulghum, Robert Dale
Fullar, William John
Gaffney, Paul Golden, II
Gaines, Carl Amos, Jr.
Gaines, Gary West
Galentine, Paul Guy, III
Gallery, Philip Daly, Jr.
Gardner, George Henry, III
Garrett, Cain, Jr.
Garrett, Charles Edward
Garrigues, Ned William
Garrison, Alan Willard
Gartner, Jeffrey Winter
Garwood, Richard Mallery
Gaston, Everett Blair
Gates, John Kenneth
Gaul, Michael Terrence
Geer, George Barnash
Geiger, Frederick John
Gelsomino, Michael Joseph
Gemelli, Ralph Joseph
Genstil, Stephen Michael
German, James Jay
Germani, Thomas Robert
Gibbs, Dennis Keith
Giffin, Bryant Wayne
Gilbert, George Roland
Gilliland, Robert Patrick

Gillaspie, Robert Morton
Gilleskie, Robert Joseph
Gillespie, Lindsay Moore
Gilliam, Nicholas Barnet
Gilmartin, Joseph William, Jr.
Gingrich, Stewart Lee
Gisch, Robert Gary
Givens, Larry Russell
Gladics, John Steven
Glaser, Richard James
Glidden, Stephen William
Glisan, Duane Leon
Glover, Terry Lee
Glutting, Joseph Christopher
Glynn, Hugh Francis
Gmeiner, Rocklin Everett, Jr.
Goetz, Daryl Lee
Goldberg, Ira Edward
Goldfinch, Albert Louis
Goldmeyer, Frederick Richard
Good, David Stanley
Good, Paul Alan
Goode, Eugene Francis
Goodman, Sheldon J.
Goodsell, Charles Michael
Gordon, Lyman Crandon, Jr.
Gorham, Lawrence Morrison
Gottschalk, Glenn Fredric
Gowen, Charles Thomas
Grabill, Charles Eugene, Jr.
Graham, Daniel Earl
Graham, Roy Edward, Jr.
Grannis, William Walter
Grant, Gary Maxwell
Graves, William Roberts
Gray, Craig Albert
Gray, Lawrence Alan
Green, Thomas Frederick
Green, William John
Greenberger, David
Greene, Darold Price
Greer, James Walter, Jr.
Griffin, Robert Edward, Jr.
Grimes, John David
Grimm, Barry Reid
Grimm, William Frank
Grinnell, Raymond James, Jr.
Gross, Christian Robert
Grulli, Michael David
Grun, William Frederick
Guilbert, Shelby Sanders
Gump, Robert Edgar
Gunter, James William, Jr.
Gunther, Martin Albert
Gurley, Zenas Norman
Gustafson, Harry Leonard, III
Gygax, Felix Stephen
Habel, Paul Grimmer
Hagan, Edward Francis
Hagen, Michael Francis
Hagenbruch, Robert Henry
Haggland, Alan Lee
Haglund, Bruce Thadd
Haines, Stephen George
Hall, Dale Thomas
Hall, Marshall Vansant
Hall, Robert Carter
Hallauer, Russell Lewis
Hallman, Denis Stilwell
Hamilton, Jerry Allen
Hamilton, John Wesley
Hamilton, Reed Duncan, Jr.
Hamilton, Steven Monroe
Hamm, Roger Harold
Hammer, Don Charles
Hammond, Rayford Earl
Hampshire, Eddie Walter
Hampson, James Price
Hamre, Peter Eugene
Hankins, Irvin White, III
Hannifin, Steven Patrick
Hannigan, James John, III
Hanrahan, John Dennis
Hanssen, Henry Raphael, Jr.
Harden, Charles Edward
Hardin, Larry Kenneth
Hardin, Tommie Dean
Harding, Wynn Allen
Harford, Joseph Lee
Harmes, William Andrew
Harmon, Billy Ward
Harmon, James William, Jr.
Harmon, Rockne Patrick
Harper, James Edward
Harper, Weldon Lee
Harrell, Sidney Lawrence
Harris, George Scott
Harris, Joe Newton
Hart, Larry Joe
Harty, John, III
Harvell, Michael Cleland
Harvey, Edwin Jackson
Harvey, James Robert
Harville, Robert Albert
Hassell, Thomas Jerrold
Hatcher, Douglas Carlton
Haverland, Mark Albert
Hawkins, Robert Baran
Hay, Donald Ross
Hayes, Jack Douglas
Hayes, John McWane
Hayes, Robert Leslie
Hayes, Thomas
Haynsworth, Perry Beattie, Jr.
Hayward, Bruce Winslow
Healy, Donald Jeremiah
Hearn, Thomas William
Hebblewhite, Harry Rives
Heckert, Craig Robert
Heffernan, Ralph Richard
Heid, William John
Heil, Charles Clayton, Jr.
Heilmann, Thomas Carl
Heintz, John Wade, Jr.
Heinzel, John Thomas
Heitzman, Gordon E
Heitzman, Jerry Lee
Helfrich, Patrick Clyde
Heller, David Alan
Helm, John L.
Hemken, Leonard Fred
Henderson, Joseph Kee
Henderson, Robert Dale
Hendricks, Dale Wayne
Hendrix, Royal Felix III
Henrickson, Thomas Eric
Hepler, Richard Brian
Herriford, Jimmy Lewis
Herzberg, Donald Dale
Hester, William Leon, Jr.
Heubach, James William
Hewlett, Edward Malcolm
Hicks, Stormy Thomas William
Higgins, James Francis, Jr.
Higgs, Alfred Henry, Jr.
Highsmith, Raymond Carl, Jr.
Hildebrandt, Philip Clay
Hill, Carl Clifton, III
Hill, David George
Hill, Donal McIlvaine
Hill, William Foster
Hillard, John Rains
Hinkle, James Bruce
Hinsman, Donald Ernest
Hinson, Louie Caldwell
Hintz, Edward Joseph, Jr.
Hoban, William James
Hodges, George Lee, Jr.
Hodgson, David Alan
Hodson, Eric Staf
Hoeche, John Wayne
Hoffman, Herbert Stewart, III
Hoffman, Robert Emmett
Hofwolt, Gerald Lee
Hogan, John Patrick
Hogan, Richard Harden, Jr.
Hogan, Walton Lewis, Jr.
Holden, Hugh Frederick
Holian, Francis Kevin
Holihan, Robert George, Jr.
Hollenbeck, Bernard Guy, Jr.
Hollerbach, Robert John
Holliday, Thomas Baird.
Hollyfield, Edward Reid.
Holmberg, Arvid Leroy.
Holmes, Richard Thor
Holmes, Robert Allen
Holzapfel, Bruce Matthew
Honigschmidt, James Otto
Honour, Craig Gibson
Hood, Edward Francis Miller
Hooker, Gilbert Norman
Hoover, Harwood, Jr.
Hopcroft, Harry Joseph, Jr.
Hopkins, Raymond Joseph
Horn, Thomas James
Horne, Kenneth Alfred
Horne, Lance Cameron
Horney, Gregory
Horton, William Glennwood
Hosp, Howard Lynn
Hotaling, Andrew Jay
Hough, Phillip Geoffrey
Houghton, Thomas Christopher
Houin, Eric Joseph
Howe, William Bruce
Howell, Michael Wayne
Howell, Ralph Marion
Howland, Roger Jensen
Huban, George Hambre, Jr.
Huber, Elbert William
Hubert, David Leroy
Hudgens, Ambrose William, Jr.
Hudson, Carl Eugene
Hudson, Gerald Peter
Huey, Forrest Randall
Huffaker, Douglas Dean
Huggins, Robert Lloyd
Hughes, John Farrell
Hughes, Joseph Dennis
Hughes, Roger Neal
Hull, Roger Kermit
Hulme, Woodrow Wilson, II
Humphreys, Alvin Norman
Humphreys, James Arthur, III
Hunnicutt, John Osborne, III
Hunter, Gerald Franklin, Jr.
Hunter, John David
Huntington, George William
Hurst, Dennie Wayne
Hurston, James Edward
Hutchins, John Gardner
Hyde Richard Webster, Jr.
Hydinger, John Paul
Ihli, Carl Bolton, Jr.
Ilgenfritz, Kenneth William
Inglis, Thomas Nelson, III
Inouye, Lance Masao
Irelan, Dennis Wayne
Iversen, Gary Kenneth
Jackson, Joseph Ingram, Jr.
Jackson, William Henry, Jr.
Jacobs, Francis Theodore
Jacobs, Frederick Thomas
Jacobson, Mark Ernst
James, Bruce Edward
Jankovic, Oleg
Janov, Bernard
Jantz, Michael William
Jedrlinic, John Anthony
Jenkins, Eben Kenneth
Jensen, Gary Dean
Johann, Robert Kaylor
Johns, Vernon Michael
Johnsen, Robert Lynn
Johnson, Adrian Warren, Jr.
Johnson, Gordon James
Johnson, James Walter
Johnson, Jay Lynn
Johnson, John Michael
Johnson, Jon Craig
Johnson, Lairy Adrian
Johnson, Paul Francis
Johnson, Quentin Charles
Johnson, Robert Stephen
Johnson, Ronald Ross
Johnson, Stephen Alger
Joines, James Junior
Jonasson, William Bradford, Jr.
Jones, Alfred Anthony
Jones, Harland Wilber, Jr.
Jones, Michael Alan
Jones, Richard Leonard
Jones, Stephen King
Jonik, Philip Anthony
Joyce, Kevern Richard
Kadlick, Richard Mark
Kalashian, Daniel
Kaler, Robert Larry

Kambic, William Joseph
Kane, John Edward, Jr.
Kane, William John
Katauskas, Philip John
Katsetos, Chris Louis
Kavale, Joseph John
Keagy, Thomas James
Keane, Walter Francis, Jr.
Keaton, William Creath
Keef, Mark Byron
Keefe, Richard Joseph
Keefer, Richard Lee
Keith, Philip Allen
Keithly, John Luther
Kellett, Raymond Arthur, Jr.
Kelly, James Scott
Kelly, Lawrence Michael
Kelsey, David Bruce
Kemp, John Melton
Kennedy, John Francis
Kennedy, John Patrick
Kern, James Franklin
Kerr, Thomas Webster
Kersey, Michael Laurence
Kevan, Mark Richard
Kick, Nelson Joseph, Jr.
Kidd, Raymond Charles
Kiechel, Walter, III
Kiernan, Loyd Julian, III
Kiffer, James Christian
Kilmartin, Hugh Edward, Jr.
Kimball, David Patten
Kincaid, Thomas Richard
Kinney, Richard Stephen
Kinnison, Gary J.
Kirkendall, James Edward, Jr.
Kivlin, Philip Burge
Kjeldsen, Richard Christian
Klausner, James John
Klein, Johnu Charles, III
Knapp, John Charles
Knapp, Larry Ray
Knode, Ronald Barry
Knust, Fred Prahl
Koch, William Radcliffe
Koehler, Richard Evans
Koenig, Karl Victor
Kolarcik, Kenneth Ernest
Kollasch, Orville Alvin
Koller, John
Koopman, Theodore
Kosich, John Lewis
Kosky, Edward Louis
Kraatz, William Harry
Kratovil, Edward William
Kratovil, Robert Orville
Krause, Larry Lee
Krawchuk, Peter
Kressel, Herbert John
Krogstad, Bruce Norris
Kroll, James Thomas
Krulis, Richard Paul
Krumbholz, Karl Otto
Krupnick, Charles Alexander
Kuehn, Leo Steven
Kullberg, Wayne Robert
Kusiak, Patrick John
Labate, Henry Anthony
Lacey, Walter Hamer II
Ladouce, Ralph Jeffrey
Lafleur, Jean Russell
Lagow, Michael Laird
Lagraff, Kevin John
Lai, Alexander
Lamarche, Jay Richard
Lambert, Max Richard
Lammers, Roger Anthony
Landon, Philip Craig
Lane, William Michael
Laney, Robert Bayliss
Lankford, Ronny Dean
Lanning, John Thomas
Lantrip, Bobby Bennett
Lapicola, John Jay
Larock, Francis, Jr.
Larson, Vernon James
Larue, James Lloyd
Lascala, Bernard Joseph
Lawrence, Robert Edwin, Jr.
Lawson, Bobby Ray
Lawson, Robert James, Jr.
Lawton, Richard Warren
Layl, Jerry Neal
Lear, Daniel Barrett
Leatherbury, George William
Leaver, Stephen Coffman
Leblanc, Paul William
Lee, Charles Allen
Lee, David Michael
Lee, Douglas Edward
Lee, John Warren
Lee, Robert Edward
Leffew, James Thomas
Lehman, Leo Joseph, Jr.
Lekander, Daniel Jon
Lemon, Ronald Scott
Lenz, Jack Carl
Leppert, Michael Erwin
Lesesne, Joseph Bancroft
Lewis, Edgar Barry
Lewis, Michael Nelson
Lewis, Robert Ernest
Lifgren, James Arthur
Linberger, Alan Gamble
Lindner, Theodore Martin
Lindoerfer, Paul Wesley
Lindsey, Charles Morgan
Lindstedt, Russell James, II
Lindstrom, Eric David
Linn, Larry Dean
Linnen, David Charles
Linton, Paul Allen
Liotard, Andre Robert
Lipinski, John Bernard
Lipson, Merek Evan
Little, Douglas Bruce
Logue, Donley Charles, Jr.
Lohla, Jerry Alan
Lohnes, Jonathan James
Long, Kirk Alan
Long, Philip Reeves
Long, Robert Lavern
Longardt, Michael George
Longerbone, James Michael
Longeway, David Michael
Lopez, Albert Richard
Louder, Frederick Charles, Jr.
Lowe, Michael Baxter
Lowry, William Harlan
Luca, Matthew Harmon
Lucas, Robert Gillem
Lucey, Joseph Francis
Ludwig, John Elmer, III
Lund, Allan Bruce
Lundquist, Carl Iver
Lydiard, John Morton, III
Lynch, Edward Junior
Lyons, John Thomas, III
Lysaker, Jack Thomas
MacCoy, Bruce David
Maciejewski, John Norbert
Mackey, Malcolm Clay
Mackin, John Joseph
MacNeill, Kent Van Lewis
Madden, Edward Leo
Madden, Thomas Francis
Madel, Robert William
Magee, William Thomas, III
Mahumed, Karl Arthur
Maiden, Jesse Joe
Mallon, David Joseph, Jr.
Malmborg, Charles Leroy
Mangin, Albert Mitchell
Manker, William Harold, Jr.
Man, Edward Francis, Jr.
Mara, Theodore John
Marenbach, Harry Alfred
Marquis, William Phillip
Marra, John Frank
Marschner, Walter David
Marsh, Frank Anthony
Marshall, Philip Roundy
Marshall, William Dale
Marshall, William McFarland, Jr.
Martin, James Philip
Martin, Kenneth Wayne
Martin, Kurt Stewart
Martin, Patrick Gregory
Martin, Thomas Francis
Martin, William Henry, III
Martinson, Charles Leonard
Marvel, Dennis Cruce
Marvil, Stephen Patrick
Masden, Ward Beacher, Jr.
Mast, James Welker
Mathers, Lee Jon
Matheson, Stephen Henry
Mathis, Larry Thomas
Matthews, William Charles
Mauck, Charles Joel, III
Mauldin, James Davis Drane, Jr.
Maupin, William Edward, Jr.
Maxwell, David George
Mayer, Charles Walter, Jr.
Mayer, John Frederick, Jr.
Mayo, Richard Walter
Mazza, Joseph Dennis
McAdoo, Richard Allen
McBride, Lawrence Cary
McCaleb, Virgil Frank
McCance, Richard Lee
McCann, Eugene Dennis
McCarthy, John James, Jr.
McCarthy, Joseph Edward
McCarthy, Vincent John
McClure, Halbert Steele Deleon
McConnell, Harry George
McConnell, Lawrence Gregg
McConnell, Michael Charles
McCorkell, Thomas Eugene
McCormack, Jerry Wayne
McCormick, Michael Timothy
McCowan, Kenneth Edwin
McCreary, Walter Ellwood
McDermott, Donald Gray
McDonough, Edward Charles
McDowell, Robert Lloyd
McDowell, William Lee, III
McElroy, William Charles, Jr.
McGarity, Kevin James
McGee, James Murry
McGinnis, Stephen Jack
McGlashan, Douglas Scott
McGlothlin, Clifton Lee
McGough, Charles Randall
McGovern, William Joseph, III
McGowan, Edward Charles, Jr.
McGowan, James William
McGrath, James Patrick
McGrath, Thomas Joseph
McGreevey, Henry Joseph
McGregor, Alexander Bradford
McGuire, John Francis, Jr.
McGuire, Joseph Ruane, Jr.
McHatton, James Thomas
McHugh, Michael Lyn
McIntosh, John Edward
McIntyre, Samuel Peter
McKee, John Raymond, Jr.
McKee, Phillip Francis
McKinnon, William Stephen
McLain, Larry John
McLaughlin, Howard Joseph, Jr.
McLaughlin, James Terrence
McLaughlin, William Thomas
McLaughlin, Arthur Jay, III
McLellan, William Ross
McMahon, Douglas Duvall
McMaster, Timothy Richard
McMullen, Richard Floyd
McMurray, Bruce Kirkland
McNab, John Denise
McNaughton, Paul Richard
McNease, Dwight William
McQuaid, Michael James
McQuerter, Kent Loryn
McRoberts, James Scott
McRoskey, John Henry
Meade, Geoffrey Manning
Meade, Martin Carl
Meadows, Robert Preston
Meads, Leonard Enzer
Meaney, William Michael
Measel, Martin Leman
Meckfessel, John Frederick
Meehan, Patrick Harold
Meehan, Timothy Michael
Meier, Lyle Dean
Menke, James Ewing
Merriam, Alvin Russell

Metcalf, Michael Donald
Metcalf, Stephen
Metzger, Joe David
Metzger, William Robert
Meuchel, Frank Tony
Mewhinney, Thomas Reilly
Meyer, Francis Douglas
Meyer, James Ray
Michael, Don Richard
Micken, Robert Warren
Middlebrooks, Robert Durwood
Mikell, Oswald Lightsey
Milam, James Aaron
Miles, James Edward
Millen, Joseph Andrew
Miller, Dana Fontaine
Miller, Grady Wilson, III
Miller, James John
Miller, John Dudley, Jr.
Miller, Patrick Albertus
Miller, Robert Jerel
Miller, Walter Everett
Miller, William Conrad
Mills, John Martin
Milner, John Henry, Jr.
Miltko, Stanley Edward, Jr.
Minno, Dennis Stephen
Minter, Richard Graham
Mitchell, Theodore Arnold
Mitnik, John
Moak, Donald Charles
Mock, William George
Moffett, James Francis, III
Moir, William Preston
Monagle, Daniel Edward
Monroe, John Frazier
Montgomery, James Derby, Jr.
Montz, Andrew Curtis
Moon, Julian Lafayette, III
Moore, Arnold Preston
Moore, Charles William, Jr.
Moore, Frederick Cranford
Moore, Frederick John
Moore, John Anthony
Moore, Kevin Thomas
Moore, Leland Thompson
Moore, Michael Patrick
Moore, Owen Edward
Moore, Thomas Joseph
Moore, Walker Dupree
Moreau, Richard Baker
Morell, Paul Leroy
Morgan, James Edward
Morgan, Vincent Schuver
Morge, Kenneth Warren
Morgenson, James Eric
Morris, Charles Romulus, III
Morris, Phillip Gail
Morrissey, Michael Joseph
Mortsakis, John Nicholas
Motl, Gerald Patrick
Moyers, Darryl Raymond
Mueller, William Joseph
Muise, Jeffrey Robert
Mulhern, Edward Michael
Mulholland, William Michael
Mullen, Michael Glenn
Mulligan, Robert Dale
Mulvany, Michael Shane
Mundy, William Edward
Muniz, Fred Louis
Munkres, Raymond Dale
Munnikhuysen, Richard Dallam
Munsey, Charles Robert, Jr.
Murach, Edward Francis Joseph
Murray, Leslie Glenn
Mussett, Gerald Thomas
Myers, David Lee
Myers, Richard Noden
Myles, James Albert
Naedel, Richard Gregory
Naughton, Richard Joseph
Nawrocki, Lawrence Meledin
Nawrocki, Peter Anthony
Naydan, Theodore Phillip
Neal, Charles Clinton
Neal, Joseph Alexander Fran, Jr.
Neal, Paul Gartrelle
Neal, Teddy Max
Neale, Michael Tilghman
Nealley, Alan William
Nebel, Kenneth
Nedham, Bruce Harry
Nelson, David William
Nelson, John Stanley
Nelson, Robert Hugo
Nepomuceno, Eugenio Nocon
Neumann, Adolf
Neville, Thomas Francis
Neville, William Josiah, Jr.
Newell, Neal
Newton, Samuel Lambie
Nibe, Richard Jerome
Nichol, James Arthur
Nichols, Kenneth Leslie
Nicholson, Thomas Merl
Nick, Louis Adolph, Jr.
Niehus, James Patrick
Nimmer, David Sherman
Nittle, Jeremy John
Noe, George Albert, Jr.
Noel, Charles Edward
Noerager, Jon Philip
Nolan, Robert Gordon
Nolan, Thomas Francis, IV
Nolter, Joseph Charles
Nonoshita, Wayne Gregory
Nordmann, Robert George
Norman, Ronald Wayne
Norris, Lowell Robert
Norris, Robert Norman, Jr.
Norris, William James
Northrop, Robert Stiles
Nosal, Leonard Jerome
Nugent, John Thomas
Nyman, Keith Oscar
Ober, William Taylor
O'Brian, Alfred Reginald Walter
O'Brien, James Patrick
O'Connor, John Dale
O'Connor, Thomas Charles
O'Dell, Edward James
O'Donnell, Thomas Frederick
Ogdahl, Arthur Theodore
O'Hanlon, Michael David
Ohm, Robert Lee
Ohnemus, Donald Pierre
O'Leary, Cornelius Francis
Oliver, Thomas William, III
Olsen, John Franklin
Olson, Jerome Arning
Oltraver, Dennis Allen
Onder, James Andrew
O'Neil, Michael William
O'Neil, John H., Jr.
Opeka, Donald John
Orzech, James Kenneth
Oser, Eric Leroy
Osth, John Andrew
Otterson, Peder Harlan
Overman, William Robert
Owen, Harold
Owendoff, Robert Scott
Owens, Edward Paul
Owens, James David
Owens, James Clarence
Owens, Richard Lee
Owens, William Winterton, IV
Pacenza, Franklin Joseph
Padgett, Phil B., II
Paine, William Gosnell, Jr.
Palkie, Thomas George
Palmer, David Charles
Palmer, Raymond John, Jr.
Panchura, Michael John, Jr.
Pankow, David Herbert
Parda, Nelson Robert
Parde, Merlin Lee
Parizek, Bruce
Parker, Anthony Weyburn
Parker, Jimmy Wayne
Parkhurst, Lyman Edward
Parrish, John Michael
Parry, Thomas Victor
Partridge, Benjamin Waring, III
Pascoe, Donald Bradley
Patrick, Darl Paul
Patrick, Urey Woodworth, III
Patton, Bernard Warren
Patton, John Collier
Payne, Richard Edward
Peariman, Ellry Bruce
Pearson, James Anthony
Pearson, Robert Thomas
Pearson, Ronald Steven
Pease, Alfred Anthony
Pease, Kendell, Milford, Jr.
Pegden, Burl Richard
Pierce, John Wentworth
Palaez, Marc Yve Eugenio
Peloquin, Peter Joseph
Peltier, Donald Wallace
Perine, Stephen Gray
Perkins, Allen Leroy, II
Perkins, Earl Eugene, Jr.
Perrault, Michael Edward
Perrotta, Joheph William, Jr.
Pestorius, Thomas Daniel
Peter, Leo Edwin, Jr.
Petersen, Robert Elmer
Peterson, Arne Maurice
Peterson, Frank James
Peterson, Gordon Irwin, Jr.
Peterson, Robert Lee
Peterson, Walter Harry
Petrino, Richard Alan Domenick
Pfahl, Roger Alan
Phelan, James Arthur
Phillips, Braden James
Phillips, Everett Leon
Philpott, Bruce Ray
Picciuolo, Jonathan Charles
Pickett, Ludwell Lewis
Piehl, James William
Pier, Jeffrey Ross
Pierman, David Charles
Pinkerton, Everett David
Pinnell, Robert Brian
Pittman, Alan Ralph
Pletscher, James Harvey
Plummer, Douglas Allen
Plyler, Conrad A., Jr.
Polk, Deward Winston
Polk, James Stanley
Polk, Michael Raymond
Pollard, Don Pearson
Ponessa, Alfred Edward
Poole, William Leonard
Porter, Joel Alan
Porter, Joel
Porter, Ronald D.
Posnak, George Peter
Post, John Rockwell, Jr.
Potter, Jay McCune
Potwora, Raymond Paul
Powell, Darrell Russell
Powell, Edward Bennett, Jr.
Powell, William Oscar, III
Powers, Richard George
Prall, Thomas Edward
Prawdzik, David Allen
Preece, Bill Rutherford
Presecan, Thomas Norman
Prestero, Mark George
Pricco, James Stephen
Prince, Michael David
Priscilla, Ronald John
Proctor, Kenneth Allen
Proffitt, Bobby Wayne
Pruske, James Edward
Punches, Jeffrey Newton
Purvis, James Douglas, Jr.
Putnam, Frank William
Putnam, Michael Blair
Pyle, Kenneth Lawrence
Pyrz, Kenneth Edward
Rabb, Michael Tribble
Rabren, Bobby Ray
Raglin, Kenneth Alan
Ralston, Michael Gilbert
Ramer, Orville Glenn
Ramsey, Edward Allen
Randhahn, Gary Joseph
Rasfeld, Joseph Henry
Rasmussen, Andrew Anthony
Rasmussen, Christopher Lee
Rather, James John
Ray, James Billie, Jr.
Reape, Gerald John
Reardon, Andrew Fitzpatrick
Reardon, Kevin John
Rearer, Thomas Charles
Redeker, Steven James

Redford, Melvin Robert, Jr.
Reeber, Christopher Joseph
Reed, James Ronald
Reed, Robert Bushnell, Jr.
Reedy, John G.
Reeves, Billy Smith
Regan, Kevin James
Reidhead, Ricky Morris
Reimert, Ronnie Charles
Reinheimer, Richard
Ribaudo, Nicholas Ross
Ricci, Ronald Vincent
Rice, Arleigh Hamilton, Jr.
Richardson, Harmond Becker, III
Richardson, Arthur Lee, II
Richardson, William Lee
Richardson, Paul Fredrick
Richey, Daniel Otto
Rickards, Elwood Bright, Jr.
Riddle, John Humbert
Rider, Hans Eugene
Ries, Stephen Hamilton
Riffer, William James
Riffle, Donald Lee
Rigsby, John Newton
Riley, Charles William
Riley, Edward Monroe, Jr.
Riley, Francis Clair, Jr.
Riley, Michael Andrew
Rinaldi, Ronald Albert
Ritchie, Coy Doyle, Jr.
Rittenour, Harry Taylor
Rivers, Charles Silas, Jr.
Rizzardi, Dennis Albert
Robben, Charles David, Jr.
Robbins, John Randolph
Robbins, Spencer Everett, II
Roberds, Darryel Lee
Roberts, Gary Gene
Roberts, James Arnold
Roberts, Richard Newton
Roberts, Wade Hampton, Jr.
Roberts, William Pope
Robichaud, Gerald Oliver
Robinson, James Howard
Roby, Charles Kenneth
Roddy, Charles Paul
Roeske, Alfred Duane
Rogers, George Cephas, Jr.
Rogers, William Lynn
Rogers, William Olin
Rogus, David Francis
Rolf, Charles Francis
Ronchetti, Gregory Henry
Rooke, Harold Norman
Roos, Neal Gerald
Rose, John Michael
Ross, David Bernard
Rouse, Fred Lawson
Roux, Jeffrey Andrew
Rovetto, Gary Wayne
Rowland, Charles Brett
Rowley, Dennis James
Ruch, William Leech, III
Ruffin, Paul Denson, Jr.
Ruhe, Barnaby Seiger
Ruland, Thomas Christopher
Rumpf, Daniel John
Russ, John Ernest, III
Russell, Robert Edward
Ruth, Michael Allan
Ryan, Mark Joseph
Sabadie, Patrick Alfonso
Sacks, Brian Lee
Sager, David Alan
Salez, Nelson Charles
Sallee, Fred Merridith
Samms, Floyd Tamerlane, Jr.
Sampson, Gary Allen
Samuelson, David Rudolph
Sanchez, Richard Rhodes
Sandberg, Hyrum Carl, III
Sanders, George Allen
Sandison, Gordon Thomas
Sandoz, John Frederick
Sandoz, Patrick Allen
Sanesi, Nelson Joseph, Jr.
Santarlasci, Joseph Howard, Jr.
Santee, James Liten
Santoro, Michael Anthony
Satterfield, Gary Thomas
Sautter, Frederick Root, Jr.
Savo, John Charles
Sawin, James Leslie
Saxman, Jonathan Humphrey
Saxon, Patrick Hurley
Scales, Francis Leo
Scales, John Cayme, Jr.
Scally, Robert Ernest
Schaefer, Lowell Thomas
Schafer, James Joseph, Jr.
Schanning, Brian Peter
Schantz, Curtiss William J.
Schaubel, Raymond Charles
Schellhaas, Richard Begue, Jr.
Schenkel, Roger Lee
Schiltz, John Allan
Schmidt, George Walker
Schmidt, Henry Edward, Jr.
Schminky, Roy Robert
Schneider, Daniel Henry
Schneider, Richard Fredrick
Scholtens, Michael Jon
Schoonderwoerd, Martin Gene
Schreiber, Robert Arnold
Schreiver, William Herbert
Schrope, Richard Bruce
Schulz, Carl Joseph
Schutter, Peter Arthur
Schwarz, Andrew Jerald
Schwechten, Robert John II
Schweitzer, Robert Charles
Schwertman, James Arthur
Schwikert, Frank Donald
Schwinger, Mark Edward
Sciabarra, Joseph Peter
Scott, Don Bacot
Scott, Donald William
Scott, Richard Frederick
Scott, Robert Mitchell
Scott, Ronald Lynn
Scott, William Nathan, Jr.
Searls, Robert Ray
Sears, Everett Edwin
Seiden, John Ben
Seiders, Marlin David, Jr.
Sell, John Christian
Sellers, Richard Leland
Sellers, William Lester
Senft, Milton Leroy
Serkin, Howard Charles
Serley, James Edward
Shaddix, James Delano
Shade, Robert James
Shaffer, Paul Bruce
Shaner, Randolph Glenn
Shanyfelt, Tommy Lee
Sharon, James Wesley
Sharp, James Robert
Sheddan, James Terry, Jr.
Shields, Joseph Carl
Sholars, Robert Eastman
Shook, Richard Millard
Showers, Michael James
Shroyer, William Leroy
Shults, Porter Revon, Jr.
Shumpert, Harold Corbett
Shurtz, Don Carlos
Sickler, Burton Harry
Sidner, Robert William, Jr.
Siemen, Harry Alfred, Jr.
Sikes, Joseph Kelly
Silverberg, Jon Friedolf
Simmons, David Franklin
Simpson, Michael Ernest
Sinclair, John Rodger
Sine, George William, Jr.
Sink, Francis Leroy
Sippel, Lee Jerome
Sisk, Arnold Jay
Sjoberg, Douglas Martin
Sjostrom, Leonard Carl
Skaar, Gordon Lee
Skipworth, William Holland
Slattery, Joe Allen
Slattery, Michael Gerald
Slebos, Christian Gerard
Smith, Alan Roy
Smith, Donald Edward
Smith, Edward Allen, Jr.
Smith, Floyd Harold
Smith, Gordon Coleman, II
Smith, Gordon Kenneth
Smith, Jack Robert
Smith, Richard Theodore
Smith, Stephen Roger
Smith, William Howard
Smith, William Harold
Smitheman, James Courtland
Smolak, Michael Albert
Snavely, William Wayne, Jr.
Snell, Peter Sherman
Snyder, Donald Clinton, II
Snyder, John Russell
Sobyra, Michael August
Solder, Edward Lee
Solymossy, Joseph Martin
Sorce, Anthony Michael
Southerland, James Julien, III
Southworth, David Moir
Spaeth, Warren Theodore, Jr.
Spalsbury, Clark Stanley, Jr.
Speace, Charles Hayes
Speakman, Glendon Caldwell
Speed, William Goodwin, Jr.
Speers, Thomas Edward, Jr.
Spellman, Donald Jerome
Spencer, Barton Marsh
Spengel, Michael Francis
Spengler, Richard Paul
Spooner, David Ford
Sprey, Douglas
Spruiell, Phillip Ronald
Squires, Robert Lewis
Staebler, Charles Alexande, III
Staley, Miles Marvin
Stamm, Steven Lewis
Stanfield, Kenneth Robert
Stanton, Laird Wilvin
Starks, Victor James
Starr, David Homer
Startt, Thomas Lee
Statton, Charles M., Jr.
Steere, David Campbell
Stehle, Charles Douglas
Steidle, Craig Eugene
Stein, Eric Andrew
Steitz, Peter
Stephenson, Gerald Edward
Steussy, James Michael
Stevens, William Edward
Stewart, Robert Leroy
Still, Daniel William
Stinson, James Alfred
Stocke, John Thomas
Stockslager, William Eby
Stokes, Roger William
Stoll, Robert Edward, Jr.
Stone, Frederick Cecil
Storm, Gary Alan
Stosel, Stanley Lewis
Stovall, John William
Stradley, Michael Ward
Strassberger, John William, Jr.
Strausbaugh, Wayne Lee
Strother, Dennis Edward
Stults, James David
Sturges, James Watler
Stutts, James Cornell, II
Sucato, Paul Joseph
Sullivan, Edward Joseph, Jr.
Sullivan, Jerry Eugene
Sullivan, Joseph Edward
Sullivan, Timothy Thomas
Sundberg, Edward August
Sutter, James Francis
Swain, Scott Cunningham
Swanson, Dale Eugene
Sweatt, William McClain, Jr.
Sweeney, Orval Lester
Swenson, Carl Frederick
Szlaga, Andrew George
Tabb, William Troop, Jr.
Taber, Theron Simeon, III
Talipsky, John Edward
Tamulevich, Carl Joseph
Tangren, Peter Andrew
Tapscott, Kennith Walker
Tarbox, Harold Chester, Jr.

Tauber, Richard Jacob
Taylor, Gerald Edgar
Taylor John Duffy
Taylor, Loren Lee
Taylor, Marcus Gene
Taylor, Norman Robert
Taylor, Richard Ford
Teach, Thomas Adams
Tellman, Donald Francis
Teneyck, Thomas Williard, Jr.
Tess, James Henry
Thacker, Reginald Allen
Thibeau, Richard James
Thomas, Benton Dean
Thomas, H. Clay, III
Thomas, Larry Walter
Thomas, William J.
Thompson, David Mathew
Thompson, John Richard
Thompson, Kenneth Ralph
Thompson, Richard Wittich
Thomas, James William McIntos
Tiedeman, George Ralph
Tillotson, Kenneth Delmer
Tilseth, Don Leroy
Tilson, Paul Evans, Jr.
Timmons, Thomas Francis
Tinkel, Terrence Lee
Tinnon, Lloyd Dean
Tippett, Terry Lee
Tirrell, William Barclay
Titus, Fred Walter, Jr.
Tkach, Michael Joseph
Tobiason, Joel Edward
Tollefson, Michael Rolf
Torbert, Michael Mayne
Tourigny, Leonard Robert
Toussaint, Terry Alan
Treglio, Ames Ronald
Trousdale, David Mangham
Troutman, David Leland
Trulson, Steven Alf
Tuck, William Dean, II
Tucker, Gerald Duane
Tuttle, Paul Eugene, Jr.
Twombly, Arthur Lee
Tyler, Henry David
Tyrrell, Robert Grattan
Uchman, Allen Eugene
Uplinger, Leon Joseph
Upton, Thomas George
Valentine, Bernard Richard Moi
Valleau, Neil Phillip
Vanderlofske, Peter Joseph
Vanderpoel, Eric
Vansaun, David
Vasiliauskas, Algimantas
Vaughn, David Eugene
Vellis, John Demetrius, II
Velsor, Herbert Frank
Venator, Craig David
Verschuern, Joseph
Vice, Larry Wayne
Vieau, J rome Brewster
Virtue, James Paul
Vivrette, Lyndon Richards
Vonsuskil, James David
Vorhoff, Gilbert Harold, Jr.
Voss, Edward John, II
Vranich, Ronald Mathew
Vtipil, Donald Sheridan
Wachowicz, Frederick Steven
Wagenseil, Taylor Brahs
Wagner, Paul Helmut
Wakefield, Robert David
Wales, Jon Bruce
Walker, Allan Ray
Wallace, David William
Wallace, Donald Stephan
Wallace, Ray Anderson
Walsh, Joseph David
Walsh, Neil Patrick
Walters Gary Allan
Walters, Melville Joseph, III
Waltrip, Burrough Allen, Jr.
Warburton, Frederick Thomas, Jr.
Ward, Dennis Lyle
Ward, Joe Frank
Warner, Carl Dean
Warner, Robert Sands, Jr.
Warren, Cassius Clay, Jr.
Washam, Eric Lee
Washer, William Lee
Waterman, Bradford Bates, III
Watson, Jerry Carthal
Watson, Tannis Robert
Watson, Harry Franklin, Jr.
Way, Ervin Ross, Jr.
Wease, Walter Henry, Jr.
Weber, Charles Lawrence, Jr.
Webster, Edward Hollis, III
Webster, Paul Edward
Weiss, Donald Alan
Welch, Lee Kimmel
Wells, Eugene Arthur
Weseloh, Morris Arthur
West, Edward Malcolm
West, Thomas Ben
Westman, Charles Stuart
Wetzel, Jeffrey Peter
Wexler, Stephen Alan
Weyrick, Max Thomas William
Whatley, James Wade
Whitco, Denis John
Whitcraft, John Cecil
White, Charles William
White, Henry Francis, Jr.
White, William Joseph, III
Whitehouse, John Henry, Jr.
Wicklander, Edwin Richard, Jr.
Wickman, Victor Paul
Wiggins, James Howard
Wike, Charles Richard, Jr.
Wikoff, Wallace Leroy
Williams, Clyde Roydon
Williams, Frank Broyles, III
Williams, Ivan Leroy
Williams, Jay Killian Bowman
Williams, Kenneth Lynn
Williams, Nathan Clark
Williams, Steven Albert
Williams, Terrill Douglas
Williams, William Roger
Willms, Gary Roland
Willoughby, Paul Ralph
Willson, Thomas Dexter
Wilner, Douglas David
Wilson, John William, III
Wilson, John Howard
Wilson, Michael Francis
Wilson, Robert Taylor
Wilson, Samuel Nathan, III
Wilson, Stephen Roy
Wilson, William Ralph, Jr.
Wilt, Thornton Willard, Jr.
Wiltzuis, Lawrence Nicholas, Jr.
Wire, Keith Raymond
Wisdom, Hayden Rand
Wisler, Larry Smith
Witte, Gary Paul
Wolverton, Gilbert Leroy
Wood, Gregory James
Wood, Scott Allen
Woodlan, Donald Ray
Woodman, William Douglas
Woodrich, Richard Henry
Woods, Joseph Godfrey
Woods, Larry Joe
Woods, Thomas McCoy, III
Woodward, Richard Calvin
Wooldridge, Francis Rust
Woollen, Edmund Boice
Work, Robert Dale
Worthley, John Abbott
Wray, Donald Milford
Wright, Bruce Alan
Wright, Jay Lee
Wright, Sherman E., Jr.
Wright, William Walter
Wurster, Ronald Frederick
Wyatt, Randall Edward
Wyckoff, George Thomas
Yankolonis, Barry Lee
Yarborough, Thomas Stokes Jr.
Ylitalo, Joe Alan
Yoder, Thomas Harry
York, Russell Clayton
Young, James Albert
Youngblood Frederick Lee
Zacharias, Merle John
Zahn, Howard Edward
Zahner, Richard Randall
Zavadil, John Leslie

The following-named women officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Anderson, Betty Sue
Babb, Anne Elizabeth
Barto, Lona Amonce
Beckart, Sherry Dawn Sikkema
Belling, Patricia Jean
Bishop, Duchess Adams
Canfield, Susan Barbara
Delaere, Lavonne Kay
Dickson, Bonnie Joyce
Franzia, Mary Louis
Granger, Patricia Carol
Hayes, Mary Anne
Hill, Karen Duane
Hintz, Beth Marie
Homko, Pauline Margaret
Johnson, Susan Fairbanks
Johnson, Yvonne Marie
Kerr, Dona Lee
Krampf, Margaret Frances
Lewis, Mary Ruth
Madden, Donna Margaret
Michajluk, Beverly Jae
Mobley, Sydney Donetta
Mullen, Virginia Christine
Pond, Barbara
Riley, Kathleen Ruth
Shane, Rosalee Ann
Slocum, Patricia Sue
Smallwood, Kent Grey
Vanfossen, Jane Marie
Vestal, Kathleen Bunnie
Wuest, Mary Elizabeth

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate August 10, 1970:

Office of Emergency Preparedness

Darrell M. Trent, of Kansas, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness.

U.S. Air Force

The following named officer for temporary appointment in the U.S. Air Force under the provisions of chapter 839, title 10 of the United States Code:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Roy M. Terry, xxx-xx-xxxx FR (colonel, Regular Air Force, chaplain) U.S. Air Force.

In the Army

The U.S. Army Reserve officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3384:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Herbert R. Hackbarth, SSAN xxx-xx-xxxx.

Brig. Gen. James M. Roberts, Jr., SSAN xxx-xx-xxxx.

Brig. Gen. Leonard S. Woody, SSAN xxx-xx-x...

To be brigadier general

Col. Richard C. Allgood, Jr., SSAN xxx-xx-... xxxx Quartermaster Corps.

Col. James W. Dunham, SSAN xxx-xx-xxxx Field Artillery.

Col. Charles L. Easterday, SSAN xxx-xx-xxxx xxx-..., Medical Corps.

Col. Rogers B. Finch, SSAN xxx-xx-xxxx, Quartermaster Corps.

Col. Orville K. Fletcher, SSAN xxx-xx-xxxx Infantry.

Col. Naiff H. Kelel, SSAN xxx-xx-xxxx, Military Police Corps.

Col. Robert D. Upp, SSAN xxx-xx-xxxx Judge Advocate General Corps.

The Army National Guard of the United States officer named herein for promotion as a Reserve commissioned officer of the Army,

under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3385:

To be brigadier general

Col. Wilbert A. Allen, SSAN xxx-xx-xxxx, Armor.

The Army National Guard of the U.S. officers named herein for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Jack W. Blair, SSAN xxx-xx-xxxx xxx-x... Adjutant General's Corps.

Brig. Gen. Larry C. Dawson, SSAN xxx-xx-x... xxx-... Adjutant General's Corps.

Brig. Gen. John N. Owens, SSAN xxx-xx-x... xxx-x... Adjutant General's Corps.

Brig. Gen. Alberto A. Pico, SSAN xxx-xx-x... xxx-... Adjutant General's Corps.

To be brigadier general

Col. Ferd L. Davis, SSAN xxx-xx-xxxx, Infantry.

Col. Van Hixson, SSAN xxx-xx-xxxx Field Artillery.

Col. Rafael Rodriguez-Ema, SSAN xxx-xx-x... xxx-... Infantry.

Col. Theron F. Stimson, SSAN xxx-xx-xx... xxx-... Field Artillery.

Col. Ronald R. Woodin, SSAN xxx-xx-x... xxxx Signal Corps.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. James F. Calvert, U.S. Navy, having been designated for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

Rear Adm. Raymond E. Peet, U.S. Navy, having been designated for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231 for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

Vice Adm. Ralph W. Cousins, U.S. Navy, for appointment as Vice Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy, pursuant to title 10, United States Code, section 5085.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major general, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Homer S. Hill	Herman Poggemeyer, Jr.
Leon J. Dulacki	
Carl W. Hoffman	William C. Chip
William G. Johnson	

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general:

Edward J. Miller	Charles D. Mize
Wilbur F. Simlik	Norman W. Gourley
James H. Berge, Jr.	Paul G. Graham
James R. Jones	William R. Quinn
William G. Joslyn	Harvey E. Spielman
Donald H. Brooks	Andrew W. O'Donnell

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, August 10, 1970*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Finally, brethren, be of one mind, live in peace: and the God of love and peace shall be with you.—II Corinthians 13: 11.

O God, who art the light of all who put their trust in Thee and the life of those who walk in Thy way, we draw near to Thee in the quiet of this moment of prayer seeking strength and wisdom for the tasks of this day.

We bring to Thee our responsibilities to ourselves, to one another, and to our country, and we would see them in the light of Thy will for us. Empowered by Thy spirit we would carry them with honor to Thee, to our Nation, and to ourselves.

Again we bow in sorrow at the remembrance of our beloved colleague who has gone to his eternal home. We thank Thee for his presence in our midst and for the contribution he made to our country as a Member of this body. Comfort his family with the assurance of Thy spirit and strengthen them for this experience and for the days that lie ahead.

In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceeding of Thursday, August 6, 1970, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 689. Concurrent resolution providing for an adjournment of the House from August 14, 1970, until September 9, 1970, or sooner if reassembled by the Speaker.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 3547) entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Narrows unit, Missouri River Basin project, Colorado, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. CHURCH, Mr. BURDICK, Mr. ALLOTT, and Mr. JORDAN of Idaho to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also annoonced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 704. An act to amend the act of October 15, 1966 (80 Stat. 953; 20 U.S.C. 65a), relating to the National Museum of the Smithsonian Institution, so as to authorize additional appropriations to the Smithsonian Institution for carrying out the purposes of said act.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair would like to announce that the Chair is not going to recognize Members for the usual 1-minute speeches at this time, due to the situation with respect to the rules that exist in relation to the consideration of a constitutional amendment, with one exception: and that is that the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CORBETT) to announce the death of our late and beloved colleague and friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WATKINS).

THE LATE HONORABLE G. ROBERT WATKINS

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

Mr. CORBETT. Mr. Speaker, it is my very sad duty to announce the sudden death Friday evening of G. ROBERT WATKINS of the Ninth District of Pennsylvania.

All of us knew him as BOB WATKINS, and found him to be a very congenial friend and a very clear-thinking legislator. The fact that the people of his county recognized his ability and loved him is proved by the fact that he was elected Sheriff of his county, he served three terms in the Pennsylvania State Senate, then was elected a Commissioner of Delaware County, Pa., and following that was elected to the 89th, 90th, and 91st Congresses. He is survived by his wife, Hilda Jane, his son, G. Robert Watkins, Jr., and his son, Dwain. It is a gross understatement to say that those of us who knew him here will miss him most profoundly, and we extend our deepest sympathies to his wife and family.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I was shocked and saddened by the announcement of the news that BOB WATKINS had passed away. I had talked with him on a number of occasions just last week. He seemed healthy, vigorous, and in his usual good spirits. I will miss a close and a dear friend, and I believe the House as a whole will miss a stalwart Member.

We all extend to his widow and to his family our deepest condolences.

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

Mr. CORBETT. I yield to my colleague from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, in the death of the Honorable G. ROBERT WATKINS last Friday evening, the Nation lost a dedicated public servant, the people of the Ninth Congressional District of Pennsylvania lost an outstanding representative, and all of us lost a great colleague—and I lost a close personal friend.

No one in this distinguished body can feel this loss more personally than I. It