

terranean and outright Soviet military involvement in Egypt. But the Pentagon always seems unable or unwilling to find alternatives that would save the United States the embarrassment of bolstering a repressive regime in the avowed interest of defending freedom.

POW IS NO CLOSER TO HUMANE TREATMENT

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, on September 17, 1969, I joined with a number of my colleagues in sponsoring House Concurrent Resolution 362, which called upon North Vietnam and the National Liberation Front of South Vietnam to comply with the requirements of the Geneva Convention relative to the treatment of prisoners of war.

These provisions, which North Vietnam signed in 1957, include making public the identification of prisoners, free exchange of mail between prisoners and families, impartial inspection of prisoner camps, and release of seriously ill or injured prisoners.

A year has passed since that resolution was introduced but we are no closer to humane treatment of our prisoners now than we were then.

My heart bleeds for these men, for their families, and their wives and sweethearts.

Picture the plight of the wife or sweetheart whose husband or fiance has been missing for years. Is he dead or alive? Should she start to rebuild her shattered life or should she continue to wait?

Never before has America been treated so contemptuously. Never before have the tenets of civilization been so completely ignored.

We have waited in vain for Hanoi to warm to our suggestion for humane treatment of these prisoners.

We have pursued the philosophy that an outpouring of indignation by our citizens would move Hanoi to soften its policies, but the only outpouring of indignation that we had was directed at political prisons in South Vietnam.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the United States should take whatever steps now considered necessary to obtain information on these prisoners of war and to convince Hanoi of the necessity to treat them in a civilized manner.

JUDICIAL INTERPRETATION OF EQUAL EMPLOYMENT

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, September 23, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, in Louisiana we now have a judicial interpretation by a Federal judge of equal employment opportunity in State jobs.

"Blacks to fill all vacancies."

Mr. Speaker, I include a newsclipping from the August 26 Times Picayune of New Orleans, as follows:

BLACKS TO FILL ALL VACANCIES—JUDGE SETS REFORM SCHOOL HIRING GUIDELINES

Federal Judge Alvin B. Rubin Tuesday ordered that any staff vacancies occurring in the state's three main reform schools must be filled by Negroes.

In addition, he approved a plan presented by the Department of Corrections which would give special placement to boys tested at a new diagnostic center, for which the 1970 Legislature allocated funds.

After testing at the center, and rated according to mental and physical age, the lowest and highest would be sent to the Louisiana Training Institute in Monroe, with those in the middle bracket remaining in Scotlandville. Girls below 15 years of age would be placed in the LTI in Pineville and others will be located in Scotlandville.

Judge Rubin stressed that staffing of the diagnostic center must be done on an equal racial balance, and he ordered that the administration of the schools follow guidelines which he established for equalizing staffs in regard to Negro and white personnel. His quotas for the various departments called for virtually 50-50 ratio of blacks to white.

"I am aware of the employment problem, however," Judge Rubin said. "And I am not requiring that persons be hired who are incompetent. Rather, in order to achieve a racial balance, I am saying that it may be necessary to hire the second best. Nevertheless, if it seems impossible to fill vacancies for this purpose, I will consider other suggestions. Any deviation from the guidelines, however, must be done by court consent."

The judge said he believes the action will create motivations to seek out personnel from minority groups.

SENATE—Thursday, September 24, 1970

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the President pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations received today, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to House Joint Resolution 589, expressing the support of the Congress, and urging the support of Federal departments and agencies as well as other persons and organizations, both public and private, for the international biological program.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 3637. An act to revise the provisions of the Communications Act of 1934 which relate to political broadcasting;

H.R. 11953. An act to amend section 205

of the act of September 21, 1944 (58 Stat. 736), as amended;

H.R. 18127. An act making appropriations for public works for water, pollution control, and power development, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Panama Canal, the Federal Water Quality Administration, the Bureau of Reclamation, power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and related independent agencies and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes;

S.J. Res. 218. Joint resolution providing for the designation of a "Day of Bread" and "Harvest Festival Week";

S.J. Res. 228. Joint resolution to authorize the President to designate the period beginning October 5, 1970, and ending October 9, 1970, as "National PTA Week";

H.J. Res. 589. Joint resolution expressing the support of the Congress, and urging the support of Federal departments and agencies as well as other persons and organizations, both public and private, for the international biological program; and

H.J. Res. 1178. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the month of October 1970 as "Project Concern Month."

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, September 23, 1970, be dispensed with.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

FIXING A TIME FOR COMMITTEE TO FILE A REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations have until midnight tonight to file its report on H.R. 18306, to authorize U.S. participation in increases in the resources of certain international financial institutions, to provide for an annual audit of the exchange stabilization fund by the General Accounting Office, and for other purposes, together with individual and minority views.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare; the Subcommittee on Small Business of the Banking and Currency Committee; the Subcommittee on Parks and Recreation of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs; and the Committee on Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, there is no objection on the minority side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection—

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the Senator from Indiana is reluctant to impose an objection on his colleagues, but I think the RECORD of yesterday will show the reasons for doing so.

I notice that this is the first time there has not been an objection proposed by our friends on the minority side relative to one particular committee that has been meeting for some time, but I do object, Mr. President, without any further explanation, but with all apologies to my colleagues for the inconvenience.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is heard. The Senator has that right as a Member of the Senate.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, with a time limitation of 3 minutes therein.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana has been recognized.

Mr. BAYH. Reserving the right to object, would the majority leader state his request one more time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. I understand this was agreed to on yesterday.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent—and this is the usual procedure allowed under any and all circumstances—that there be a period for the

transaction of routine morning business, with a time limitation of 3 minutes therein.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana does not care to object. The Senator from Indiana would not have objected yesterday. This is normal courtesy to the Senate.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I appreciate the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Indiana.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order of yesterday, the distinguished Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) is now recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, to clear the RECORD—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. JAVITS. Well, Mr. President, I have exactly 5 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator yield to me, without losing any of his time, of course?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I want to clear the RECORD by stating that at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from New York the period for the transaction of routine morning business will begin.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana is correct.

The Senator from New York is recognized.

THE TRADE BILL

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, 1 month ago, I spoke on the Senate floor on the trade bill which had been reported out of the House Ways and Means Committee. This bill is now pending before the House Rules Committee, and Senator HOLLINGS in his press conference of last Friday indicated that he would introduce it as an amendment to both the social security bill and the family assistance plan. I cannot support this parliamentary maneuver and regret that special interest legislation such as the trade bill might be attached to domestic legislation of overriding concern to millions and millions of Americans.

In my statement of 1 month ago I specifically analyzed various provisions of the bill. Today I would like to explain in greater detail why this legislation is anticonsumer and also why it represents a reversal of the trade policy the United States has followed since the end of the war.

The legislation that has been reported out of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives is out and out quota legislation which will immediately limit the entry of five categories of products including textiles and shoes into the United States.

In addition, the general purpose quota triggering device contained in section

301(5)(a) of the bill could lead to quota restrictions on dozens of products ranging a wide spectrum from automobiles to wigs. By limiting the entry of these products into the United States without regard to internationally accepted injury criteria, the supply-demand equation for these products will be altered. It is widely accepted that changes in the supply-demand equation for any product lead to price changes and supply limitations almost inevitably result in price increases. This is not in the interest of the consumer or in the interest of our Nation in terms of curbing the inflationary spiral.

In addition to the price increases which can result from rigid import quotas, the consumer is also denied the flexibility of choice. Quotas, by insuring that fewer competing products will be available, distort normal marketing patterns. Foreign industries exporting to the United States under a quota limitation will seek to maximize their profits within the limited market range, available to them. Production shifts toward higher priced products are often a result.

For example, my office has now received a barrage of letters asking for an import limitation on speciality steels. This problem arose very suddenly after "voluntary" steel export quotas were agreed to by the European Common Market and Japan. These exporting countries shifted their production into these higher priced lines of steel in order to maximize profits. This case also indicates how quotas can disrupt normal marketing patterns and inadvertently injure other sectors of the industry. It also is indicative of the fact that the imposition of quotas leads to demands for more quotas.

In previous statements I have made on the trade bill, I spelled out in detail the effect on prices import quotas have had on two items of direct interest to the consumer—oil and meat—the facts clearly indicate that quota controls on these two items have materially contributed to higher prices for consumers.

The trade bill, as reported out of the House Ways and Means Committee, does violence to one of the key principles of the international trading world, namely the most-favored-nation clause. Under the rules of the GATT, nations have been enjoined to accord other free nations the same treatment in trade. For example, the United States cannot accord West German automobile imports different tariff treatment than French or Japanese automobile imports. In turn, in negotiations tariff concessions granted by one country to another must also be granted to all other trading partners in the free world. Since the end of the war then, international trade negotiations generally have been nondiscriminatory and multilateral. But, the trade bill now before the Congress would turn the clock back to bilateral, discriminatory negotiations; it contains a clause which gives the President the power to exempt certain countries from specific quotas where he deems such an exemption is in the national interest. This provision shapes up as a potential nightmare for the State Department and augurs a new era for our economic policy.

For example, it has been reported that during the Spanish military bases negotiations, the question of an exemption for Spain's shoe exports to the United States was on the negotiating table. It has also been reported that Latin American nations have been promised an exemption from some of the quota provisions in the bill.

This national interest exemption provision opens endless possibilities of bilateral pressure. Under this clause, country after country would feel obliged to lobby bilaterally with the United States for exemptions. This would put a premium on the type of questionable lobbying practice which came to characterize the granting of quotas under our sugar import policies in years past. The diplomatic mischief could be played both ways with foreign countries holding the "exemption gun" to our head in terms of military bases on foreign investment negotiations, and so forth, and the United States in turn could promise quota exemptions to secure political or military objectives. The chances for abuse are enormous.

Moreover, every time a specific exemption came under consideration, formidable political pressure would be put on the White House by domestic lobbies to reject the exemption request. The lobbying and counterlobbying would present an endless source of new problems for the White House and reduce U.S. trade policy to bilateralism, favoritism, and special interest consideration. This game has already been played in textiles and oil and it is my view that it has not rebounded to our national interest.

It is the course of wisdom, in my view, not to go the protectionist route with all the inherent dangers of a trade war. However, if this Nation's lawmakers are determined to go the protectionist route, it is better that this protectionism be nondiscriminatory rather than a protectionism which picks and chooses its victims on a bilateral, arbitrary basis. The impact of the trade bill will not solve any problems. It will heighten them for the businessman, the consumer, and the country.

Mr. President, I make these remarks because we may be faced with the trade bill as a rider to some other bill in the closing days of this session.

I wish to serve notice now—I am sure not only for myself but for other Senators—but certainly I serve notice for myself, that I consider this bill so inimical to the interests of the United States, including the consumers and the workers of America, that I shall consider it appropriate to use every means available to an individual Senator to see that we do not make an improvident mistake for the future of this country in that regard.

Mr. President, a bill such as the trade bill deserves to have the considered and intelligent and wise judgment of the Senate. I am entirely willing to come here and stay here as long as necessary, including all of October or to come back immediately after election, whatever the leadership desires. To endeavor to have such a critical measure introduced as an amendment to some other measure because of the crowding at the end of

the session would, I think, be a great mistake.

I hope we do not make that mistake.

TECHNOLOGY, MAN, AND NATURE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, The Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies, of which Mr. Joseph E. Slater is president, and the International Association for Cultural Freedom, whose president is Mr. Shepard Stone, recently sponsored a conference of most distinguished scientists, artists, scholars, public officials, and citizens for many parts of the world to consider the better use of modern technology for the needs of man.

As this conference aroused broad interest in many parts of our society, I ask unanimous consent that the concluding statement of the conference, together with lists of the participants, be printed in the RECORD.

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

TECHNOLOGY, MAN, AND NATURE

We have come together from many parts of the world—scientists and artists, scholars and philosophers, public officials and citizens—to consider how societies can make better use of modern technology for the needs of man. This is one of the most pressing of all issues facing humanity today. Even if a man succeeds in the supreme task of avoiding annihilation by nuclear warfare, the consequences for society and for the natural environment of the uncontrolled peaceful uses of technology could bring disaster within the foreseeable future. This is one of the crucial concerns of our age.

Men have from the beginning used technology to alter the physical and social environment. One should not underestimate that accomplishment. Technology has eliminated hunger and misery in many countries, and it can do so in many more. It has helped to halt malaria, polio, famines, and floods. It has provided unprecedented opportunities for education and for the development of individuality.

Yet technology has also served the interests of suppression, genocide, saturation bombings, and economic exploitation. In other words, technology can become the tool of mindless, selfish, or malign governments or industries that overlook human ends. Today, moreover, technologies are so powerful that they can threaten radical and irreversible changes in the entire planet, in the quality of human life, and even in the biological nature of man. The root of the problem is not in technology as such, but in its generation, its management, its use, and in the difficulty of controlling it.

We are concerned both about the sense of defeat shown by many young people and poor people and about the complacency of large sections of the public in all countries. We are also concerned about the continuing deterioration of many parts of our natural environment.

We are all agreed that the problems of poverty and human deprivation are the most pressing we now face, but we are also unanimous in the belief that there will be an environmental crisis if we do not take deliberate and timely steps to prevent it.

How much injustice can society suffer? How much change can man adapt to? How much punishment can the earth sustain? These are the questions that rightly disturb us and, particularly, young people. They are urgent questions and their resolution will demand greater wisdom in the development and application of new technologies than societies have usually shown in the past.

We emphasize that the need is not for the slower development of technology, either in advanced or in developing countries. Such a slowdown would cruelly sacrifice the interests of millions of underprivileged people whose hopes and expectations cannot begin to be met without more technology. The need is rather for more thoughtful and careful application of new technologies to prevent both long-range damage to the earth and violence to human values and to foster social, economic, and cultural development.

The prosperity which technology has brought to some nations and to some communities within nations is continuously sharpening the differences between rich and poor. Within nations, close attention must be given to the problems of disadvantaged communities if internal political stability and social justice is to be assured. Between nations, the disparity between the developed and the developing nations is not merely a threat to international stability, but also an impediment to bringing the developing nations fully within the international community.

It follows that advanced and developing societies must both aim at increasing the transfer of technology and technological capability to the developing nations. At the same time, however, each developing nation should be free to determine priorities consonant with its own cultural values and social institutions. Aid organizations must be fully aware that technical assistance, usually given for projects which are economically worthwhile in the simplest sense, should also be sensitive to socially desirable objectives.

In many respects existing social and political institutions—local, national, and international—are now inadequate for the problems occasioned by technological advance and the growth of population. National institutions frequently lack the means or the will to impose necessary restraints on the exploitation of technology and to mediate equitably between individual interests and those of the community at large. International institutions are often unable to reconcile conflicting interests among nations or even international corporations.

We believe that many of these deficiencies can be remedied. Indeed, even existing legal and political devices have often been used to direct technological developments constructively. In meeting changing needs, it may often be sufficient to extend the scope of many existing institutions, to strengthen administrative regulations and to make more effective the enforcement of judicial rights. These steps require political will, often reinforced by appropriate economic incentives. Nevertheless, there are already many circumstances in which new kinds of institutions are necessary, and there will be many more.

In the actual world, conflicts of interest, disagreements about goals, and differences in values will no doubt always remain to be resolved through political processes, both national and international. But it would be wrong to suppose that rationality and wisdom can make no contribution. Often, conflicts may be overcome when a third way is found to advance common aims. Even where incompatibilities of interests and values remain, however, knowledge and intelligence can play a crucial role by showing which choices are preferable, and which are not, in a given specific situation.

The rapid growth of population and its concentration in some parts of the world are particular and growing causes for concern. There is an urgent need to move as quickly as possible towards a stationary population, not merely for the improvement of the quality of life but for the development of human personality. Only by the control of population growth can societies hope to share the potential benefits of technology. Moreover, we know that economic and social progress

is one of the most effective inducements to a declining birth rate.

We believe it to be important that the encouragement of economic growth should not be simply an end in itself but also an encouragement of social development. From this it follows that aid organizations should be sensitive to the need to support some technical projects in developing countries when potential social benefits outweigh possible apparent diseconomies. Capital for economic development outside the industrialized nations is an urgent need, however, and in this spirit it is important that developed countries should concentrate economic development in advanced technology and at the same time be prepared to throw open their markets to imports of manufactured goods from labor-intensive industries of countries in earlier stages of development.

Similarly, governments seeking to encourage economic growth should provide means by which poorer communities would be able to share as fully as possible in the potential benefits of technology. In the attempt to adapt the uses made of technology to the needs of society, governments should be aware of the uses which may be made of economic tools for directing efforts and resources to desirable ends. Economic incentives and disincentives can also help to insure the development of technologies which are not wasteful of natural resources.

The pace of technological development, faster than ever before, compels increasing vigilance in anticipating the consequences of technological development. The objectives should be to predict as fully as possible the social, economic, and even political consequences of new developments and to provide governments and their electorates with an opportunity for making informed assessments of potential benefits and social costs. In many countries, new institutions will be needed for this work.

One particular task to be undertaken is the continuing assessment of developments in weapons technology, for the threat of nuclear warfare requires constant vigilance. But early warning systems, often administered by new institutions, are also necessary in the surveillance of the condition of the natural environment and in the continuing assessment of scientific research, which may provide opportunities for beneficial application. One component of this apparatus should be more research in the natural and social sciences; desirable as this may be in its own right, deeper understanding will make it easier to foresee the consequences of new technological developments and thus easier to choose wisely between alternatives.

In this same spirit, fuller use must be made of institutions of the kind which at present serve to bring individuals in touch with government—voluntary associations, local governments, parliamentary bodies, and the investigating committees which they often set up. Such devices can alone provide groups of individuals with means of assessing the opportunities and the dangers of new technological developments.

Institutional changes are needed in both education and the arts. In developing nations, educational systems may have to evolve in a way radically different from those appropriate to industrial societies, and they should be supported and encouraged to develop according to indigenous cultural needs. But, in industrial societies as well, educational reform—in structure, purpose, and content—is also necessary at all levels.

Higher education should not be concentrated on a given age group; opportunities and financial support for adult education are of the utmost importance.

The delicate relationship between the arts and society has been stressed by developments in technology. Artists have always had

a unique power to clarify human experience. Their work has had the dual function of defining the character of contemporary reality and of imagining alternatives. The most gifted artists have responded with prescience to the impact of technological change. As the rate of change accelerates, however, the public often has more difficulty in understanding what artists have perceived. Society must recognize that the contributions of its artists will take surprising and disturbing forms. In this situation, we reaffirm that the artist's primary responsibility is to his own work, and that society in turn must encourage him and leave him free.

The freedom of expression which creative artists require if their work is to prosper must be mirrored by the freedom which individuals of all kinds must be given and must assume if society as a whole is to function well. Nothing in the new technology requires that freedom and diversity should be restrained. On the contrary, unless society can devise means by which individuals can participate fully and equitably in the making of decisions, wise decisions about the proper exploitation of technology will be difficult and even impossible to reach. The continuing development of technology is not a restriction of the right of individuals to be free but rather reinforces their responsibility to assert their claims on society at large.

TECHNOLOGY: SOCIAL GOALS AND CULTURAL OPTIONS—PARTICIPANTS

Mr. Amory Bradford, Aspen, Colorado 81611.

Monsignor Marvin Bordelon, Director, Department of International Affairs, U.S. Catholic Conference.

Prof. Harvey Brooks, Dean, Department of Engineering and Applied Physics, Harvard University.

Mr. Colin Crouch, Lecturer in Sociology, London School of Economics.

Mr. K. E. de Graft-Johnson, Lecturer in Sociology, Sociology Department, University of Ghana.

Mr. Frederic de Hoffmann, Chancellor-Elect, Salk Institute.

Countess Marion Doenhoff, Editor-in-Chief, "Die Zeit".

Mr. Jean-Marie Domenach, Director, "Esprit."

Prof. Paul Doty, Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Harvard University.

Mr. Charles Eames, Filmmaker and Designer.

Prof. Victor Ferkiss, Department of Government, Georgetown University.

Mr. Stephen Fischer, Assistant to the Publisher, "Scientific American."

Mr. Fred Freed, Executive Producer, NBC White Paper.

Mr. Edward Furia, Attorney, City Planner, and Environmental Consultant.

Prof. Murray Gell-Mann, Robert Millikan, Professor of Physics, California Institute of Technology.

Mr. Mathias Goeritz, Architect, Sculptor, City Planner.

Mr. Maurice Goldsmith, Secretary General, the Science of Science Foundation.

Prof. William Goemberg, Professor of Industry, Wharton School of Finance and Commerce.

Mr. Paul Goodman, Writer.

Mr. Gordon Harrison, Officer in Charge, Resources and Environment, Division of National Affairs, Ford Foundation.

Prof. Yurjiro Hayashi, Tokyo Institute of Technology.

Professor Stanley Hoffmann, Professor of Government, Harvard University.

Dr. Alexander Hollaender, Consultant and Senior Research Adviser, Biology Division, Oak Ridge National Laboratory.

Mme. Danielle Hunebelle, Journalist.

Mr. Isaac Hunt, Lawyer and Urban Researcher, the New York City Rand Institute.

Dr. Ivan Illich, Philosopher and Independent Educator.

Dr. Erich Jantsch, Richard Merton Professor, Technical University, Hannover, Germany.

Dr. Carl Kaysen, Director, Institute for Advanced Study.

Dr. Prof. Karl Kaiser, Professor of Political Science, Universität des Saarlandes, Inst. für Theorie u. Soziologie der Politik, Saarbrücken, Germany.

Mr. Pierre Kende, Economist and Associate Lecturer, University of Paris-Ouest (Nanterre).

Dr. Alexander King, Director General for Scientific Affairs, OECD.

Mr. Kurt Klapphois, Reader in Economics, London School of Economics.

Raj Krishna, Professor of Economics, University of Rajasthan, Rajasthan, India.

Mr. Hans Landsberg, Economist and Director, Resource Appraisal Program, Resources for the Future, Inc.

Professor Cyrus Levinthal, Chairman, Department of Biological Sciences, Columbia University.

Mr. Robert Lilley, Director, Environmental Action Institute.

Professor Salvador Luria, Department of Biology, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Professor Gene Lyons, Chairman, Department of Government, Dartmouth College.

Prof. Donald G. MacRae, Professor of Sociology, London School of Economics.

Mr. John Maddox, Editor, "Nature".

Professor Leo Marx, Professor of English and American Studies, Amherst College.

Miss Mary McCarthy.

Mr. Victor McElheny, Science Editor, "The Boston Globe."

Dr. Emmanuel G. Mesthene, Director, Harvard University Program on Technology and Society.

Mr. John Oakes, Editor of the Editorial Page, "The New York Times."

Mr. Hasan Ozbekhan, Economist and Planner.

Mr. Guy Pauker, Senior Staff Member, Social Science Department, Rand Corporation.

Dott. Aurelio Peccei, Vice Chairman, Olivetti Corporation.

Professor Morse Peckham, Distinguished Professor of English and Comparative Literature, University of South Carolina.

H. E. Dr. Ernst Petric, Minister of Science of the Republic of Slovenia.

Mr. Herman Pollack, Director, Office of International Scientific and Technological Affairs Department of State.

Professor Theodore T. Puck, Chairman, Department of Biophysics, University of Colorado.

Professor Isidor Rabi, Columbia University, Professor Emeritus, Columbia University.

Mr. James Reston, Vice President, "The New York Times."

Professor Roger Revelle, Director, Harvard University Center for Population Studies.

Mr. Harold Rosenberg, Writer and Art Critic, "The New Yorker."

Professor Nathan Rosenberg, Visiting Rockefeller Professor ('70-'71), Department of Economics, University of the Philippines.

Dr. Jonas Salk, Director, Salk Institute.

Mr. Daniel Schorr, Radio-TV Commentator, CBS.

Professor Eugene Skolnikoff, Professor of Political Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

Mr. Joseph E. Slater, President, Aspen Institute for Humanistic Studies.

H. E. Ambassador S. Soedjatmoko, Indonesian Ambassador to the U.S.

Mr. Shepard Stone, President, International Association for Cultural Freedom.

Mr. Tatsutomo Tanaka, Government Official, Tokyo, Japan.

Professor Laurence Tribe, Harvard Law School.

Mr. Marc Ullmann, Economic Editor, "L'Express."

Mr. John Voss, Executive Officer, American Academy of Arts and Sciences.

Mr. David Webster, Assistant Head of Current Affairs Group, BBC-TV Studios.

Mr. Thomas Wilson, The Anderson Foundation.

ASPERN INSTITUTE FOR HUMANISTIC STUDIES—TRUSTEE-OBSERVERS

Mr. Robert G. Anderson, Chairman, AIHS.

Mr. Herbert Bayer.

Mr. Robert Ingersoll, Chairman, Borg-Warner Corporation.

The Honorable Robert S. McNamara, President, World Bank.

Mr. John Merriam.

Mr. John Musser.

Mr. Harold Pabst.

Mrs. Walter Paepcke.

Mr. James H. Smith, Jr.

Mr. William E. Stevenson.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR SCHWEIKER TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, immediately following the disposition of the reading of the Journal and the disposition of any unobjection to items on the calendar, the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER) be recognized for 15 minutes.

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

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, following the remarks of the able Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER) on tomorrow, there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

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

MAJORITY OF AMERICANS FAVOR CUT IN MILITARY SPENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, today's publication of the Gallup poll brought additional proof of public support for congressional cuts in military spending. According to Gallup, a majority of the American people now favor a reduction in military spending. The Gallup pollsters asked the following question:

Congress is currently debating how much money should be spent for military purposes. Would you like to have your Congressman vote to keep spending for military purposes at the present level, increase the amount, or reduce the amount?

MAJORITY FAVOR CUTTING

In reply, 49 percent said they would like to have their Congressman vote to reduce military spending. Another 34 percent favored keeping spending at the present level. Only 10 percent nationwide favored increasing military spending. Seven percent had no opinion. Thus, the majority of those with an opinion favored the cut.

In every section of the country except the South over 50 percent of all those

asked favored cutting military spending. Even in the South, a total of 77 percent either favored cutting below the present military spending levels—36 percent—or in holding the line at the present level—41 percent.

I ask unanimous consent that a table giving the results of this latest Gallup poll be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the results were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	[In percent]			
	Present level	Increase	Reduce	No opinion
National	34	10	49	7
East	32	8	53	7
Midwest	32	9	53	6
South	41	12	36	11
West	34	11	51	4
College background	29	6	60	5
High school	38	11	45	6
Grade school	34	13	40	13
21 to 29 years	29	8	60	3
30 to 49 years	36	11	46	7
50 and over	35	9	46	10
Republicans	37	8	46	9
Democrats	36	11	46	7
Independents	30	9	55	6

12,500 WISCONSINITES AGREE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the results of this Gallup poll are not surprising. Last month I sent a questionnaire to my Wisconsin constituents in which I asked them specifically how they would vote on President Nixon's proposed spending levels for a number of major programs. I received about 12,500 replies. In the case of the President's proposed \$73.6 billion military spending for fiscal year 1971, I received the following answers:

Program	Cut below proposed level			
	Billions proposed spending	Proposed level (percent)	Hold at proposed level (percent)	Increase above level (percent)
National Defense	\$73.6	66	30	4

I want to point out that the question I asked my constituents was based on the spending level the President proposed for fiscal year 1971. It cannot be argued, therefore, that the cuts which Congress made in the President's requests last year of about \$6 billion are sufficient. The \$73.6 billion figure is the reduction occasioned by the huge cut which Congress made last year. The public therefore wants a further cut in military spending.

When the votes for either holding the line on military spending or cutting it are combined, the results are even more spectacular.

Hold line or cut below present levels

[In percent]	
Proxmire Wisconsin poll	96
Gallup poll:	
National results	83
East	85
Midwest	85
South	77
West	85

ADMINISTRATION SPOKESMEN OUT OF STEP

Yet while the public overwhelmingly favors a cut in military spending, spokesmen for the administration are calling for no more cuts. In the last few weeks

there have been a series of statements by top-level military or budget officials saying we should cut no more.

Speaking at a press conference on the 6th of August, Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird had this to say:

The Chairman of the House Appropriations Committee had indicated he believes our budget will be cut by one billion dollars.

I'm going to do everything I can to see that it isn't. I think we have submitted a rock bottom budget this year.

The Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Affairs, Mr. Warren Nutter, had this to say in an address before the Western Economic Association's annual meeting in Davis, Calif., on August 28:

In brief we have cut defense enough for the present. It is time to look elsewhere for relief from the heavy burden of taxes and for resources better employed in meeting pressing domestic needs.

And he concluded by saying that:

Those whom you have entrusted with responsibility for the nation's security speak with one voice in sending this message to you.

TAXPAYER'S REGRET

I am certain that the American taxpayer must regret these inflexible stands against cutting defense expenditures on the part of the leading spokesmen for the Pentagon in the administration.

Not only is there vast waste in the military, but according to the very best estimates we now have, the Government faces a budget deficit of at least \$10 billion for the 1971 fiscal year.

The only place where significant cuts can be made which would both reduce that deficit and affect the inflationary pressures which have brought it about, is in the military spending area. That is where the cuts must be made.

The administration is clearly out of step with the views of the people of my State. From today's results in the Gallup poll, they are out of step with the views of the majority of the people in the Nation.

The time has come to cut military spending, provide additional resources for high-priority programs, and give the hard-pressed American taxpayer some long-overdue relief.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article from today's New York Times on the results of the Gallup poll be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

49 PERCENT IN POLL FAVOR DEFENSE-COST CUT—GALLUP FINDS SHIFT IN VOTERS' VIEWS IN LAST 10 YEARS

PRINCETON, N.J., Sept. 23—A majority of voters in all major regions of the nation except the South would like their Congressmen to vote for a reduction in military spending, the Gallup Poll reported today.

For the nation as a whole, the latest Gallup survey found that 49 per cent believed spending should be reduced, 10 per cent thought it should be increased and 34 per cent favored keeping it at its present level.

The two groups most in favor of a reduction in military spending were the college-educated and young adults. Little difference was found between the opinions of Democrats and Republicans.

Opposition to military spending stems largely from frustration over the Vietnam war and the belief that the war is diverting much-needed funds from problems at home, the Gallup organization said.

Total military spending (including Vietnam expenditures) accounts for about half the Federal budget, which totaled about \$195-billion in 1970.

QUESTION ASKED OF 1,474

The following question was asked of 1,474 adults in a survey conducted Sept. 11-14 in more than 250 localities across the nation:

Congress is currently debating how much money should be spent for military purposes. Would you like to have your Congressman vote to keep spending for military purposes at the present level, increase the amount, or reduce the amount?

Here are the findings:

	[In percent]			
	Present level	Increase	Reduce	No opinion
National	34	10	49	7
East	32	8	53	7
Midwest	32	9	53	6
South	41	12	26	11
West	34	11	51	4
College background	29	6	60	5
High school	38	11	45	6
Grade school	34	13	40	13
21 to 29 years	29	8	60	3
30 to 49 years	36	11	46	7
50 and over	35	9	46	10
Republicans	37	8	46	9
Democrats	36	11	46	7
Independents	30	9	55	6

EARLIER SURVEYS SIMILAR

Two earlier nationwide surveys conducted during the last year showed the public favoring reductions in military spending, with results closely comparable to those reported today.

The polling organization said a "dramatic change" in public attitudes on military spending had come about in the last 10 years, based on previous survey evidence.

In April, 1960, during a period of relative peace, 18 per cent of Americans believed the United States to be spending "too much" for defense. Twenty-one per cent said "too little," while 45 per cent thought the amount being spent was "about right."

Still earlier, just before the outbreak of hostilities in Korea, more than six out of every 10 voters favored an increase in the outlay for national defense.

Before World War II, in the face of Hitler's growing power in Germany, the public expressed concern over the inadequacies of our defense program and called for greater expenditures for this program.

S. 4393—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR PHYSICAL DISABILITY SEPARATION FROM SERVICE OF MILITARY PERSONNEL AND TO PROVIDE CIVIL COMMITMENT

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend title 10 of the United States Code which would provide the opportunity for drug dependent military personnel to be separated from service on a physical disability basis and to be civilly committed and treated for their drug dependence.

This amendment to our laws is long overdue in my estimation and we should not delay in moving it through the Congress to the President's desk for enactment into law.

Clearly, the evidence presented before

the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee during recent hearings points to the need for this bill.

Much has been said by Members of this body concerning our political-military involvement in Indochina, little however, is mentioned about a related problem which poses a serious threat to the United States both in that theater of operations and here at home.

Narcotics addiction and drug abuse are certainly not new in the military. In recent years, however, the problem has intensified. It has become more complex and it now demands that efforts be undertaken to provide adequate medical assistance and treatment to those servicemen who either become addicted or drug dependent while in the military.

While the Defense Department now acknowledges that there is a drug abuse problem in the military, they are not willing to acknowledge that drug addicted servicemen should be separated from service on physical disability bases.

Basically the Defense Department's position on this issue is that drug addicted individuals or servicemen habituated to drugs are usually involved in some additional form of misconduct during their tour of service. This they feel, should preclude service personnel from receiving an honorable discharge from the services on medical grounds.

In keeping with this line of reasoning one of the recommendations of the Department of Defense's Task Group on Drug Abuse was the retention of present discharge provisions which do not allow the drug addict to be discharged medically. The specific recommendation states:

The Discharge System now in effect in the Armed Forces represents a fair and proper method of categorizing service. Changes in it should not be made for the sole reason of allowing drug abusers to receive Veterans benefits.

I do not believe that the basic point at issue is Veteran's benefits. It is the well being of the individual soldier who has become addicted to or habituated to narcotics and who should receive a medical discharge with provisions for treatment and rehabilitation.

The U.S. Supreme Court in the Robinson decision—370 U.S. 660 (1962)—recognized that narcotics addiction, per se, was not a crime and the court went on to allude to the medical nature of addiction as an illness rather than a crime.

And while the military clings to the theory that addicts tend to be criminals, studies conducted by a former Army social worker who served in Vietnam, Roger Roffman, do not substantiate this.

He stated in testimony before the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee:

We found, for example, that while 28 percent of our entire sample had received at least one Article 15 (a non-judicial punishment generally for a minor infraction), some 39 percent of the users had received such punishment. There was no trend, however, in the incidence of courts-martial. Moreover, there was no greater proportion of users seeking professional help for emotional problems.

Mr. President, I believe that we must acknowledge drug addiction for what it

is, namely, an illness that must be treated.

This is the position I take and the bill that I introduce today reflects this view.

The ravages of narcotics addiction are certainly known in the United States. The countless numbers of lives that are lost to this scourge and the millions of dollars that are wasted each year by drug addicts are factors that are known to the Congress and to the American people.

And the fact is, Mr. President, that our involvement in Indochina may be compounding this problem because of the number of drug dependent military personnel who return to the United States with their drug habits or dependencies and are unable to take their place in an orderly society nor make any contribution to that society.

The Federal Government has long been concerned with the rehabilitation of narcotics addicts. Our Federal hospitals at Lexington and Fort Worth have been in the fore in treating and in attempting to rehabilitate those who become addicted to narcotic drugs.

The Federal Government's concern for this problem was further recognized with the enactment of the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1966, which for the first time provided an alternative to jail for those Federal offenders adjudged to be addicts and likely to be rehabilitated. That effort, only recently begun, is a signal effort and one which will in time show positive results.

Unlike our domestic policy toward the narcotic problem, the problem with which I am concerned today has not been met by the Federal Government. The result is that drug dependent military personnel, many of whom either have served or are now serving in Vietnam or Cambodia, or other areas of the world, are not considered to be eligible for medical discharge for their drug abuse or dependency.

The result is that, if they are subsequently discharged administratively or on other than honorable grounds, they are returned to their communities and continue their drug habits without any assistance or rehabilitation.

The legislation that I propose today would do much to correct this situation.

My concern with this problem is not new.

The subcommittee which I chair, the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee, has conducted public hearings and investigations into this controversial area since 1966.

Before elaborating on these subcommittee efforts, I would first remind Senators who have questioned our jurisdiction in this matter that the subcommittee by resolution of the Senate is charged with the responsibility of examining, investigating, and studying the adequacy of existing provisions of law, including the youthful offender provisions of title 18 of the United States Code. This is in addition to our specific responsibility to determine the extent to which juveniles and youthful offenders are violating Federal narcotics laws.

I believe that this mandate is clear and I find no conflict in jurisdiction.

Certainly the treatment and rehabilitation of narcotic addicts or drug dependent persons falls within the purview of the term "correctional action taken with respect to youthful offenders by Federal courts" included in the subcommittee's resolution. The chapter of title 18 dealing with the treatment of youthful offenders extends jurisdiction to the age of 22, an age at which many, if not most, of our military men have served their terms of service.

It is this youthful age group within the military with which we are concerned. The testimony before the subcommittee confirms the fact that it is this very age group that is most involved in illicit drug use.

The testimony further reflects the inadequacy of treatment or corrective action for drug dependent military personnel, the preponderance of whom are young men.

Because of these facts, I concluded long ago that the subcommittee is well within its mandate in inquiring into the problem of drug abuse in the military.

I am hopeful that my colleagues, including those who have questioned this jurisdiction, would accede to this view and support the bill that I propose today to help correct a very real and pressing problem.

I would now turn to a brief legislative history of the subcommittee's inquiries with regard to the problem of narcotics and drug abuse in the military and especially in overseas theaters of operation.

The dimension of this aspect of the drug abuse problem was brought home to me as long ago as 1966 when Dr. Robert Baird, director of the Haven Clinic in New York City, made these remarks in his appearance before the subcommittee:

The important point that I am trying to make this morning is that I am concerned about the increased amount of addiction of boys in the Armed Services. There is a small percentage of men who are dropouts, with 3 years or less of high school, who are getting drugs in the Armed Services, and who have either experimented with drugs before entering the service or are psychologically extremely susceptible to the suggestion of others to take drugs.

He then observed:

I have come across servicemen in every branch—the Army, the Navy, the Air Force and the Marines—who have gotten narcotics, marihuana, barbiturates and amphetamines, known as goof-balls and pep pills, in every place from their own home stations, training grounds, and towns, to overseas, in France, Italy, Germany, Greece, Sweden, Korea and Vietnam.

Dr. Baird indicated that based on his knowledge of the problem he would estimate that there were some 10,000 to 15,000 addicts in the service and about 100,000 marihuana smokers in the Military Establishment.

Mr. President, those estimates were hard to accept then, but I believe that time has proven that Dr. Baird's estimates were more accurate than official Defense Department figures.

Appearing with Dr. Baird at those hearings in 1966, was an ex-marine, who had served in Vietnam and had flown approximately 125 combat missions as a crew chief and a gunner on a helicop-

ter. The former marine was an addict who told us that drugs were readily available to him while he was in the service, both in the United States and overseas.

He related a personal experience with drugs while serving as a gunner aboard a helicopter in Vietnam where he shot and wounded friendly troops thinking they were the enemy.

The point, Mr. President, is that this young marine had taken a quantity of "goof balls," that is, barbiturates before that mission; and while on that mission under the adverse illusionary influence of those drugs, he machine-gunned two friendly Vietnamese soldiers.

That marine told the subcommittee that he personally knew 12 heroin addicts and numerous other men who abused other drugs, including hashish, pep pills, and goof balls.

It was during those hearings that testimony was given relative to the handling of military personnel who are either drug abusers or drug dependent.

Dr. Baird when asked to outline the types of discharges afforded these men stated:

I have reviewed some of these things. Some of these discharges are undesirable discharges, some of them are character disorder discharges. But I don't think I have come across one that has said the individual was discharged because of drug addiction.

I would add at this juncture that the picture in that regard has not changed and today there is no physical disability discharge available for either drug abusers or drug dependent persons.

One question that must be explored, of course, concerns whether drug addiction and drug abuse among the military are detectable while the individual is in service.

If the drug condition is not established while the individual is in the military, then the bill that I propose could not be operable. I am convinced, however, based on the testimony of former military doctors that the drug addict and the chronic drug abusers in the military in the majority of cases are not only detected, but are actually seeking assistance for their problem, assistance which in most cases may be inadequate at best or not available at worst.

When the subcommittee next held hearings on this aspect of the drug abuse problem in March of 1968 I requested that the Defense Department furnish us with an evaluation of the drug situation in the military establishment.

I did so because of the fact that additional testimony, citing the prevalence of marihuana use among service personnel in Vietnam, was heard by the subcommittee.

The witness, John Steinbeck IV, a former soldier who had served in Vietnam, told the subcommittee that he estimated that 60 percent of the men in Vietnam, between the ages of 19 and 27, were smoking marihuana whenever they thought it reasonable to do so.

He went on to opine that upwards of 75 percent of that same age group would be involved with marihuana as they became more sophisticated in its use.

The picture painted by Steinbeck was that marihuana was a relatively harm-

less drug, a view that he said was also accepted by the military.

The response of the Defense Department in the form of testimony before the subcommittee was that drug abuse in the military was a minimal problem and that statistics reflected that "there is virtually no addiction to the so-called hard narcotics and a low rate of incidence of drug abuse in the Armed Forces."

This testimony presented in early 1968 represented an evaluation of the drug abuse problem through calendar year 1967, the last year for which statistics had been compiled at the date of the subcommittee's 1968 hearings.

It is axiomatic that official statistics concerning drugs abuse rarely, if ever, indicate the true incidence of such abuse whether it be military or civilian in nature. Statistics usually simply represent apprehensions, that is, those who have been detected and arrested for illicit drug involvement.

One is not going to come forward and acknowledge that he is either violating a Federal law or one of the Articles of the Uniform Code of Military Justice by acknowledging drug involvement.

In the military such an admission is punishable as a violation of the Uniform Code.

Thus, one can reasonably conclude that official and reported statistics do not present an accurate picture of illicit drug use and abuse. However, they certainly are indicators which can be used to evaluate developing patterns especially changes in the incidence of arrests or apprehensions.

With this in mind, certain questions may be put to the Department of Defense relative to the figures that were furnished the Subcommittee in 1968. This is especially true in view of recent knowledge of the problem that was made available in testimony presented before the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee.

Did the Defense Department know the extent of drug abuse at that time?

Did they ignore it?

Did they attempt to cover it up?

Were they honestly unaware of the magnitude of the problem?

Or, was there, as official figures seem to indicate, a relative minimal problem at that time?

A definitive answer on my part would be speculative. However, I can point to testimony before this subcommittee which indicates that there is a serious drug abuse problem in the military establishment and that legislation such as I propose today is urgently necessary.

My bill, since it provides for physical disability separation from service, would in effect be of assistance in determining the true incidence of drug abuse in the military in that it provides that such abuse be handled medically rather than punitively, as is now the case under present military law.

It would thus serve as an incentive for drug abusers to come forward in order to seek the treatment that is necessary for their rehabilitation.

What then are the drug abuse conditions in the military today towards which this legislation is directed?

I can only characterize the problem as massive, dangerous, unabated, and growing.

It is a problem with which the military has not yet come to grips and the result of this lack of responsiveness is that drug addicted or drug dependent servicemen are returning home, unknown to civilian authorities, with only one way to go, a continuation of their drug oriented way of life.

While there is certain controversy over the effects of marihuana smoking, the fact is that the ultra strong Vietnamese variety has particular and discernible adverse effects, which have been described before the Juvenile Delinquency Subcommittee in terms of toxic psychosis, in other words, drug-induced insanity.

The marihuana toxic psychosis is a cerebral cortex malfunction due to toxins in the body due to the marihuana smoked or ingested. This condition has already been described in the medical literature as existing among Vietnam servicemen who are marihuana smokers.

The manifestations of this condition are readily discernible and include a loss of reality testing, paranoid feelings or feelings of suspiciousness, disorientation, confusion, and auditory and visual hallucinations.

These conditions are usually temporary.

But we have heard of cases where the individual soldier remains schizophrenic even after having come out of the acute toxic state.

Mr. President, in layman's terms the above medical descriptions of the adverse reactions to marihuana smoking means that the soldier in Vietnam who smokes marihuana may react violently, hysterically or in other aberrant behavior patterns.

This is particularly true because of the fact that our servicemen in Vietnam are under great stress, they are under great tension and undoubtedly are fearful for their lives in combat situations.

The point to be stressed here is that one's mental set and the social-psychological conditions under which one smokes marihuana to a large extent determine the individual's response to it.

Therefore, if one is under great stress, great tension, and is fearful for his life, the marihuana episode can enhance that mental condition and can result in violence, including murder, rape and assault.

This behavior has been described to us and I certainly have no reason to question it.

It is a matter of record at the Long Binh jail in Vietnam.

A case in point concerns the death of a U.S. soldier in Vietnam who jokingly told his companion that he was Ho Chi Minh. The companion who had smoked marihuana only minutes before experienced a panic reaction and shot the man to death.

While the reference to Ho was made jokingly, the confused and hallucinating marihuana smoker reacted in a disoriented manner and shot his comrade.

In addition to the above behavior patterns, we have been told of cases where

the individual pot smoker, if he is a heavy user of marihuana, will experience "trips" similar to those experienced upon ingestion of LSD, a potent hallucinogenic.

An anomaly concerning the marihuana experience is that the soldier who smokes marihuana believes that the drug relaxes him and makes him better able to function, while in truth, his functioning is severely impaired.

Whether the soldier is in a combat unit or a support unit, his marihuana smoking impairs his functioning, his judgment, and his ability to carry out his assigned mission.

One witness told the subcommittee that he had a standing order with the men of his squad that marihuana was not to be smoked prior to any military operation. His rationale was that the marihuana smoker could not function and would impair the success of the mission and, in fact, endanger the lives of those assigned to the mission.

Further evidence of this anomalous situation is to be found in a taped interview with servicemen from Vietnam which was summarized in Family magazine, a Sunday supplement to the Army Navy and Air Force Times publication.

The interviewer questioned the men on instances where servicemen, who were under the influence of marihuana, may have been adversely influenced by the drug.

The following is one incident cited by these active duty military men:

There was an incident in Korea. We were going on patrol across the DMZ and we were walking through a mine field. He (another trooper) was the point man and he stepped on a mine and had his leg blown off. But I mean that really wasn't his mistake because he just read the map wrong. But yet, I mean he was high at the time.

Another case from the interview gives us a glimpse of the confused state of mind resulting from marihuana smoking:

We got caught in an ambush. I was just sitting there eating chow and instead of going for my rifle when they started shooting . . . it happened just like this . . . I looked at him (a comrade who had just smoked marihuana) and said, "Oh no! My man got hit" and instead of going for my rifle I went for his 79 because at that time in my mind I was high and I said, "What's the use of having this puny M-16 when I've got a hell of a lot more fire power over here on my righthand side?" You know, I just started plugging away with the M-79 and we got out of there.

In summary, the man under the influence of marihuana hysterically grabbed the wrong weapon and fired at the enemy.

The interview, which lasted for 2½ hours, is a chilling documentary on the reactions of these troops in combat and frontline situations. The most dramatic aspect of the statements made by these soldiers is the difference between their subjective reactions to marihuana smoking and the actual facts surrounding their performances in combat.

They thought they were doing just great.

In reality, they and their befuddled buddies were getting killed, wounded, and routed because they were reacting in

the confused, unreal, distorted world of marihuana intoxication.

Additional evidence of the problems created in combat by marihuana abuse in Vietnam, were brought to our attention during our most recent hearings on the issue.

I questioned Vice Adm. William P. Mack, a Defense Department expert on drug abuse, about the combat readiness of our troops in Vietnam and the possible impairment of functioning of the men as the result of marihuana smoking.

He replied:

We also agree with you that there are many instances where a platoon or a squad endangers some of its members. Maybe a squad mission cannot be carried out. We know this has happened, or helicopter mission, and there have been people killed who should not have been killed, but we are looking at it really from the overall point of view that we do not feel at this moment that our ability to do what we want to do in Vietnam is, for instance, endangered. We are talking about a higher level. At the lower level we agree with you.

The point is that when you get down to cases, marihuana smoking does impair the functioning of men who abuse the drug. And in a combat situation this means unnecessary deaths and loss of unit efficiency.

Examples of such losses were given by two former veterans. Jon Steinberg, who served in Vietnam told the subcommittee of cases such as the following in which a unit suffered losses because of a psychotic episode following marihuana use:

The release of assaultive behavior happened to a soldier in Saigon. This particular soldier was on guard duty and smoking pot in a bunker with four buddies. He had smoked marihuana on three other occasions without any trouble. All those experiences were pleasurable. This time, after smoking his normal amount of pot, he picked up his M16 and emptied a magazine into his four friends. They did not all die following this initial burst of gunfire, so he put another magazine into his rifle and stopped their crying with bullets.

Additionally, Dr. John K. Imahara, a former Army psychiatrist, who served in Vietnam, testified to the loss of effectiveness of combat units because of marihuana use by many members of a given squad or company:

A military lawyer told me about an incident in which a helicopter began to receive gunfire at night. The helicopter swooped down and strafed the area. The following morning, American soldiers were found dead with evidence of marihuana in the guard post. There were stories about how bunkers were overrun or break-throughs into the base camps by the enemy with the evidence of marihuana cigarettes present. I cannot enumerate all of the many situations in which marihuana and/or other drugs were involved. Needless to say the use of marihuana and other drugs can contribute to a more dangerous situation in the combat zone.

Mr. President, I believe that the evidence of adverse reactions to marihuana smoking in Vietnam is sufficient to justify labeling that particular drug as dangerous.

What then is the estimate of the incidence of such drug abuse in Vietnam? Again, based on our record, as high as

80 percent of the men in Vietnam have used marihuana at least once. The incidence of chronic marihuana use has not been determined definitely. Figures do indicate that at least 30 percent of the men in Vietnam can be classified as chronic users of marihuana.

Dr. Joel Kaplan, a psychiatrist who was a U.S. Army major with a year's tour in Vietnam, told the subcommittee that 70 percent of the outpatients who he saw in Vietnam, some 3,000 men, were heavy drug users.

In addition, 50 percent of the inpatients seen by Dr. Kaplan during his tour in Vietnam were heavy drug users.

Thus, in Dr. Kaplan's words, 3,500 men about whom he knew personally were heavy drug users in Vietnam requiring medical and psychiatric assistance for their drug abuse and dependence.

When describing what he considered chronic drug use Dr. Kaplan put it this way:

When I refer to drug abusers, I am not referring to the soldier who smokes marihuana once a week or even once every few days. I am referring to a soldier who is using drugs heavily day in and day out.

Dr. Kaplan's view of the seriousness of this problem is shared by other professionals.

Dr. James Teague, another psychiatrist, who had served a year's tour of duty in Vietnam with the U.S. Army Medical Corps told the subcommittee that prior to his going to Vietnam and experiencing firsthand the adverse reactions to marihuana smoking, he considered the drug to be relatively harmless.

He has since changed his appraisal of marihuana abuse because of his professional experience with the drug among servicemen in Vietnam and he considers Vietnamese marihuana to be a potentially dangerous substance.

Evidence of the potential dangers of drug abuse is contained in figures concerning drug overdose deaths in Vietnam that have been furnished the subcommittee by the Department of Defense.

From 1965 through 1967 there were no deaths attributed to drug overdose among U.S. Army personnel in Vietnam. However, in 1968, seven such deaths were recorded and in 1969 the number of troops who died from overdoses jumped to 18.

We can be thankful that drug overdose deaths are no higher than indicated.

While the consensus of the witnesses who appeared before the subcommittee would indicate that medical assistance is available in Vietnam to treat drug abusers and drug dependent persons, they insisted that available medical assistance is inadequate to meet the problem.

There is evidence of a need to detoxify drug abusers and to hospitalize chronic marihuana users in order to stabilize their conditions and hopefully return them to duty.

Dr. Kaplan told the subcommittee of his treatment efforts with regard to drug abusers including reliance on group therapy sessions.

While these efforts to treat and stabilize chronic drug abusers are utilized in Vietnam, the testimony reflects that they are currently inadequate and that more must be done not only with regard to treatment, but with regard to drug abuse education and preventive efforts.

If the treatment programs are not adequate, an alternate approach must be available which would provide for the physical disability discharge of drug addicted or dependent servicemen. However, under current military law, that is impossible.

Drug abuse and/or drug addiction are not considered by the Army to be grounds for a medical or psychiatric discharge. Such symptomatology must be subsumed under the heading of character behavior disorders which must be then handled through administrative channels. Such a situation now means a discharge, under existing Army regulations, for an underlying personality disorder. As a result of this procedure, the individual is not treated upon his discharge and continues his drug habit upon his return home.

And the fact is, Mr. President, that we have now begun to see the results of this problem at home.

Dr. Myron Feld, a former psychiatrist with the Veterans' Administration recently spoke out on this problem and indicated that the heavy abuse of drugs by servicemen in Vietnam is responsible for a high rate of mental breakdown among Vietnam veterans. He went on to point out that the breakdowns are occurring after discharge, and are due to the heavy use of ultrastrong Vietnamese marihuana and to other drugs including LSD and amphetamines.

Feld pointed out:

Our troops find it necessary to enter combat under the influence of drugs and, further to continue their use on return to the United States.

Mr. President, it is my firm belief that the Congress must now recognize the serious nature of the drug abuse problem in the military and must take immediate action to provide means to alleviate not only the immediate, but the long-term results of drug abuse by servicemen.

I believe that the legislation that I now propose would go a long way toward achieving such a goal.

If a man cannot function in the military because of drug addiction or drug dependence, he must be medically separated from service, treated and hopefully rehabilitated under an organized program of care.

The bill that I propose would do just this.

It provides:

For the physical disability separation from service of drug dependent and drug addicted military personnel.

For their civil commitment to treatment under titles III and IV of the Narcotic Addict Rehabilitation Act of 1968.

For penalties for drug offenses that are commensurate with those provided for in the Controlled Dangerous Substances Act.

I believe that if this bill is enacted, that we will make inroads into a problem of serious dimensions not only in the mili-

tary, but here at home where drug abuse and dependency must not be compounded by returning servicemen who have become "dope fiends" while in military service.

We should provide the very best of care for our returning veterans and this includes adequate treatment for drug dependency.

I urge my colleagues to give this bill their favorable consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4393) to authorize members of the Armed Forces to be discharged from active military service by reason of physical disability when such members are suffering from drug addiction or drug dependency, to authorize the civil commitment of such members after their discharge, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. Dodd, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

LET US OFFER EXCHANGE OF PRISONERS OF WAR—OFFERING ON BASIS OF 35 FOR ONE OF OUR MEN

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, at this time Americans have reason to believe that approximately 1,500 American fighting men, most of them officers of our Air Force, are being held as prisoners of war in prison camps in North Vietnam and in South Vietnam. Most of these officers and men were known to have been shot down over North Vietnam or South Vietnam or over the Gulf of Tonkin or South China Sea. Their planes were damaged or destroyed. When the downed pilots were not found alive, they were listed as missing in action. They have been presumed to be killed in combat or prisoners of war. A large majority according to American observers who saw the war planes shot down or were in rescue helicopters directly after these incidents or based on other information obtained, are believed to be prisoners of war.

It is believed that this total may approximate 1,500 American fighting men still being held as prisoners of war. Information servicemen known by their names are presently being held as prisoners of war by the forces of the National Liberation Front in South Vietnam or by the authorities in North Vietnam. An additional 1,100 are missing in action. It is hoped and believed that particularly all of them are prisoners of war.

Mr. President, I have no means of knowing how many of the 36,000 VC and North Vietnamese held as prisoners by the friendly forces of South Vietnam are officers. Probably relatively few are, in fact, officers.

It is an unfortunate policy that prisoners taken by our GI's are turned over to ARVN forces who do but very little fighting.

Veterans of World War II never held a German prisoner of war hooded and with his hands manacled behind him. We should by all means offer to exchange all these 36,000 prisoners of war for the 1,500 Americans. This operation, of course, to be handled entirely

by the International Red Cross and in accord with the Geneva agreement pertaining to the humane treatment of prisoners of war to which we are signatory. Whether or not the militarist government of Thieu and Ky have also signed the Geneva agreement for the humane treatment of prisoners, I do not know.

David Poling in the Christian Herald recently stated:

There is no doubt that there are thousands of Americans in North Vietnamese prisons.

From the thousands of helicopters and planes shot down alone, we understand a goodly percentage of personnel have been rescued and held prisoner by the North Vietnamese. The treatment of prisoners of war even by the most civilized nations does not always follow the Geneva Convention on rules of war. In the Vietnam conflict the Americans themselves do not show up too well in this connection. We turn over the captured enemy to the South Vietnamese to do with as they like, and the reports on conditions in South Vietnam prison camps are shocking. Torture of the most fiendish sort is inflicted, care of the wounded and sick is practically nil, and starvation is rife.

We know from pictures on our screens that invariably VC taken prisoners are immediately tortured by the South Vietnamese. Americans witnessed on their television screens a VC officer murdered by General Loan immediately after being turned over by Americans to whom he had surrendered.

Here is a proposal which might be accepted as Pentagon claims VC are suffering a shortage of manpower due to heavy losses.

In the history of warfare not only in wars in which the United States has been involved but almost universally there have been prisoner-of-war exchanges.

I am today making a constructive suggestion which I hope will be acted on by officials of the International Red Cross. Also, that leaders in the executive branch of our Government will work in trying to bring about the release of a thousand or more Americans held as prisoners of war by offering this exchange of approximately 36,000 prisoners most of whom were captured by our GI's. We should insist that President Thieu and Vice President Ky of the Saigon militarist regime go along and obey us on this or does the little tail wag the dog?

We Americans would gain a great deal if we received a thousand or more American prisoners of war through the work of the International Red Cross, and gave back to the VC and the North Vietnamese on the basis of 35 to 1 some 36,000 prisoners we have taken in this war.

Mr. President, in the entire history of our Republic including throughout two world wars and the Korean conflict our generals never adopted that abominable brutal system termed "body count." This was concocted by officers in the Pentagon some years ago about 1963 or 1964. This so-called body count policy has been followed from that time to the present time in reporting casualties supposedly suffered by the VC and North Vietnamese in the course of the undeclared war we are waging in Southeast

Asia, first in Vietnam and now in recent months expanded and escalated to fighting in Cambodia, Laos, and Thailand.

Pentagon officials and the generals of our Joint Chiefs of Staff no longer refer to this as the Vietnam war but term it the Indochinese war. They have adhered to this body count policy although no knowledgeable American believes these highly exaggerated body count figures issued regularly from the Pentagon. Were these body count figures accurate, anyone would wonder how it comes there are any men left to fight on the side of the VC or forces of the National Liberation Front.

This Indochinese war became the most unpopular war ever waged in the history of our Republic very shortly following the time that President Lyndon Johnson on his own, in the absence of a declaration of war from Congress, had more than 500,000 U.S. troops in Vietnam at one time. In the administrations of Presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy we had military advisers in Vietnam—no combat troops. On the day President Eisenhower left the White House we had 687 military advisers in Vietnam—no combat troops. On the day that President Kennedy was assassinated we had approximately 16,200 military advisers in Vietnam—no combat troops.

Waging a major war in Southeast Asia is the most horrendous mistake made by a U.S. President. Vietnam is of no importance whatever to the defense of the United States. This is the most unpopular war our Nation has ever waged. It is an undeclared war. It is the longest war in point of time. With the exception of World War II, it is the most costly war in the loss of priceless American lives.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

MR. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for 3 additional minutes.

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

CARL MCINTIRE: PREACHER OF HATRED

MR. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, Carl McIntire, the rightwing extremist preacher of hatred who has invited Vice President Ky of the militarist Saigon regime to come to Washington and participate in his so-called march for freedom, has long been recognized in religious circles as a charlatan and heretic.

The fact is that Carl McIntire is a bigot in clerical clothing. He was defrocked in disgrace in 1936 by leaders of the United Presbyterian Church. Today, the United Presbyterian Church has a membership of 3,172,760. By comparison, Mr. McIntire's group of misguided followers in the splinter Bible Presbyterian Church he established number 1,800. The United Presbyterian Church is more than 1,500 times the size of McIntire's group of followers.

Mr. McIntire spews forth his brand of hatred from a dilapidated building in Collingswood, N.J. His organization

prints the Christian Beacon, a weekly compilation of the preacher's opposition to legitimate political and religious groups as well as printing books, tracts, and position papers.

Last year, Reverend McIntire, so-called, was expelled from the executive committee of the American Council of Christian Churches due to his extremist views and his reputation as a spewer of hate.

Mr. President, yesterday Vice President AGNEW stated that Vice President Ky's scheduled appearance at the October 3 rally would not serve any "useful purpose." I am in complete agreement with the Vice President.

When I was in Vietnam in 1968, I interviewed Vice President Ky of the Saigon militarist regime for nearly an hour. He is an abominable fellow. This mini-dictator, who is a fraud and a phony air marshal, was born and reared in Hanoi. He, along with nine generals born in North Vietnam who overthrew the legal civilian government in Saigon in June 1965, fought with the French Armed Forces seeking to reestablish their tyrannical colonial Indochinese empire. In 1954, Ky was in the French Air Force as were those nine generals opposing their fellow countrymen fighting for national liberation then termed "Viet Minh," now Vietcong. Ky proudly displayed on his flamboyant flying jacket a decoration he was awarded by the French. He is really a traitor to his nation now the same as he was at the time of Dienbienphu.

He and President Thieu stalled for 4 weeks before sending delegates to join Ambassador Averell Harriman at the Paris conference. Their refusal caused a halt to all proceedings toward peace. During a period when 200 or more Americans were being killed in Vietnam each week, he and President Thieu refused to join the conference.

In addition, Vice President Ky personally receives \$15,000 per week from the receipts of the Saigon racetrack. In 1967, Ky admitted he was receiving this racetrack money and said he used it from time to time to help disabled war veterans. He had, up to that time, paid out the total sum of \$65 for this purpose.

Our Ambassador to South Vietnam, Ellsworth Bunker, who in 1968 made the astonishing statement that the Tet lunar offensive was "a resounding military defeat for the Vietcong," accompanied Ky to the airport when he left Saigon last week on his trip to Paris and Washington. Perhaps Ambassador Bunker personally had reason to rejoice and state that the Tet offensive of the Vietcong was "a resounding military defeat." He fled and escaped with his life from the U.S. Embassy compound. The Vietcong breached the fortress-like wall, invaded our Embassy, killed American soldiers and civilians in the Embassy compound, and held possession of the Embassy for 7 hours.

In this same Tet lunar offensive of February 1968, the Vietcong invaded Saigon and released thousands of prisoners in jail and they forcibly invaded and took possession of 37 of 44 provincial capitals in South Vietnam, in every instance releasing prisoners from jail, con-

September 24, 1970

scripting many of the young men in their armed forces and seizing possession of many tons of rice. They held possession of Hue, the ancient capital, for a month. Our marines finally drove them out after suffering heavy casualties.

It was reported at the time that Ambassador Bunker escaped and was secluded in a safe place. He was able, however, to return after some 7 hours, probably feeling happy to be alive.

Mr. President, it is disgraceful to contemplate that Vice President Ky and Reverend McIntire, so-called, would stand in the shadow of the Washington Monument and the Capitol calling for the American people to rally for all-out military victory in waging an immoral war in a tiny country in a remote part of Southeast Asia that we have devastated.

In any event this flamboyant Vice President Ky, instead of coming to Washington to participate in the demonstration, would be well advised if he would go to Hong Kong or Switzerland and rendezvous with his unlisted bank accounts in both places, or continue to take \$15,000 almost every week in receipts from the militarists in Saigon which he controls.

Reverend McIntire, so-called, and Vice President Ky are advocates of blood and tears and fighting on to a complete American military victory in Southeast Asia even though that might cause another 50,000 young Americans to be killed in combat.

A TRUTH WE ALL AGREE ON

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, some truths bear constant repetition. When Col. Frank Borman addressed a joint meeting of Congress concerning his diplomatic mission on behalf of American prisoners of war, he spoke a simple truth on which we all agree.

The humanitarian aspect of this question is above all political and military aspects. Regardless of what our individual opinions are on the Vietnamese war, we unite in our concern for these unfortunate captives.

They have been denied the minimum treatment prescribed in the Geneva Convention on prisoners of war. The North Vietnamese Government is a signatory to that treaty. We are determined to make every effort to persuade that Government to rise to that minimum level in its prisoner-of-war policy.

MAKING CONGRESS MORE EFFECTIVE

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I call attention to a study report just released which I believe will stimulate a broad and constructive discussion. It is a statement by the Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development.

I ask unanimous consent that at this point in the RECORD the membership report of that committee be printed.

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

RESEARCH AND POLICY COMMITTEE

Jervis J. Babb, New York, New York.
Joseph W. Barr, President, American Security and Trust Co.

Frederick S. Beebe, Chairman of the Board, Newsweek.

William S. Belnecke, Chairman of the Board, The Sperry and Hutchinson Company.
S. Clark Beise, President (Retired), Bank of America N.T. & S.A.

William Benton, Publisher and Chairman, Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc.

Joseph L. Block, Chairman, Executive Committee, Inland Steel Company.

Marvin Dower, Director, McKinsey & Company, Inc.

John L. Burns, President, John L. Burns and Company.

Rafael Carrion, Jr., Chairman and President, Banco Popular de Puerto Rico.

Emilio G. Collado, Executive Vice President, Standard Oil Company (New Jersey).

Robert C. Cosgrove, Chairman of the Board, Green Giant Company.

Marion B. Folsom, Rochester, New York.

William C. Foster, Washington, D.C.

John M. Fox, Chairman, United Fruit Company.

Co-Chairmen: Emilio G. Collado, Executive Vice President, Standard Oil Company (New Jersey).

Philip M. Klutznick, Chairman, Urban Investment and Development Company.

Vice Chairmen: Howard C. Petersen, Chairman, National Economy, The Fidelity Bank.

John A. Perkins, President, Improvement of Management in Government, Wilmington Medical Center.

Philip M. Klutznick, Chairman, Education and Urban Development, Urban Investment and Development Co.

William M. Roth, International Economy, San Francisco, California.

David L. Francis, Chairman, Princess Coal Sales Company.

William H. Franklin, President, Caterpillar Tractor Co.

Richard C. Gerstenberg, Vice Chairman of the Board, General Motors Corporation.

Ellison L. Hazard, Chairman and President, Continental Can Company, Inc.

H. J. Heinz, II, Chairman, H. J. Heinz Company.

William A. Hewitt, Chairman, Deere & Company.

Charles Keller, Jr., President, Keller Construction Corporation.

Robert J. Kleberg, Jr., President, King Ranch, Inc.

Philip M. Klutznick, Chairman, Urban Investment and Development Co.

Ralph Lazarus, Chairman, Federated Department Stores, Inc.

Thomas B. McCabe, Chairman, Finance Committee, Scott Paper Company.

George C. McGhee, Washington, D.C.

John F. Merriam, Chairman, Executive Committee, Northern Natural Gas Company.

Raymond H. Mulford, Chairman, Owens-Illinois Inc.

Robert R. Nathan, President, Robert R. Nathan Associates, Inc.

Alfred C. Neal, President, Committee for Economic Development.

John A. Perkins, President, Wilmington Medical Center.

Howard C. Petersen, Chairman, The Fidelity Bank.

C. Wrede Petersmeyer, President, Corinthian Broadcasting Corporation.

Philip D. Reed, New York, New York.

Melvin J. Roberts, President, Colorado National Bank of Denver.

William M. Roth, San Francisco, California.

Robert B. Semple, President, Wyandotte Chemicals Corporation.

S. Abbot Smith, Boston, Massachusetts.

Philip Sporn, New York, New York.

Allan Sproul, Kentfield, California.

William C. Stolk, Chairman, W. C. Stolk & Associates, Inc.

Alexander L. Stott, Vice President and Comptroller, American Telephone & Telegraph Company.

Wayne E. Thompson, Vice President, Dayton-Hudson Corporation.

H. C. Turner, Jr., Chairman, Turner Construction Company.

Herman L. Weiss, Vice Chairman, General Electric Company.

Frazar B. Wilde, Chairman Emeritus, Connecticut General Life Insurance Co.

Walter W. Wilson, Partner, Morgan Stanley & Co.

Theodore O. Yntema, Department of Economics, Oakland University.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, this distinguished group has captioned its statement, "Making Congress More Effective." It is a statement which generated considerable discussion among the committee members themselves. One can notice from the footnotes the sincere effort by each member of that distinguished group to clarify particular individual attitudes of the individual, all of whom joined the general statements of conclusions of the committee.

To encourage my colleagues and others in the country to read the full statement, I ask unanimous consent that the "Summary of Conclusions and Recommendations" of the committee be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Facing issues of unprecedented magnitude and scope, Congress—like most other human institutions—is reluctant to modify its long-established, habitual ways of doing business. Continuing delay in modernization of Congressional structures and procedures, however, will surely be injurious to the national interest and can lead only to further erosion in influence and effectiveness of the Legislative Branch.

Recognizing the complexities and obstacles standing in the way of change, we have limited the recommendations in this statement to proposals designed to overcome weaknesses without undertaking a complete remodeling of the present system. No further reference is made, for example, to the possible substitution of multi-member for single-member districts in the House of Representatives, or to changes that would require amendment of the Constitution.

In the following chapters we advocate significant modifications that are both pragmatic and immediately practicable, dealing with three separate though interrelated fields of action. First, we urge fundamental improvements in the Congressional handling of fiscal-economic decisions. Second, we propose readjustment of the entire committee structure and of the procedures associated with it. Third, we strongly support divestment by Congress of inessential and unsuitable administrative burdens, together with other measures that would strengthen public confidence in its objectivity.

The present Congressional approach to fiscal affairs is indefensible. When budget decisions are extended long past the beginning of the fiscal year for which they are intended, when there is no Congressional mechanism to tie revenues and appropriations into a coherent pattern, when no legislative procedure exists to initiate actions based on a comprehensive view of the economy, then national stability is endangered. When Congress permits its evaluation and oversight

of programs to be carried out in ways that allow the continuance of obsolete programs and the wasteful management of potentially useful ones, then both the credibility and the effectiveness of the entire national government are seriously harmed. To correct these conditions we recommend that:

Means for comprehensive review of the annual budget be established and used, relating total revenues and expenditures to the state of the economy.

Annual authorizations be discounted; instead, authorizations should be made along program and project lines, fully funded, for minimum terms of four years.

Evaluation of program performance, in terms of objectives as well as dollars, be heavily stressed.

The federal fiscal year be changed to coincide with the calendar year, so that appropriations may always precede expenditures.

Congress establish and observe deadline dates for both authorizations and appropriations.

The committee system has the crucial role in Congressional decision making. As it now operates, however, decisions are fragmented; problems demanding a broad policy approach are handled in piecemeal fashion and hence poorly by the many autonomous committees and their innumerable subcommittees. These committees carry out much of their work in obscurity or secrecy which can be and often is maintained—even against the inquiries of other Members—in defiance of the elementary tenets of democracy. Through the assignment system that determines their makeup, and by means of restrictive procedures, committees can be dominated by small groups of Members with special interests held in common—or even by the desires of a powerful and autocratic chairman. These conditions prevent Congress from making open and effective response to urgent national needs. Therefore, we recommend:

Fewer standing committees, with broader jurisdiction for each.

Better use of joint and select committees.

More flexible subcommittee arrangements, with rotating chairmanships.

Abandonment of seniority as the sole criterion in selecting committee chairmen.

Democraticized procedures, with many more open hearings.

Better informational and analytical resources for committees.

There is no doubt that there has been an erosion of popular respect for Congress. This is injurious to the nation as well as to Congress as an institution. Citizens are now insisting that every level and branch of government become more responsive, more open to the demands of all the people, more attuned to current priorities, and less bound by traditional approaches or endless red tape. In the face of these trends Congress has appeared to fold in upon itself. Its endless involvement with minor details of administrative management and its open and attentive solicitude for special interest groups contrast with its negative reaction to many concerns of the general public. Prompt action on several fronts is needed to restore public trust. Hence, we propose:

Relinquishment of detailed direction of all administrative functions unsuited to management by a legislative body or by any committee of such a body.

Stronger "Codes of Ethics."

Assurance of majority rule on major issues in both chambers.

Installation of modern voting procedures which would eliminate the secrecy surrounding teller, standing, and voice votes in the House of Representatives.

Thorough reform of campaign finance, with full disclosure and tax incentives for contributions.

Prohibition of committee meetings while sessions of the chamber are in progress.

Acceptance of these recommendations

would do much to improve Congressional operations and to enhance the Congressional image.³ Fortunately, there are no legal barriers to their adoption; changes in House and Senate rules, modification of outmoded customs, or statutory enactments in some few cases, would suffice. The Members can make the necessary changes whenever the majority chooses. Congress has considered and debated many of them in recent years, so far to little or no avail.⁴ It is now time to correct obvious weaknesses. The defects of Congress are not congenital; its wounds are self-inflicted.

Mr. HART. Finally, Mr. President, three of the recommendations appear to me to have particular appeal. The first is the recommendation that the Federal fiscal year be changed to coincide with the calendar year. The other two deal with the matter of congressional authorization and appropriation procedure. The committee recommends that annual authorizations be discontinued; that authorizations should be made along program and project lines, fully funded, and for a minimum term of 4 years. It proposes that the appropriations process should be designed to modify long-range programs in terms of short-range capabilities in light of performance.

The statement makes many other challenging suggestions with most of which I find myself in agreement.

Again, I thank the distinguished Americans who made up the Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development. In the past, CED has published studies bearing on executive management in the Federal Government, Federal budgetmaking, presidential succession, modernizing local government, modernizing State government, financing a better election system, statements on a fiscal program for a balanced federalism, and reshaping of government in metropolitan areas.

Some of the policy recommendations made in those earlier statements already have been adopted. Others, I am sure, will be.

In this most recent report "Making Congress More Effective," there are recommendations which ought to be adopted by the Congress. In any event, given the quality and experience, the source from which this study comes, each of the recommendations reflected in that statement should have the most serious study and attention from all of us in Congress.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED AMENDMENT OF THE DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

A letter from the Director, Office of Emergency Preparedness, Executive Office of the President, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, to eliminate the

³ See Memorandum by Mr. Richard C. Gerstenberg, page 62.

⁴ See Memorandum by Mr. Joseph L. Block, page 63.

restriction on guaranteed transactions under section 301 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO SERVICES OF CONSULTANTS IN CONNECTION WITH CIVIL FUNCTIONS OF THE CORPS OF ENGINEERS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Act of July 3, 1930, as amended, relating to the services of consultants in connection with civil functions of the Corps of Engineers (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION RELATING TO PAY OF CIVILIAN MEMBERS OF THE BOARD ON COASTAL ENGINEERING RESEARCH

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend Section 103 of the River and Harbor Act of 1960, pertaining to the pay of civilian members of the Board on Coastal Engineering Research (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A resolution adopted by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, Denver, Colo., relating to prevention of pollution in the Arctic; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, Denver, Colo., relating to loss of wet lands and sports fisheries caused by stream channelization under the Small Watershed Act; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, Denver, Colo., relating to consideration of fish and wildlife aspects in water resources management; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, Denver, Colo., relating to legislation modernizing the P-R and D-J Acts; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, Denver, Colo., relating to regulation on shipment of diseased fish; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, Denver, Colo., relating to need for "new product" clearing house at the Federal level; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Philadelphia, Pa., memorializing the President and the Congress to declare a boycott of the Arab States; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A resolution adopted by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, Denver, Colo., relating to continued efforts on public land law review; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, Denver, Colo., relating to need for population control to maintain a quality environment; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, Denver, Colo., relating to required course in environmental science; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

A resolution adopted by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, Denver, Colo., relating to research on mercury contamination of the environment; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, Denver, Colo., relating to establishment of a National Water Bank; to the Committee on Public Works.

A resolution adopted by the Association of Midwest Fish and Game Commissioners, Denver, Colo., relating to coordinated advance planning on projects affecting environmental quality; to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RANDOLPH, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with an amendment:

S. 2461. A bill to amend the Randolph-Sheppard Act for the blind so as to make certain improvements therein, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-1235).

By Mr. JAVITS, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with an amendment:

S. 3425. A bill to amend the Wagner-O'Day Act to extend the provisions thereof to severely handicapped individuals who are not blind, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-1236).

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

S. 752. A bill to authorize the conveyance of all right, title, and interest of the United States reserved or retained in certain lands heretofore conveyed to the State of Maine (Rept. No. 91-1237).

By Mr. INOUYE, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

S. 4187. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands at Fort Ruger Military Reservation, Hawaii, to the State of Hawaii in exchange for certain other lands (Rept. No. 91-1238).

By Mr. BYRD of Virginia, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 14373. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to convey to the city of Portsmouth, State of Virginia, certain lands situated within the Crawford urban renewal project (Va-53) in the city of Portsmouth, in exchange for certain lands situated within the proposed Southside neighborhood development project (Rept. No. 91-1239).

By Mr. DOMINICK, from the Committee on Armed Services, with an amendment:

S. 3795. A bill to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, in order to extend under certain circumstances the expiration date specified in a power of attorney executed by a member of the Armed Forces who is missing in action or held as a prisoner of war (Rept. No. 91-1240).

By Mr. JACKSON, from the Committee on Armed Services, with amendments:

H.R. 17604. An act to authorize certain construction at military installations, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-1234).

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with amendments:

H.R. 18306. An act to authorize United States participation in increases in the resources of certain international financial institutions, to provide for an annual audit of the Exchange Stabilization Fund by the General Accounting Office, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 91-1241).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report favorably three nominations of general and flag officers in the Army and Navy.

I ask that these names be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NELSON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The nominations, ordered to be placed on the Executive Calendar, are as follows:

Maj. Gen. John Norton, U.S. Army, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President, for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general while so serving;

Adm. Ephraim P. Holmes, U.S. Navy, for appointment to the grade of admiral on the retired list; and

Vice Adm. Charles K. Duncan, U.S. Navy, for commands and other duties determined by the President, for appointment to the grade of admiral while so serving.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, in addition, I report favorably 8,027 promotions in the Navy in the grade of captain and below and 323 appointments in the Marine Corps in the grade of colonel and below. Since these names have already been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in order to save the expense of printing on the Executive Calendar, I ask unanimous consent that they be ordered to lie on the Secretary's desk for the information of any Senator.

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

The nominations, ordered to lie on the desk, are as follows:

James W. Abraham, and sundry other officers, for temporary appointment in the Marine Corps;

Richard C. Adams, and sundry other officers, for permanent promotion in the Navy;

Arnold T. Stevens, a temporary disability retired officer, for reappointment in the Marine Corps;

Carl Andrew Armstrong, Jr., and sundry other officers, for temporary promotion in the Navy;

Herman Carl Abelein, and sundry other officers, for temporary promotion in the Navy; and

Arthur R. Anderson, Jr., and sundry other officers, for temporary appointment in the Marine Corps.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. DODD:

S. 4393. A bill to authorize members of the Armed Forces to be discharged from active military service by reason of physical disability when such members are suffering from drug addiction or drug dependency, to authorize the civil commitment of such members after their discharge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

(The remarks of Mr. DODD when he introduced the bill appear earlier in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. MILLER:

S. 4394. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to make a misdemeanor the flight, in interstate or foreign commerce, by any person who is the parent of a minor child or who is a married man, if such person so flees with the intent of evading his legal responsibilities with respect to the support or maintenance of his minor child or his wife; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(The remarks of Mr. MILLER when he in-

roduced the bill appear below in the Record under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. HARRIS:

S. 4395. A bill for the relief of Adelaida M. Alinsagay; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCOTT (for himself, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. GORE, Mr. METCALF, Mr. PERCY, Mr. SCHWEIKER, and Mr. YOUNG of Ohio):

S. 4396. A bill to amend Title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide Medicare benefits (financed from general revenues) for disabled coal miners without regard to their age; to the Committee on Finance.

(The remarks of Mr. SCOTT when he introduced the bill appear below under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

S.J. Res. 237. Joint resolution to establish the Mineral Resources Commission to study and submit recommendations concerning laws and procedures relating to the administration of the mineral resources in the public lands and other lands of the United States; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

(The remarks of Mr. MANSFIELD when he introduced the joint resolution appear below under the appropriate heading.)

DIRECT POPULAR ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT AND THE VICE PRESIDENT—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 946

Mr. ERVIN submitted an amendment, in the nature of a substitute, intended to be proposed by him, to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution to provide for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President of the United States, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

S. 4394—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO MAKE A MISDEMEANOR THE FLIGHT IN INTERSTATE OR FOREIGN COMMERCE BY A PERSON LEGALLY RESPONSIBLE FOR THE SUPPORT OF A WIFE OR MINOR CHILD

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate references, a bill to make it a Federal crime to cross State lines for the purpose of evading legal responsibility for the maintenance or support of a wife or minor child.

The Senate Finance Committee recently completed hearings on the House-passed family assistance plan. The House bill contains a provision creating an obligation to the United States on the part of a deserting parent equal to the total amount of family assistance benefits received by the deserting parent's spouse and children. This amount could be collected from amounts otherwise due or becoming due the deserting parent from any agency of the United States or under any Federal program. During the hearings and discussion on this particular provision it became clear that something further is needed to help assure that husbands would not desert their children and wives but would continue to provide support for them. One of the most effective ways to accomplish this result is to discourage the flight across State lines for the purpose of

evading these marital or parental responsibilities. The bill I am introducing would be a step, I believe, in that direction.

The bill would merely provide that any parent of a child under the age of 18 or a married man who travels across State lines with the intent of evading any obligation for the maintenance or support of such child or his wife would be subject to a fine of not more than a \$1,000 nor imprisonment for more than 1 year, or both. The bill would establish a presumption that such interstate movement was with the intent referred to above if as a result of such movement: First, the individual is outside the jurisdiction which imposes the support obligation and the wife or child remains within the jurisdiction; second, at the time of such movement the child or wife is destitute; and third, the individual fails to notify his wife or children of his whereabouts for a period of more than 1 month.

Since this proposal deals with establishing a crime, I assume the bill will be referred to the Senate Judiciary Committee. I am hopeful that the committee will act quickly on it so that it might be considered in connection with the welfare reform.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN of Idaho). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 4394) to amend title 18, United States Code, to make a misdemeanor the flight, in interstate or foreign commerce, by any person who is the parent of a minor child or who is a married man, if such person so flees with the intent of evading his legal responsibilities with respect to the support or maintenance of his minor child or his wife, introduced by Mr. MILLER, was received, read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 4396—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL RELATING TO EXTENSION OF MEDICARE TO THE NATION'S DISABLED COAL MINERS

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I introduce, with the distinguished senior Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH) as its primary cosponsor, a bill to extend full medicare benefits under social security to the Nation's disabled coal miners, regardless of age.

We are pleased to be joined as additional cosponsors in this effort by our able colleagues, the Senators from Tennessee (Mr. GORE), Montana (Mr. METCALF), Illinois (Mr. PERCY), Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER), and Ohio (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. President, our bill is addressed to the men who bear the scars of mining accidents and diseases. These men represent a national problem—one which cannot be overlooked simply because it is often hidden in the hills and valleys of Appalachia or in other remote coal mining areas.

The black long provisions of the recently enacted Coal Mine Health and Safety Act deal with only one specific problem. Unfortunately, neither these provisions, nor the medical coverage

provided by the United Mine Workers of America welfare and retirement fund, have been sufficient in a great many cases to take care of the needs of disabled coal miners. The spiraling cost of medical care, together with the uniquely hazardous nature of mining work, places in an extremely precarious position the miner who is disabled, but not qualified for other benefits.

The social security law makes men who have worked a lifetime, and who retire at age 65, eligible for "medicare" benefits. This program has been of immeasurable benefit for America's elderly who can no longer work because of age.

It is our belief that disabled coal miners should be afforded similar treatment under the law. They have given the full of their working lifetime to America—a lifetime which is measured in disability, if not in years. We believe it is justifiable that the nation should provide medical and hospital care for men crippled and otherwise disabled during the course of their work in our coal mines.

We offer our bill as proof that America has not forgotten its disabled coal miners. We urge prompt and favorable consideration of this vital legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN of Idaho). The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill, S. 4396, to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide medicare benefits—financed from general revenues—for disabled coal miners without regard to their age, introduced by Mr. SCOTT, for himself and other Senators, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 237—INTRODUCTION OF A JOINT RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH THE MINERAL RESOURCES COMMISSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I introduce today a joint resolution calling for the creation of a National Mineral Resources Commission. Very generally, it would be the duty of this Commission to study and submit recommendations concerning laws and procedures relating to the administration of the mineral resources in the public lands and other lands of the United States. As set forth in this resolution, it would be the declared policy of Congress that all mineral resources in this Nation should be: First, located, retained and managed; or, second, disposed of, all in a manner to provide for the maximum benefit of the general public.

The Commission would have a 2-year life. It would be composed of three majority and three minority Members of the Senate; three majority and three minority Members of the House of Representatives, and six persons appointed by the President of the United States from among members of the public who have particular knowledge and expertise with respect to our minerals and minerals policies.

The Commission would study existing statutes and rules and regulations gov-

erning the location, the retention and management and the disposition of our mineral resources. Studied as well would be the various incentive and subsidy programs relating to our minerals with a view to their effectiveness and their adequacy. Additionally, the Commission would review the policies and practices of all of the Federal agencies that are charged with jurisdiction over these resources. The Commission would also compile data necessary to understand and determine the various demands on our mineral resources today and in the foreseeable future. Finally, the Commission is to recommend such modifications in existing laws, in rules and regulations and in current policies and practices, including the various incentive and subsidy programs, as will best serve the public interest.

Established in an advisory capacity to the Commission would be the Mineral Advisory Council. The Council would be comprised of the representatives of the various agencies having jurisdiction over our minerals, together with 20 additional members representing various major citizens groups interested in problems relating to the minerals of this Nation.

In closing, Mr. President, I would only say that I think this resolution goes further than any I have seen in granting to a proposed Minerals Commission the authority to study the full range of problems that will confront this Nation with respect to its minerals in the years ahead. Interests of consumers, of producers, and investors, and of workers as well, must be served. They must be served in a manner that will best suit the public as a whole.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be appropriately referred and that it be considered along with other measures relating to this same matter.

I also ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JORDAN of Idaho). The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the joint resolution will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 237) to establish the Mineral Resources Commission to study and submit recommendations concerning laws and procedures relating to the administration of the mineral resources in the public lands and other lands of the United States, introduced by Mr. MANSFIELD, was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S.J. Res. 237

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) it is hereby declared to be the policy of Congress that the mineral resources in the public lands and other lands of the United States be (1) located, retained and managed, or (2) disposed of, all in a manner to provide the maximum benefit for the general public.

(b) As a result of the fact that laws of the United States relating to its mineral resources have developed over a long period of years through a series of Acts of Congress and are not fully correlated with each other and because such laws may be inadequate to meet the current and future needs of the

American people, the Congress declares that it is necessary to have a comprehensive review of those laws and the rules and regulations promulgated thereunder, and to determine whether and to what extent revisions thereof are necessary.

SEC. 2. (a) For the purpose of carrying out the policy and purpose set forth in the first section of this Resolution, there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Mineral Resources Commission, hereinafter referred to as the "Commission".

(b) The Commission shall be composed of nineteen members, as follows:

(1) Three majority and three minority members of the United States Senate to be appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate;

(2) Three majority and three minority members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives;

(3) Six persons to be appointed by the President of the United States from among members of the public who have particular knowledge and expertise with respect to minerals and numerical policies; and

(4) One person, elected by majority vote of the other eighteen, who shall be the Chairman of the Commission.

(c) Any vacancy which may occur on the Commission shall not affect its powers or functions but shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

(d) The organization meeting of the Commission shall be held at such time and place as may be specified in a call issued jointly by the senior member appointed by the President pro tempore of the Senate and the senior member appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The Commission shall select a Vice Chairman from among its members.

(e) Ten members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a smaller number, as determined by the Commission, may conduct hearings.

(f) Members of Congress who are Members of the Commission shall serve without compensation in addition to that received for their services as Members of Congress; but they shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of the duties vested in the Commission.

(g) The members appointed by the President shall each receive \$100 per diem when engaged in the actual performance of duties vested in the Commission, plus reimbursement for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by them in the performance of such duties.

SEC. 3. (a) (1) The Commission or, on authorization of the Commission, any committee of two or more members, at least one of whom shall be of each major political party, may, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this resolution, hold such hearings, take testimony or receive evidence under oath and sit and act at such times and places as the Commission or such authorized committee may deem advisable. The member of the Commission presiding at any such hearing is authorized to administer the oath to witnesses. Subpoenas for the attendance and testimony of witnesses or the production of written or other matter may be issued only on the authority of the Commission and shall be served by anyone designated by the Chairman of the Commission.

(2) The Commission shall not issue any subpoena for the attendance and testimony of witnesses or for the production of written or other matters which would require the presence of the parties subpoenaed at a hearing to be held outside of the State wherein the witness is found or resides or transacts business.

(3) A witness may submit material on a

confidential basis for the use of the Commission and, if so submitted, the Commission shall not make the material public. The provisions of sections 102-104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes (2 U.S.C. 192-194) shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpoena or testimony when summoned under this section.

(b) The Commission is authorized to secure from any department, agency, or individual instrumentality of the executive branch of the Government any information it deems necessary to carry out its functions under this resolution and each such department, agency, and instrumentality is authorized and directed to furnish such information to the Commission upon request made by the Chairman or the Vice Chairman when acting as Chairman.

(c) If the Commission requires of any witness or of any governmental agency production of any materials which have theretofore been submitted to a government agency on a confidential basis, and the confidentiality of those materials is protected by statute, the material so produced shall be held confidential by the Commission.

SEC. 4. It shall be the duty of the Commission to—

(1) study existing statutes and rules and regulations governing the location, retention, management, and disposition of the mineral resources in the public lands and other lands of the United States including various incentive and subsidy programs with a view to determining the consistency, effectiveness, and adequacy of existing Government policies, plans, and programs involving such resources;

(2) review the policies and practices of the Federal agencies charged with administrative jurisdiction over such resources insofar as such policies and practices relate to the location, retention, management, and disposition of such resources;

(3) compile data necessary to understand and determine the various demands on such mineral resources which now exist and which are likely to exist within the foreseeable future, and the existing and long-range supply outlook with respect to such mineral resources; and

(4) recommend such modifications in existing laws, rules and regulations, policies, and practices including various incentive and subsidy programs as will, in the judgment of the Commission, best serve to carry out the policy set forth in the first section of this resolution.

SEC. 5. The Chairman of the Commission shall request the Secretaries of State, Defense, Interior, Commerce, and Health, Education, and Welfare; the chairmen of Federal Power Commission and the Atomic Energy Commission; and the Directors of the Office of Emergency Preparedness and the Office of Science and Technology to appoint, and the head of such department or agency shall appoint, a liaison officer who shall work closely with the Commission and its staff in matters pertaining to this resolution.

SEC. 6. (a) There is hereby established Mineral Advisory Council, which shall consist of the liaison officers appointed under section 5 of this Resolution, together with twenty additional members appointed by the Commission. Members appointed by the Commission shall be representative of the various major citizens' groups interested in problems relating to the location, retention, management, and disposition of the mineral resources in the public lands and other lands of the United States, including the following: organizations representative of State and local government, private organizations representative of consumer interests, conservation interests, landowner interests, mining interests, oil and gas interests, commercial and sport fishing interests, commercial outdoor recreation interests, industry, labor,

education, and public utilities. Any vacancy occurring on the Advisory Council shall be filled in the same manner as the original appointment.

(b) The Advisory Council shall advise and counsel the Commission concerning matters within the jurisdiction of the Commission.

(c) Members of the Advisory Council shall serve without compensation, but shall be entitled to reimbursement for actual travel and subsistence expenses incurred in attending meetings of the Council called or approved by the Chairman of the Commission or in carrying out duties assigned by the Chairman.

(d) The Chairman of the Commission shall call an organizational meeting of the Advisory Council as soon as practicable, a meeting of such Council each six months thereafter, and a final meeting prior to the approval of the final report by the Commission.

(e) The Chairman of the Commission shall invite the Governor of each State to designate a representative to work closely with the Commission and its staff and with the Advisory Council in matters pertaining to this resolution.

SEC. 7. (a) There is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sum, not to exceed \$3,000,000, as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this resolution and such moneys as may be appropriated shall be available to the Commission until expended.

(b) The Commission is authorized, without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates, to fix the compensation of its Chairman, and to appoint and fix the compensation of its staff director, and such additional personnel as may be necessary to enable it to carry out its functions. Such appointments may be made and such compensation fixed without regard to the provisions of title 5, United States Code, governing appointments in the competitive service and the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of such title relating to classification and General Schedule pay rates; except that any Federal employee subject to the civil laws and regulations who may be employed by the Commission shall retain his civil service status without interruption or loss of status or privilege.

(c) The Commission is authorized to enter into contracts or agreements for studies and surveys with public and private organizations and, if necessary, to transfer funds to Federal agencies from sums appropriated pursuant to this resolution to carry out such aspects of the review as the Commission determines can best be carried out in that manner.

(d) For the purposes of Chapter 11 of title 18, United States Code, service of an individual as a member of the Advisory Council, as the representative of a Governor, or employment by the Commission of an attorney or expert in any job or professional field on a part-time or full-time basis with or without compensation shall be considered to be service or employment rendered as a special government employee.

SEC. 8. The Commission shall, not later than December 31, 1972, submit to the President of the United States and the Congress its final report. The Commission shall cease to exist six months after the submission of such report or on June 30, 1973, whichever first occurs. All records and papers of the Commission shall thereupon be delivered to the Administrator of General Services for deposit in the Archives of the United States.

SEC. 9. As used in this Resolution, the term "public lands" includes (a) the public domain of the United States, (b) reservations, other than Indian reservations, created from the public domain, (c) lands permanently or temporarily withdrawn, reserved, or withheld from private appropriation and

disposal under the public land laws, including the mining laws, (d) outstanding interests of the United States in lands patented, conveyed in fee or otherwise, under the public land laws, (e) national forests, (f) wildlife refuges and ranges, and (g) the lands defined by appropriate statute, treaty, or judicial determination being under the control of the United States in the Outer Continental Shelf.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF A BILL

S. 4297

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), I ask unanimous consent that, at the next printing, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON) be added as a cosponsor of S. 4297, to create a health security program.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

SOCIAL SECURITY AMENDMENTS OF 1970—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 947

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I rise at this time to submit an amendment to H.R. 17550, the House-passed social security amendments of 1970, which is now before the Senate Finance Committee. I ask unanimous consent for the printing in today's RECORD of my amendment in order that my colleagues may review this proposal. Rather than waiting for the social security bill to reach the Senate floor, I am offering my amendment at this time so that the finance committee may study this proposal along with the other alternatives under consideration. Essentially, I am offering an amendment which would require the States to disregard all social security benefit increases in determining need for public assistance.

Many retired citizens have pointed out to me that the social security increases authorized by the Congress are offset by State action which reduces old age assistance payments in proportion to the social security increase. In other words, the retired citizen may receive no benefit at all as the social security increase is taken away by a reduction in State assistance. My amendment attempts to resolve this inequity by requiring the States to disregard social security benefit increases authorized by the Congress when determining their income need figure for public assistance. This proposal will not place any great financial burden upon the States, but it will help ease the economic crisis facing many of our retired citizens.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HANSEN). The amendment will be received and printed, and will be appropriately referred; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment (No. 947) was referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 947

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

"DISREGARDING OF SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFIT INCREASE IN DETERMINING NEED FOR PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

"SEC. 302. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2(a)(10), 1002(a)(8), 1402(a)(8), and 1602(a)(13) and (14) of the Social Security Act, each State, in determining need for aid or assistance under a State plan approved under title I, X, XIV, or XVI of such Act, shall disregard (and the plan shall be deemed to require the State to disregard), in addition to any other amounts which the State is required or permitted to disregard in determining such need, any amount (or any portion thereof) paid to an individual under title II of such Act (or under the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 by reason of the first proviso in section 3(e) thereof) if—

"(1) for the month preceding the first month that monthly insurance benefits payable under title II of the Social Security Act are increased by reason of the enactment of section 101 of this Act—

"(A) such individual received aid or assistance under such State plan;

"(B) such individual was entitled (on the basis of an application filed in or before such month) to monthly insurance benefits under section 202 or section 223 of the Social Security Act; and

"(2) such amount (or portion thereof) is attributable to the increase, in monthly insurance benefits payable under title II of the Social Security Act, resulting from the enactment of section 101 of this Act."

COSPONSOR OF AN AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 858 TO H.R. 18515

On behalf of the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 858 to H.R. 18515, the HEW-Labor appropriation bill.

NOTICE CONCERNING NOMINATIONS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the following nominations have been referred to and are now pending before the Committee on the Judiciary:

Roger C. Cramton, of Michigan, to be Chairman of the Administrative Conference of the United States for a term of 5 years, vice Jerre S. Williams, resigned.

Irving W. Humphreys, of West Virginia, to be U.S. marshal, Southern District of West Virginia for the term of 4 years, vice Cornelius J. McQuade, retired.

Fred C. Mattern, Jr., of Virginia, to be Examiner in Chief, U.S. Patent Office, vice Nogi A. Asp, resigned.

John H. Schneider, of Virginia, to be Examiner in Chief, U.S. Patent Office, vice Peter T. Dracopoulos, resigned.

Saul I. Serota, of Maryland, to be Examiner in Chief, U.S. Patent Office, vice Pasquale J. Federico, resigned.

Curtis C. Crawford, of Missouri, to be a Member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1976, vice Ziegel W. Neff, term expiring.

Paula A. Tenant, of California, to be a Member of the Board of Parole for the term expiring September 30, 1976, vice Charlotte P. Reese, term expiring.

On behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, notice is hereby given to all persons interested in these nominations to file with the Committee, in writing, on or before Thursday, October 1, 1970,

any representations or objections they may wish to present concerning the above nominations, with a further statement whether it is their intention to appear at any hearing which may be scheduled.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Thursday, October 1, 1970, at 10:30 a.m., in room 2228, New Senate Office Building, on the following nominations:

Max Rosenn, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. Circuit Judge, Third Circuit, vice David Stahl, deceased.

John Paul Stevens, of Illinois, to be U.S. Circuit Judge, Seventh Circuit, vice Elmer J. Schnackenberg, deceased.

Cornelia G. Kennedy, of Michigan, to be U.S. District Judge, Eastern District of Michigan, vice Thaddeus M. Mackrowicz, deceased.

Frank J. McGarr, of Illinois, to be U.S. District Judge, Northern District of Illinois, vice a new position created under Public Law 91-272, approved June 2, 1970.

Edwin L. Mecham, of New Mexico, to be U.S. District Judge, District of New Mexico, vice a new position created under Public Law 91-272, approved June 2, 1970.

At the indicated time and place persons interested in the hearing may make such representations as may be pertinent.

The subcommittee consists of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN); the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. Hruska), and myself as Chairman.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS OF SENATORS

PART III—THE DIRECT-ELECTION BOONDOGGLE

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, in two previous speeches I have spelled out my strong reason for opposing the direct-election plan. In each of these statements, I have sought to document as clearly and fully as possible the specific grounds on which I base my belief that the adoption of this scheme would shake the very foundation of our society.

To my mind, the direct-election proposal is undemocratic, inconsistent, chaotic, divisive, and dangerous. In other words, this plan is nothing more than the proverbial "can of worms."

It is undemocratic because it dispenses with the concept of majority rule. Instead, it substitutes a procedure under which a candidate might be elected without capturing a plurality in even one State. So long as he gathers 40 percent of the vote nationally and none of the other candidates receives more, he will be the winner. Thus, a person can be elected President when 60 percent of the people are dead set against him, if they have split their votes among more than one candidate.

The direct-election system is inconsistent because it does not provide for an accurate determination of the "people's choice," as promised by its advocates. Instead, it is arbitrarily assumed that in a runoff the majority of voters would turn to the same person who has won a 40-percent or higher plurality the first time around. This is an incredible assumption to make, and it is clearly disproved when projected against an election similar to the one held in 1968.

In that election President Nixon received 43.4 percent of the total count, and Mr. Humphrey had 42.7—a difference of less than 1 percent. It does not take much stretch of the imagination to picture these results being reversed. In this event, Mr. Humphrey would have been declared the winner had the direct election method been in effect.

However, this would have completely ignored the fact that 10 million votes were cast in the election for third-party candidates. The authors of direct election would pick up these votes and, in effect, transfer them into the Humphrey column. They would do this by making the arbitrary decision that Mr. Humphrey was "the people's choice." Their plan would also have the arbitrary effect of depriving the true majority of voters of any opportunity to express their will up or down on the two leading candidates.

The fact that the bulk of third-party voters were diametrically opposed to continuing the policies of the National Democratic Party in 1968 would mean nothing. Their votes would be canceled out as if they had no right to vote at all. And this would be done in the name of a so-called reform that was supposed to count every man's vote equally.

Mr. President, the direct election plan is chaotic because it would lead to a rash of vote contests that would spread throughout the Nation whenever the election was reasonably close. This would be true whether or not fraud was charged. The inevitable occurrence of human and mechanical error would be sufficient by itself to make it worth while for a losing candidate to challenge the election outcome. When the impact of a mistaken count in one city or county is no longer insulated within the boundaries of a single State, but can directly affect the result across the entire Nation, it will be mandatory for losing candidates to demand a recount in almost every political unit in the United States.

Once any recounts get started all 180,000 precincts will be involved. A switch of votes in Illinois will no longer affect the outcome in that State alone. It might change the result nationwide. And so it goes down the line.

By the time candidates get through filing petitions for recounts the election outcome would be thrown into a state of utter confusion. It would take several months to exhaust the many avenues of legal proceedings and appeals that must be granted in order to satisfy the basic requirements of due process. All the while the country would be living in a giant nightmare without any recognized head-of-State. It would be an intolerable, unthinkable situation.

Mr. President, I also charge that the direct election of our Chief Executive would be divisive at a time when the people urgently need stability and accommodation. In my last speech on this subject, I quoted from no less than seven outside witnesses who made the same prediction before the Senate Judiciary Committee.

As Richard Goodwin noted:

Direct election would not come at a worse time . . . All around us we see an increasing tendency to political fragmentation and ideological division. Direct election might almost be just the trigger, perhaps accidental trigger, to transform such divisions into political conflict.

Mr. President, direct election would feed the fires of dissension by fostering a proliferation of one-issue candidates, by allowing one region of America to control an election, and by increasing the chances for electing a President who does not have the votes or backing of a majority of the people.

What is more, Mr. President, direct election is destructive of our Federal system. Yes, Mr. President, I am aware of the intricate calculations made by certain authorities who seek to measure the relative voting power of different groups of citizens. I realize some of these studies claim to show a surprising disparity in voting power for residents of the smaller States.

But, Mr. President, what all of these mathematical-computer analyses are incapable of programming is the human factor. Even if these involved simulations are correct insofar as mathematical disparities are concerned, they do not and cannot take account of the human psychology which governs real-life politics.

These ivory-towered calculations blithely fail to consider the identity of the States as communities of citizens who hold a feeling of association with each other. The harmful effect that direct election would have on this frame of mind was clearly described by Theodore H. White, who warned the Senate Judiciary Committee as follows:

This new proposal would take away an equally vital part of the political system in abolishing the sense of community in our various States. The States vote as communities. They are proud of how they vote. People like to be New Yorkers or Kentuckians or Missourians or Hoosiers. To deprive them of this sense of belonging to a voting unit and being sunk in the electronic dots that go over a tote board, that could be perhaps the gravest political danger that this new resolution invites.

Richard Goodwin, a former assistant to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, offered the same frank appraisal to the Senate committee. In commenting on the drastic effect which the Bayh amendment might have on the relative importance of large and small States, Mr. Goodwin noted that the psychology of presidential campaigns is one "in which today's candidates think in terms of States rather than numbers."

He added:

Today, nearly every state has a swing vote which, even though very small, might win that state's electoral vote. Thus, nearly every state is worth some attention. If the focus shifts to numbers alone, then the can-

didate will have to concentrate almost exclusively on the larger states. This is where the people and where the most volatile vote is to be found.

The importance of the present system, as a means of supporting the federal system, was accurately recognized by Mr. Goodwin when he stated that:

The Electoral College, along with the Senate, is one of the few mechanisms we have to influence those of the center of affairs to visit outlying citizens, so as to learn about them and pay some attention.

Mr. President, the fear that direct election will diminish the importance of peoples in small States, as well as minority groups in general, was also shared by another witness before the Senate Judiciary Committee, Representative WILLIAM L. CLAY, of Missouri. Representative CLAY told it as it is when he charged that the Bayh amendment will diminish or eliminate the voice of minorities in our system.

While Representative CLAY was particularly concerned about the dissipation of power for ethnic groups, he expressly added that "it affects other cohesive groups and it affects small States to the same proportion."

In other words, Mr. President, the same inherent nature of the electoral system that induces national candidates to listen to racial minorities requires that they listen to other minorities as well, including peoples in the sparsely populated smaller States.

Mr. President, the Senate committee also heard the same viewpoint from Prof. Charles Black of Yale Law School, who has written many articles about our constitutional structure. Professor Black emphatically declared his belief that the strength and durability of the American form of government lies within the Federal system—or as Professor Black put it, "with the fact that we have divided power between the National Government and the States."

One essential ingredient of this concept according to Professor Black, is "that in constituting the Government and selecting both the legislative and the executive branch, we have hitherto dealt with the States one by one as independent entities."

Indeed, Professor Black credits the electoral college system with being one of the "political safeguards of federalism in dealing with the States as entities." On the other hand, he cautioned:

An election which pays no regard to State lines, which is simply totally nationwide . . . would tend to diminish this attention to the states, one by one as political entities.

Mr. President, speaking as one who has closely studied the workings of the political machinery by which our Chief Executive is selected, I am convinced these warnings are accurate. To my mind, the adoption of direct election as the method for choosing the President would constitute a mortal blow to our Federal system. Regardless of what the Whiz Kid computer crowd turns up in a laboratory setting, I predict that the use of direct election on a national scale would ultimately destroy the concept of States as separate, important entities having their own sense of community.

In fact, I view the direct election scheme as no less than a device for gnawing away the lifeblood of federalism as we know it. Once the interests and feelings of peoples in the small States are no longer considered important to the major candidates, and once a candidate can no longer afford to make concessions to the less populated areas for fear of jeopardizing his position in the larger States, then I do not care what the computers show. Direct election will tear down the last pillars of federalism. The final reservoir of power and influence held by the smaller States will crumble. With the disembowelment of the States as separate entities, the all-mighty Central Government will extend its presence, control, and influence into every detail of man's activity.

In short, the proposed change would do much to destroy the elements of accommodation and compromise that have kept our political system healthy. On top of this, it would weaken the already precarious structure of federalism. This is why I must view this so-called simple reform as being fraught with dangers so great that it is capable of undermining our entire society. It is one of the most far-reaching and radical schemes that has ever been put before Congress, and I must urge its rejection by the Senate.

Mr. President, although I cannot accept the direct election scheme as a sensible election reform, this does not mean I am opposed to making any changes at all in our national election machinery. To the contrary, I have introduced proposed legislation to carry out three substantial reforms of our voting procedures, and will have at least two more to suggest today.

First, Mr. President, I might mention that I have had the privilege to author an amendment to the voting rights law which will secure the right to vote for President and Vice President for every U.S. citizen without regard to residence requirements or where he may be in the world on election day. This amendment was sponsored by 29 other Senators, and it became a part of the law of the land on June 22 this year.

So that no one may doubt that this Congress has acted to improve our election machinery, I would like to run through four of the primary reforms made by the new law. First, with this law, Congress has abolished residence requirements as a precondition to voting for President. Second, for the first time, citizens who move into a new State after the voting rolls are closed will be able to vote for President and Vice President either by absentee ballot or in person in their last State of residence. Third, the new law grants to all U.S. citizens, both new and long-time residents of a State, the right to register absentee and to vote by absentee ballot in presidential elections. Fourth, it will require each State to keep its voting rolls open for all citizens up to at least 30 days before the election, whether or not they have moved their homes.

Mr. President, the combined effect of these changes might benefit more than

10 million Americans. Consequently, with this one action alone Congress will have expanded the franchise in presidential elections by nearly 14 percent.

But this is not all of the electoral progress that has been achieved in this Congress. Have we already forgotten the giant step taken when Congress reduced the minimum voting age to 18? Again, it was my pleasure to have joined as a sponsor of legislation which brought about this much-needed reform. In fact, I might recall that I was one of two Senators who appeared before the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments to argue the case for handling this change by statute, rather than by the ponderously slow route of a constitutional amendment. This provision, too, could add up to 11 million new voters to our election rolls.

Therefore, it must be recognized that the 91st Congress deserves credit for having enabled over 20 million additional American citizens to join the ranks of eligible voters in future elections. This is an increase of almost 30 percent in the number of persons who participate in the election of a President.

For this reason, I do not think we have to hang our heads over refusing to accept the ill-considered plan which is now before the Senate. We have already made outstanding progress in clearing away the barrier of outmoded legal technicalities that deprive citizens of the right to vote. And, if Congress is still in the mood to take action in this field, I would like to suggest three other practical ways in which we could carry on our efforts to overhaul the Nation's election system.

First, I might mention a bill I have authored which is specifically designed to broaden the effective voice of our citizens in the selection of their Chief Executive. My bill, S. 1911, provides that the time for voting in presidential elections shall be expanded to allow each citizen a full 24-hour period during which he can vote. The legislation also provides that this period shall be uniform throughout the United States. This means that the polls will open and close across the Nation at the same moment.

Mr. President, from my experience in having been my party's nominee for President in 1964, I believe this easily implemented reform would make it considerably more convenient for millions of citizens to vote.

My study indicates there may be as many as 10 million Americans who were unable to vote in the last presidential election primarily because of the limited time for going to the polls.

For example, the 1968 postelection survey by George Gallup discovered that 3 million citizens were barred from casting ballots because they were unable to leave their work. Seven million more citizens were sick or disabled on the day of the election. In both cases, it is my belief that several millions of these persons and others who stayed home for different reasons would find it possible to vote if the voting period was stretched to 24 hours and if people were given a choice of convenient times for balloting

on portions of 2 calendar days rather than only 1.

The period I have chosen, which is from 6 p.m. to 6 p.m., central standard time, is designed to permit voters to use the polls at the end of normal working hours on the first day, through the evening and night of that day, prior to going to work on the second day, and up to mid-afternoon on the second day. I am convinced that such a broad range of choices would enable many millions of citizens to find a time when it is easy for them to go to the polls, but who find themselves hindered from voting by temporary illness or unavoidable demands on their time.

As an additional benefit, my bill could eliminate many of the criticisms arising because of the reporting of significant election returns from some States before the polls close in all other States. With voting spread over a 24-hour period covering convenient parts of 2 different calendar days, the possible influence of vote projections should be considerably reduced. People in all areas of the country will possess an equal opportunity to vote at a favorable hour right up to the end of the election and, of course, the election will not stop in one region before it does in any other.

Mr. President, if we truly wish to retain momentum for the cause of election reform, I suggest it would be more constructive for us to undertake serious consideration of the type of change which I have recommended, rather than to be chasing abstract principles based upon computer simulations.

There is definite room for improvement in our election procedures. But it is not to be found in axing the electoral college. The area on which we should be focusing our attention is the quest to make it possible for the maximum number of citizens to register or to obtain ballots and to cast those ballots. In other words, we should put our minds to devising methods by which the greatest number of citizens will be eligible and able to vote.

As for the electoral college, I suggest the least tinkering we do with it, the better. One sensible change would be the elimination of the "faithless elector" problem. I would certainly accept the wisdom of requiring the electoral votes of each State or district to be cast automatically for the candidates winning that unit's popular vote contest.

Also, I think it would be a solid step toward bringing the electoral system into line with the 20th century if we would make it mandatory for each State to choose its electoral votes by the will of its people. While it is an almost forgotten fact, the Constitution allows the individual State legislatures to determine the manner by which presidential electors are chosen. In the early days of our history, the legislatures themselves often made this choice. In fact, the State legislature in South Carolina continued this practice until 1860 and it was used in Colorado in 1868 and in Florida in 1876.

Now, it is inconceivable that the people would ever want this right to be taken away from them again, and it is for that

reason I believe an amendment is in order to absolutely prevent the State from appointing electors by any means other than direct popular vote. Here is one setting in which direct election is the only acceptable method.

In summary, I can only say that many avenues are still open to us by which we can build upon the progress that has already been made in the 91st Congress on the road to election reform. While I must reject the direct election scheme as a means for choosing the President, I will be glad to devote my strongest efforts to making other practical revisions which will provide for the widest possible participation by our people in the election of their President.

DIRECT ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, before political parties, conventions and preferential primaries were conceived, it was the opinion of a majority of the delegates to the constitutional conventions that the people would not be sufficiently informed as to the qualifications of the various candidates to make a wise choice. Electors, on the other hand, carefully chosen in each State, would be among the most knowledgeable and capable persons in the country.

In a new Nation of a few States and small population, the electoral college was generally approved. Today, however, the complex elective process has eliminated the need for informed, knowledgeable, and capable electors. They perform a mere ministerial function, and even in the performance of that routine act sometimes betray the voters of a State.

Arguments favoring the abolition of the electoral college of presidential electors are so forceful and widely known as to make unnecessary the need for further comment. The electoral vote, though, is of far greater importance and of deeper significance.

While some delegates to the constitutional convention favored direct popular election of the President and Vice President, others argued that the electoral system providing for at least three electors for each State, regardless of population, gave the small States some protection against domination by large States. That argument is considered by historians to have had considerable weight in swaying the convention in favor of the electoral system and still carries weight today.

Retention of the constitutional guarantee of at least three electoral votes per State is still a substantial factor in the feeling of equality which smaller States have with regard to the large industrial States in our Nation. Fifteen States and the District of Columbia, all with populations of less than a million each, have three or four electoral votes apiece and an overall total of 58 electoral votes. In every instance, each of those electoral votes gives fewer people in lesser populated States a voice equal to a greater number of people in larger populated States.

For example, the Washington Post on

Monday, March 3, 1969, published an editorial on the electoral college reform. It cited Alaska as having one electoral vote for each 75,389 persons whereas California has only one electoral vote for each 392,930 persons. Some use those figures to demonstrate an inequity between citizens of large and small States but again, the State with lesser population is merely retaining its constitutional protection of electoral vote minimums.

Mr. President, my bill, Senate Joint Resolution 33, proposes that the Constitution be amended so as to eliminate presidential electors and the electoral college. It proposes, further, the retention of the electoral votes on the basis of the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which a State is entitled, but in no case less than three electoral votes.

Briefly, after the date of a presidential election, the official election returns of each State would be forwarded to the President of the Senate. Early in January the votes would be counted and each person for whom votes were cast for President in each State and the District of Columbia would be credited with such proportion of the electoral votes as he received of the total popular vote cast by the voters for President. In computing the electoral vote, fractional numbers less than one one-thousandth would be disregarded.

The person having the greatest aggregate number of electoral votes would be President if he had at least 40 percent of the total number of electoral votes.

Otherwise, from the persons having the two greatest numbers of electoral votes, the Senate and the House of Representatives, sitting in joint session, would choose the President immediately by ballot. A majority of the votes of the combined membership of the Senate and the House of Representatives would be necessary for election. The same procedure would be followed for the election of the Vice President.

This is a so-called proportional proposal under which the States and the District of Columbia would retain their electoral votes but the office of Presidential elector would be abolished. Lists of the popular vote for all candidates in each State and the District of Columbia would be sent to the Congress as at present, and on January 6 the votes would be counted by Congress. Each State's electoral votes would then be divided among the candidates for President in proportion to their shares of the total popular vote within the State and within the District of Columbia. Computations would be carried to not less than one one-thousandth. Total electoral votes thus computed would be determined and a candidate who received at least 40 percent of such votes would be elected President.

If no candidate received at least 40 percent of the whole number of electoral votes, or if two persons received an identical number of electoral votes which would be at least 40 percent of the whole number, then from the candidates having the two greatest numbers of electoral votes for President, the Senate and the

House, sitting in joint session, would choose immediately by ballot, the President. A majority of the votes of the combined membership of the Senate and the House would be necessary for a choice.

The Vice President would be elected in the same manner.

The proportional plan eliminates the unit rule, the office of elector, and contingent election in the House of Representatives with each State having one vote.

By retaining the electoral vote system, it retains State influence in presidential elections. Dividing the electoral vote of a State in proportion to the popular vote therein won by each candidate would make the electoral system much closer to a direct, popular vote, and it would more accurately reflect the popular vote than the existing system.

The distortion built into the electoral vote system would remain, however, with the proportional plan, because each State would continue to have two electoral votes for its two U.S. Senators.

The plan would reduce the chances of electing a President with less than a majority of the popular vote, without eliminating entirely the political balances achieved with the electoral vote system.

The proportional plan, however, would tend to favor the middle-sized and smaller States which are more politically homogeneous than the large, pivotal States. In the 1896 presidential election, Bryan would have won instead of McKinley, under the proportional plan. Bryan had only 47 percent of the popular vote and carried only 17 States, of which 11 were in the South. His large electoral votes in the Southern States, however, plus the electoral votes he would have won in the Northern States, would have beaten McKinley who, although he carried 28 States, would have lost many more electoral votes outside the South because of Democratic minority votes than he would have gained from Republican minority votes in the solidly Democratic South. Bryan would have been elected as a "minority" President.

The same would have happened in the 1880 election. The Democratic candidate, Hancock, with 7,000 fewer popular votes than the Republican, Garfield, would have won under the proportional system. The Democratic candidate could have lost one of the large, Northern, pivotal States by under two electoral votes, but could have won one of the Southern States by seven or eight electoral votes.

Electoral vote totals would have been much closer under the proportional system than under the existing system. McKinley, for instance, would have won in 1900 under the proportional system by 217.3 to 217.2 electoral votes, whereas under the existing system he won by 292 to 155. The results of certain other elections would have been changed. In 1876, Tilden, the Democrat, would have beaten Hayes, the Republican, by 188.1 electoral votes to 177.1 under the proportional system—Hayes' victory was by 185 to 184. In 1888, Cleveland, the Democrat, would have beaten Harrison, the Republican,

by 202.9 to 185.8—Harrison's victory was by 233 to 168. In 1960, Nixon, the Republican would have beaten Kennedy, the Democrat, by 266.1 to 265.6—Kennedy's victory was by 303 to 219.

The proportional plan would eliminate the "exaggeration factor" in the winner's electoral vote margin under the existing system, but because of electoral vote distortion, it would not always reflect accurately the popular vote as it is demonstrated by the elections of 1880, 1896 and 1960. Nevertheless, of all the reform proposals, the proportionate system comes closest to electing a President by popular vote of the people while at the same time preserving each State's relative electoral strength in the election of the President.

OFFICE OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTOR

This potential danger in the electoral system would be eliminated under the proportional plan.

ABOLITION OF THE UNIT-RULE

This would, of course, be eliminated under the proportional system.

CONTINGENT ELECTIONS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The proportional plan replaces contingent elections in the House when each State has one vote, with election by a joint meeting of the Senate and the House with each Member having one vote and a majority of the votes of the combined membership being necessary for a choice. This is a progressive step forward in that it eliminates an unfair "compromise" felt to be essential for the ratification of the Constitution, and it is a substitute for the electoral colleges. Under Senate Joint Resolution 33, such an election would be carried out by Members of the House, all of whom would be newly elected, and by Senators, one-third of whom would be newly elected.

It would be compatible with federalism in that representatives of States and of people would be making the choice.

On the other hand, section 4 of Senate Joint Resolution 33 no more solves the problem of how to place the District of Columbia into a contingent election system than does the 23d amendment. Second, 12 percent of the contingent electors—the 66 Senators who were not up for reelection the previous November—would not be newly elected. These could be in sufficient number to swing a close, contingent election yet some of them would represent the choice of voters 4 years earlier.

The concept is a vast improvement on the existing system, but it does contain some flaws of its own. A possible significant flaw is that if the Presidential candidate is a first term candidate and expects to run for a second term, his election by the Congress could make the President too dependent upon Congress.

LARGE PIVOTAL STATES

As in the direct, popular plan, the proportional system, by splitting the vote of the large pivotal States, would also diminish the emphasis now placed upon such States. A closely divided popular vote would result in a closely divided electoral vote.

In addition, the influence of minority groups in such States on the outcome of election would be reduced because they could not swing the State's entire bloc of electoral votes. The political balance between urban and nonurban areas in the Nation could be altered to the disadvantage of the former.

However, States with large electoral votes, by virtue of large populations, would continue to be prime sources of substantial electoral votes. For instance, one-half of the electoral votes of New York would be worth more than the combined electoral votes of the seven smallest States. Candidates would still be expected to be greatly concerned with the voting results in such States.

SURE STATES

Under the proportional plan no State would be a sure State to the extent that one candidate would win all its electoral votes. Splitting the electoral vote statewide would strengthen the two-party system and encourage the development of maximum party support in every State.

Nevertheless, since the smaller States tend to be more politically homogeneous than the large, pivotal States, States with dominant parties may well continue that way to the advantage of the candidate of such a party. This consequence might be countered by splinter groups breaking off from the dominant party or by the formation of new parties each of which would be seeking a share of the electoral vote of a State.

It cannot be predicted with complete certainty how the sure States would vote in a proportional scheme but their influence on the presidential election would be substantially greater than now. Small popular vote margins in these States could produce larger electoral vote gains than large popular vote margins in heavy voting States where the parties were closely competitive.

EFFECT ON OUR TWO-PARTY SYSTEM

The effect of the proportional plan on the two-party system has been noted to some extent. It would be in good part similar to the effect that direct, popular election would have; that is, there would be a fair possibility of the development of splinter and minor parties. Every party would get its share of the electoral vote, and minority groups would find this a good way to maximize their potential for influence.

Proponents of the proportional plan deny this consequence, arguing that most voters want winners and will not be apt to cast their votes for a third-party candidate who has no chance of winning the national election. The requirement of having to secure only 40 percent of the electoral votes for election is cited as a deterrent to minor parties because it insures that a third party would not be able to throw the election into the Congress with less than 20 percent of the total electoral vote.

It is also argued that the proportional system, in dividing electoral votes so as to more accurately reflect popular votes, would minimize the influence of pressure factions and multiple parties, particularly in what are now large, pivotal States. Under the present system of the

unit rule, a minor party in a State such as New York can throw the entire election in that State to one major party or the other, depending upon whether it supports the presidential candidate of one of the major parties or supports its own candidate. Such would not be possible under the proportional system.

However, the proportional system, by allowing minority groups to secure a percentage of the electoral votes in a State, might result in diminished activity by the major parties to secure the votes of minority groups. A strength of the existing, unit rule system is that particularly in the large, pivotal States, the major parties recognize and seek to represent the legitimate interests of minority groups. The proportional plan, by reducing the political importance of minority groups in such States, would make it possible for the major parties to give less attention to the interests of these groups. They could, in consequence, become underrepresented with a disadvantageous effect to the national political balance.

INFLUENCE OF FRAUD OR ACCIDENT

In a close race, the influence of fraud or acts of God could be substantial in moving an electoral vote or part of a vote either way in several States. Aggregate totals of electoral votes could be sufficiently changed to affect the outcome of the election.

It would not, however, be essential to nationalize the State laws on recount and election contests as it would be under the direct, popular election system. Far more control over the elections would be left to the States as at present.

EFFECT ON ELECTION DATES

The proportional system would not change the existing election date structure. If an election were to be decided by the Congress, a resolution thereof would probably be secured prior to Inauguration Day, January 20. The possibility of obtaining a resolution of a contingent election prior to January 20 would seem to be greater under the method proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 33, than by the runoff system proposed by Senate Joint Resolution 1, unless the dates of the general election and the runoff election were advanced for the latter system.

VOTING QUALIFICATIONS

Under section 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 33, the determination of voting qualifications would be left to the States where they have historically rested. Section 2 would authorize the States to provide lesser residency requirements for voting in presidential elections. The effect of this provision would be to authorize State legislatures to take this step directly without the necessity of amending the constitutions of the States first. Congress, of course, would be authorized to prescribe voter qualifications for the District of Columbia.

REGULATION OF THE MANNER OF HOLDING SUCH AN ELECTION

The "manner" clause in section 2 of Senate Joint Resolution 33 is the same as that in article I, section 4, of the Constitution. Congress would be granted by

this provision an authority it does not now possess over presidential elections. As a consequence, it could enact uniform standards for recounts and contested elections—although it probably will not—absentee voting, counting and canvassing of votes, prohibitions and penalties, and so forth. The requirement in section 4 that State returns be sent to the President of the Senate by 45 days after the November election, “or at such time as Congress shall direct,” provides flexibility so as to allow sufficient time for the resolution of recounts and election contests by the States prior to the counting of the votes by Congress on January 6. Since Senate Joint Resolution 33, as a whole, leaves to the States primary responsibility over elections under the proportional plan, it would remain to be seen if Congress would exercise such authority unless there were urgent necessity for so doing.

ENTITLEMENT TO INCLUSION ON THE BALLOT

Senate Joint Resolution 33 contains no such provision. Authority in this regard would remain with the States subject to adherence to the standards of the equal protection of laws clause of amendment XIV—see *Williams v. Rhodes*, 393 U.S. 23, 1968. No possible congressional regulation of the nominating process would be authorized by Senate Joint Resolution 33.

CANDIDATES FOR PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT AS A PAIR

This requirement is not included in Senate Joint Resolution 33. It is a practical necessity in a direct, popular election system with a runoff in order that the same pairs of candidates who ran in the general election be the candidates in a runoff.

Under the existing system where the House chooses the President in a contingent election and the Senate chooses the Vice President, the two officials thus elected could be chosen from different political parties.

The same result would be possible under Senate Joint Resolution 33, but highly improbable since the majority of Members of the Senate and House combined, voting in joint session, and voting as party representatives, would undoubtedly select the presidential and vice presidential candidates of their own party.

Of course, if the majority of the Senate and the House were of a party different from that of the presidential and vice presidential candidates who had received the greatest number of electoral votes absent 40 percent, the Congress could choose as President and Vice President the candidates who had received the second highest number of electoral votes. The same result would be true as regards a runoff election under the direct, popular election system however.

About the only way to circumvent such a result would be to declare elected those candidates for President and Vice President who had received a plurality of the electoral votes—or of the popular vote under the direct, popular election system. Such a standard would have so many disadvantages, however, that it is perhaps feasible to adopt the method of contingent election by the Congress with the

awareness that the possibility exists that the candidates who had received the second highest number of electoral votes, absent 40 percent, could be elected President and Vice President.

THE 40-PERCENT ELECTORAL VOTE REQUIREMENT

This is a virtual necessity under the proportional plan since the aggregate electoral vote would more closely reflect the popular vote than under the existing unit rule system. Reasons for a 40-percent electoral vote standard are substantially the same as for a 40-percent standard under the direct popular election system. Arguments contrary to such a requirement would also be substantially the same as under the direct popular election proposal.

It is essential if the proportional plan is to work with a minimum of elections thrown into the Congress.

DEATH OF THE WINNING PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE

Senate Joint Resolution 33 contains no provision in this regard where a winning presidential candidate with 40 or more percent of the electoral votes dies before the popular votes are counted and the appropriate apportionment is made by the Congress in January.

The situation would seem to be somewhat the same as that commented upon in a House committee report on the resolution which became the 20th amendment.

An analysis of the functions of Congress indicates that no discretion is given and that Congress must declare the actual vote (where the President-elect dies between the voting by the electors and the counting of the electoral votes by Congress). The votes at the time they were cast were valid. . . . Consequently, Congress would declare that the deceased candidate had received a majority of the (electoral) votes. (H. Rept. 345, 72nd Congress, 1st Sess., p. 5 (1932).)

Then, pursuant to section 3 of amendment XX, the Vice-President-elect shall be sworn in as President.

Senate Joint Resolution 33 contains no provision declaring what would happen should the winning presidential candidate die between election day in November and the counting of the popular vote and the apportioning of the electoral vote by Congress in January. Since the winning candidate would technically be the President-elect even before Congress counted and apportioned the vote—assuming the latter function to be primarily a ministerial duty—the vote for him would be counted even though he was deceased, and the Vice-President-elect would be sworn in as President on Inauguration Day—amendment XX, section 3.

DEATH OR WITHDRAWAL OF ANY CANDIDATE FOR PRESIDENT OR VICE PRESIDENT

Senate Joint Resolution 33 makes no provision for this contingency, and so the matter would be handled as it is now with the national committees being empowered by the conventions to name a substitute candidate up until the day before election day.

DEATH OF BOTH THE PRESIDENT-ELECT AND THE VICE-PRESIDENT-ELECT

Senate Joint Resolution 33 makes no provision for this contingency. Section 3 of amendment XX, which declares that

Congress may by law provide for the case wherein neither a President-elect nor a Vice-President-elect shall have qualified, would be applicable, and under title 3, United States Code, section 19, the Speaker of the House would resign from the House and be sworn in as Acting President.

PROVISION FOR RESOLUTION OF A TIE

Since it is possible under Senate Joint Resolution 33 for two candidates to be tied in electoral votes at 40 percent or 42 percent each, section 4 thereof provides for the contingent election of the President from the two such candidates by the Congress in joint session.

If three candidates are tied at 33 percent of the electoral vote each, for instance, the contingent election would still go to the Congress assembled in joint session pursuant to section 4 of Senate Joint Resolution 33.

SIMPLICITY AND COMPREHENSION

The proportional plan would have the same defects in this respect as the present system, that is, the necessity to understand the electoral vote system. An added confusing element could well be the apportionment of the vote of a State among the candidates in the ratio of the popular vote they had received therein with the figures carried to the nearest thousandth. While such figuring by Congress should be completed, with modern equipment, in a relatively short time, it is possible that the apportioning could carry over to the following day. In such circumstances lack of voter understanding could exist and popular anxiety arise.

The 40-percent requirement could be another confusing element.

It is not really possible to say how understandable the proportional system would be except that it would not be as comprehensible as direct, popular election.

EFFECT ON FEDERALISM

The proportional system should have an effect upon the maintenance of federalism that is less than the existing system but greater than direct, popular election. The States would remain as electoral units and would retain authority over voter qualifications. Congress would be granted increased power over the regulation of presidential elections.

The subtle balance of the existing system would be altered, however. Urban minorities in large, swing States would lose the significant role they play in the election of the President, and the executive branch might not be as responsive to their needs as under the present system.

Smaller States that are politically homogeneous would have larger roles in the election of the President, however, and this consequence might be to the advantage of federalism where such States tend to be somewhat conservative.

Mr. President, a choice, if necessary, by the House and the Senate would be less cumbersome, less time-consuming and less expensive than a run off election.

Unlike any of the other proposed alternatives, a proportional vote amendment would best reflect the popular strength of the candidates and still maintain our federal system. The proportional automatic system comes clos-

est to electing a President by popular vote while at the same time preserving each State's relative electoral strength.

In place of the present method which diminishes the people's voice in the most important decision the U.S. citizens can make, a proportional plan would eliminate arbitrariness and enhance the role of the individual and the State in electing the President.

In conclusion, I believe that the proportional plan for distribution of electoral votes down to one one-thousandth of a vote meets the aims of the proponents of the direct popular election system while at the same time preserving the constitutional balance of the States by retention of the electoral votes.

DICKEY-LINCOLN AND THE ELECTRIC POWER SHORTAGE

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, today marks the third day in a row of a serious electric power crisis. This power shortage threatens the health and safety of millions of citizens.

This crisis is the result of an inadequate national policy and an obstinate industry which for many years refused to acknowledge the imminent crisis and which still refuses to take adequate steps to protect the public.

Two days ago, while the lights in the Chamber were dimmed, the House of Representatives refused to appropriate additional planning funds for a viable and necessary public power project.

When the authorization for the Dickey-Lincoln School hydroelectric facility was passed in 1965, consumer rates for electricity in New England were the highest in the Nation because New England had no "yardstick." This situation has not changed.

At that time, New England and the east coast faced a shortage of fuel and electricity. This situation has not changed.

And at that time, it was clear to many people that the shortages of electric power in the East were becoming so serious that a crisis was imminent. Since then, we have had a major blackout and a growing crisis of unreliable and inadequate electric power.

Blind opposition to this project threatens the health and welfare of all the people in the Eastern United States. It is the kind of attitude which weakens faith and confidence in both public and private institutions.

As we run out the string on available sources of pollution-free electric power, the pressure to continue with the construction of the Dickey Dam will increase. The sooner the House and the private utilities recognize this fact, the sooner the public will be protected.

ARAB HIJACKERS

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, the American people have been aroused over the crimes perpetrated by the Arab guerrillas against innocent people more than anything in my memory. In seeking an answer, we harken back to the days of piracy on the Barbary Coast and how

the United States handled that situation, but it can be argued that times have changed and that other nations might not stand by for the type of reprisal most Americans feel should be brought to bear. Frankly, I have yet to see a sensible, workable plan to this end, let alone reprisal, so an editorial written by a former colleague and leader of ours, William Knowland, published in the *Oakland Tribune*, brings a ray of light to the prevention of these outbursts. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the *Oakland (Calif.) Tribune*, Sept. 9, 1970]

AN ULTIMATUM TO THE ARABS

The outrageous crimes against civilized society being committed by vicious air pirates must come to an end.

Arab terrorists this past weekend once again vented their ugly hatreds and cowardly brand of warfare upon innocent men, women and children of several nations.

It is obviously no difficult task for armed men and women to commandeer one of today's passenger-laden jet airliners in mid-flight. No amount of special passenger precautions can ever be devised to successfully detect and thwart every resourceful and conscienceless air criminal.

The only certain deterrent to air piracy is the absolute knowledge that no matter where the hijacked plane eventually lands on the face of our earth, certain, swift and the harshest of punishment awaits the hijacker.

There can be no bargaining for amnesty—no matter what the stakes—and no safe haven in any land, no matter whose politics are involved.

The success, thus far, of the Arab terrorists in three hijackings this past weekend is directly attributable to the fact that no such certain punishment awaited them upon their return to Egypt and Jordan.

For this, the blame rests squarely upon those Arab leaders who, in the past, have shown either an inability or unwillingness to capture and punish guerrilla hijackers. Such hijackers too often found their actions not only tolerated but even encouraged. Many now walk the streets as heroes in their homelands.

This is no time for further handwringing and indecisive "searching for solutions" on the part of our own government and other responsible governments of the world. There is only one solution: to force the Arab nations henceforth to treat their hijacker terrorists as the vicious criminals that they are.

To accomplish this, we propose that:

1. All international air traffic to Arab nations immediately be suspended.

2. All nations and all airlines henceforth refuse air travel to any passenger bearing a passport from an Arab nation implicated in air hijacking or in giving refuge to the air pirates.

The impact of any such air travel boycott would, of course, be tremendous. It should bring tremendous internal pressure to bear upon the leaders of the Arab countries. Arab citizens would most certainly insist that prompt action be taken to restore their access to the world's airways.

Service could be resumed to any one of the nations involved as soon as firm assurances were received that all hijackers would face certain capture and imprisonment and that full restitution would be made for any injury or death to a passenger or crew member and for any economic loss to airline carriers.

Until such individual commitments were made, the Arab world would rightfully suffer

the isolation from modern air travel that the actions of its guerrillas and inaction of its leaders had earned for it.

The present conduct and ultimatums of the Arab hijackers are nothing short of barbaric. They must no longer be tolerated by the responsible nations of the world.

INFLATION GRINDING DOWN

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, yesterday's report from the Bureau of Labor Statistics that the Consumer Price Index has registered its smallest increase since December 1968, is indeed very encouraging news. This report, along with other indicators, suggests that the inflation which has plagued this economy for the past several years is grinding down. It is still not possible to say that the inflation has definitely and finally been stopped. However, accumulating volumes of evidence suggest that the policies of the Nixon administration are proving to be effective. This is good news for the American consumer and for the economy in general.

This latest report of the decline in the cost of living increase follows the announcement 2 days ago that the major banks were lowering their prime interest rate. There are also increasingly favorable reports about the rate of business activity.

Thus we are beginning to see the possibility of the inflation being controlled and the economy beginning to move forward at full steam. The Nixon administration had made the attainment of full prosperity without inflation one of its principal goals. This goal has not yet been fully realized, but we are well on the way to achieving it and this is indeed an historic accomplishment.

INCREASED WHITE HOUSE EXPENDITURES

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, last week the junior Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) protested what he said are increased White House expenditures for staff.

The Sunday previous, the *Washington Post* published a letter from Caspar W. Weinberger, Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget, pointing out that the White House cut back by \$650,000 on its fiscal year 1971 budget and by 28 in personnel.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Weinberger's 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:

WHITE HOUSE ON STAFF EXPENSES

An article appearing in your paper recently left the impression that the White House was doubling its staff in fiscal year 1971. Such an impression would be not only unfortunate, but quite incorrect.

The appropriation requested for the White House Office for fiscal year 1971 is in fact a decrease from the actualities of fiscal year 1970 both in personnel and in funds. For fiscal year 1970 the appropriation for the White House Office was \$3,940,000, with another \$2,500,000 appropriated for special projects. In addition, personnel detailed to the White House Office from the departments and agen-

cies under authority of law resulted in basic compensation costs to those departments and agencies at the rate of \$2,820,000. Thus, the 1970 level of operation was in excess of \$9,200,000, involving 576 employees.

The President, when preparing the 1971 fiscal year budget, decided to discontinue the use of the special projects fund and personnel details from other agencies to augment funds available for the regular White House Office staff. He has thereby adopted a policy of bringing all regular employees of the White House directly onto the White House payrolls. This seemed to the President a more honest way of presenting the full cost of the White House operation.

Therefore, the budget request for fiscal year 1971 is for 548 employees, and funds in the amount of \$8,550,000 for the White House Office. This is a substantial *decrease* of more than \$650,000 in funds, and 28 in personnel—a lesson that should certainly not be lost on those who have attacked the President without benefit of the facts.

CASPAR W. WEINBERGER,
Deputy Director, Office of
Management and Budget.

WASHINGTON.

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I believe that President Nixon is doing a remarkable job in holding the line on his White House budget and staff, especially when one considers that he has been faced with a Democrat-built inflation and an ever-burgeoning bureaucracy that calls for more and more attention from the White House.

I believe those who complain about White House costs should look at what has happened to their own costs in the last 2 years and maybe the increase in salary they gave themselves just last year.

I believe that we who served in Congress when the custom at the White House was to hide the White House staff on departmental payrolls should praise the President for his honesty and openness. It is a refreshing change that I am sure the junior Senator from Hawaii will appreciate.

THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION: WHAT DOES IT MAINTAIN?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I have been speaking before the Senate for almost 4 years urging our ratification of the Genocide Convention. It is pertinent to review the major features of this human rights convention.

Genocide has been defined as any act designed to destroy a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group. Member nations, who are parties to the convention, agree to punish any person committing an act of genocide, committing an act inciting genocide, or engaging in complicity in genocide.

The convention also makes provision for the punishment of any person, be he public official or private citizen, who commits an act of genocide. I would like to point out that the convention intends for each member country to bring to trial individuals who have committed acts of genocide within their territory. The convention does not establish a world court, as some have maintained. It does allow, however, for an international penal tribunal whose jurisdiction has been ac-

cepted by the involved parties to try those charged with genocide. It is important to emphasize again that the convention does not establish any world court, nor does it supersede the authorized courts of any nation.

Article VII states that genocide will not be considered a political crime and extradition should be granted in accordance with the laws and treaties of the country. If there is a question or dispute between any two countries, article IX allows for the dispute to be settled in the International Court of Justice.

From this brief survey of the basic points of the Genocide Convention, it is clear to me that it would be in the best interest of the United States for us to ratify this human rights document. We must go on record as completely opposed to this monstrous crime.

DEATH OF VIRGINIA BLUE, STATE TREASURER OF COLORADO

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, I wish to express on behalf of Mrs. Allott and myself and for all citizens of the State of Colorado our deep sorrow over the loss of Mrs. Virginia Blue, our beloved State treasurer, who died on Wednesday, September 16.

Virginia Blue was an uncommon woman. In this age when we increasingly hear about women's rights, she, decades ago, began practicing women's responsibilities in a most exemplary and outstanding fashion. Her contributions served Colorado as well as the Nation.

She was the first chairman of the Status of Women, an organization dedicated to the equality of womanhood in our system.

She was at one time president of the American Association of University Women and later served on the National Committee for the American Association of University Women.

A prominent realtor in Colorado for many years and a partner in Blue and Blue Realty, she was a member of the National Association of Real Estate Boards and in 1962 became the first and only woman ever elected Denver Realtor of the Year.

She was one of only five women ever elected to the board of regents of the University of Colorado.

In her capacity as State treasurer, she also served as chairman of the Association of Western State Treasurers.

Her many accomplishments are noted in Who's Who in Colorado, Who's Who in the West, Who's Who in American Women, and Who's Who in Education.

She was a recipient of the Norlin Award of the University of Colorado for outstanding alumni.

Her prominent efforts included being selected the first woman to serve on the revenue and estimation committee of the State of Colorado, the first woman member of the University of Colorado Alumni Association, and 4 years ago, when she was elected State treasurer, she became the first woman ever elected to an executive office in the State of Colorado.

Her awards and achievements could fill many pages. However, Virginia Blue,

despite all of her many prominent ventures, was down to earth and always direct in her approach.

All Coloradans feel her loss deeply, but most especially, we send our heartfelt sympathy to her husband, Jim, and her family who loved her so much.

An editorial published in the Rocky Mountain News of September 18, paid Virginia Blue a most fitting tribute. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Rocky Mountain News,
Sept. 18, 1970]

VIRGINIA BLUE

In the death Wednesday of State Treasurer Virginia Neal Blue, Colorado loses a gracious woman as well as a dedicated state executive who more than lived up to every campaign promise she ever made.

Before she was cut down by an illness related to cancer at age 60, her career had so many facets it is difficult to see how one person made so much of time.

She won many high national honors in her lifetime—as a banker, as a University of Colorado regent, as a longtime Denver realtor, as Colorado's treasurer these past four years, first woman ever elected to such a high state executive post.

Despite the acclaim, she never forgot the little things of life that made her, as Gov. Love put it, "a great person and a great lady—we all will miss her very much."

She proved out the observation that a small town bank is one of the best training grounds for life. She was the daughter of the late Meeker banker, Joseph M. Neal, who first came to Colorado from Missouri at 21 in 1896 to teach school 35 miles from Meeker.

At the turn of the century, he entered the cattle business and from 1917 to 1934 he operated the largest cattle ranch in the Meeker area.

After she was graduated from the University of Colorado in 1931 with a degree in finance, Mrs. Blue returned to Meeker and a post in her father's bank.

As state treasurer she made it a point to visit scores of Colorado banks. She always said the real way to learn about a bank is to walk inside and talk to its officials. She made it a point to know a lot about the institutions in which state money was lodged as certificates of deposits.

Mrs. Blue had \$190.7 million in state funds invested in government securities and deposit certificates in 212 banks.

When she first campaigned as a Republican for state treasurer, she said the millions of dollars in the state treasury should be put to work more effectively to earn interest for taxpayers between the time the revenues flowed in and the time the state paid out the money.

As deputy treasurers she brought in first Mrs. Dorothy McRae and later Mrs. Julia E. Swearingen. And for the first time she brought in a fulltime investment officer, Mrs. Marguerite Larsen.

And the interest really rolled in. For the year ended June 30, it hit a whopping \$11.2 million. The year before that it was an all-time record \$7.1 million. Before that it was \$5.1 million and before that \$4.5 million.

The News observed recently Mrs. Blue and her tidy money managers were better at the task than the males who preceded them.

She had exquisite taste. When flowers came in, they didn't just decorate the front office but the whole office and the back rooms.

One night in mid-summer the Business and Professional Women's Club presented Mrs. Blue an award in Fort Collins and accompanied it with a huge wreath of red roses bound together by wires.

Mrs. Blue was tired that night, but the state treasurer spent more than an hour near midnight in her motel room unbinding the wires into which the roses were woven, and packing the bright roses in wastebaskets filled with ice—so they would be fresh when carried back to the Statehouse.

Mrs. Blue seemed to live by this philosophy: To heal old wounds and get people back on the track—and this applied to bankers and money dealers and everyone with whom she dealt.

Colorado has gained much by the likes of this lady.

PROSPECTIVE APPEARANCE OF VICE PRESIDENT KY, OF SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, like many Senators, I have become increasingly concerned about the prospective appearance of Vice President Ky at a Victory-in-Vietnam rally in the Nation's Capital.

Already there has been too much divisiveness among the people of our country over the war—most of it, I must in fairness point out, by those who follow a peace-at-any-price approach. Now that there have been fair debate and decision in Congress, with a strong majority supporting our President in his efforts to disengage from the war as soon as practicable, consistent with our commitments, reinforced by national polls reflecting comparable sentiment among our people, it is important that efforts toward unity—not disunity—should be made by all factions.

The appearance and, no doubt, the address by Vice President Ky at the rally would have a divisive, rather than a unifying, impact at this time. I express the hope that Vice President Ky will understand this and will act accordingly, in the best interests of both the United States and his own country, which the United States has for so long and at such great cost supported in the cause of freedom.

A GREAT DAY FOR KANSAS

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, many encouraging observations have been made concerning President Nixon's appearance at Kansas State University, September 16.

Not the least of these is that the President's visit provided the Nation an opportunity, via national television, to see and hear the reactions of more than 15,000 students and faculty at Kansas State University.

An accurate appraisal of this reaction at Kansas State is provided by Thad Sandstrom, vice president of WIBW-TV in Topeka, Kans. His views were broadcast in an editorial on September 20.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Sandstrom's remarks be printed in the RECORD.

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

WIBW EDITORIAL

This was a great week for Kansas. On Wednesday, President Richard M. Nixon flew to

Manhattan to speak at the Landon Lecture Series at Ahearn Fieldhouse at Kansas State University. Perhaps no event in history has reaped so much good publicity nor done so much for the image of Kansas and its youth. The President spoke on "Order in Our Society."

When a couple of dozen creepy kids who had no common courtesy for the office of the President nor for the 15,500 who came to listen to the President began shouting, it was obvious they were really in the minority—by a ratio of about 500 to 1—and about as effective as a raindrop in the ocean. The response of the K-State students was overwhelming. With coverage on all three national television networks and a number of independent stations, the radio networks, and numerous big city daily newspapers from coast to coast, it was indeed a bright day in America and in Kansas—for clearly the K-State students supported the concept of working within the system to bring about change.

What impressed us was the response around the country. KSU President, Dr. James A. McCain, received telegrams from all over America applauding K-State and its students. In New York City the next day, I visited with several people. Everyone brought up the Nixon speech at K-State. They commented on the "good-looking students," the well-behaved, respectful crowd, and the enthusiasm. Indeed, all three major New York TV stations featured lengthy stories on the late evening newscasts and one New York station re-ran the entire speech Wednesday night. The New York Times was most complimentary of K-State and termed it Nixon's finest performance.

So . . . it was a great day for Kansas and especially Kansas State for it showed again that here in the heartland of America are the really great people of our country—the ones whose background and up-bringing give them a really fine understanding of what life in America is all about.

To the Kansas Congressional delegation—especially Senator Bob Dole—a vote of thanks for urging the President to come to Kansas State.

To Kansas Governor Robert Docking—a salute for the non-partisan way in which he welcomed the President to Kansas.

To Alf Landon—thanks for giving K-State the vehicle through which it has been possible to attract men of great distinction to Kansas State.

But a special vote of thanks goes to K-State's President, Dr. James A. McCain. It was Dr. McCain who envisioned the Landon Lecture Series. His idea of having Governor Landon invite men of both parties to come to K-State has given Kansas State a real place in history.

Indeed . . . the Landon Lecture Series has made a great university even greater and on Wednesday showed America on national television that in Kansas . . . the people make the difference.

SERIOUS CONDITION OF AMERICAN RAILROADS

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, the recent collapse of the Penn Central Railroad and the difficulties facing other lines have brought into dramatic focus the very serious condition of a vital means of transportation.

In the spate of newspaper commentary on the Penn Central debacle, one of the most articulate analyses was written by Tom Shedd, the editor of *Modern Railroads*. Mr. Shedd points out the very serious problems created for the Penn Central by management conflicts and by haphazard diversification. He goes on to comment on the broader problems facing

the entire industry and makes this wise comment:

The time is long past when the railroads could consider themselves as a strictly private enterprise like a department store or a widget-maker. Yet to completely nationalize the U.S. railroads, as has been done in other countries of the world, would be fantastically expensive.

He urges the industry to demonstrate that it is trying to solve its own problems before seeking Federal help. In the months ahead, I am certain that Congress will have to grapple with the serious situation of the rail industry—a situation created in part by unwise governmental policies.

Mr. Shedd's wise observations are most helpful and I am sure they will be of interest to Senators.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE CHOICE: CONSTRUCTIVE ACTION NOW—OR NATIONALIZATION

(By Tom Shedd)

The collapse of Penn Central is a shocking event. It is especially jolting in view of the high hopes that were held for the Penn Central merger two years ago.

And yet PC's petition to reorganize under Section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act can prove to be a turning point in the history of rail transportation in the U.S. Depending mainly on the reaction in Washington, but also on what the rest of the industry does, this event will either open the way toward restoration of the railroads as healthy industry—or it will solidify and make irreversible the present trend toward some sort of government takeover.

(The first reactions in Washington were not too encouraging. Rep. Wright Patman (D. Tex.) seemed determined to find a scapegoat—predictably the fat, rich, sinister bank interests. The role of mankind in the conduct of the railroad business might well stand some study; but it apparently never occurs to politicians like Rep. Patman that the government's own policies toward the railroads are a fundamental—and possibly the single most important—cause of the disaster.)

Exercising 20-20 hindsight, it is not too difficult to find some reasons for what happened at Penn Central.

To begin with, the former Pennsylvania and New York Central railroads were the wrong merger partners. As many observers contended at the time, a better balanced combination would have been produced with NYC-C&O-B&O in one company, and PRR-N&W in the other. Instead, we now have Penn Central and the proposed N&W-C&O merger. The latter will doubtless be long delayed, if not killed altogether as a result of PC's troubles.

MERGER PRICE TOO HIGH

Moreover, it now seems clear that Penn Central accepted too many onerous conditions in order to get its merger through. It signed a highly restrictive labor agreement; it also agreed to take on the operating losses of the New Haven railroad. As was evident to some railroaders even at the time, these handicaps were too much to pay for the merger.

Penn Central was also caught in the general economic squeeze—the "liquidity crisis" that is affecting many businesses and individuals today. One cause of this liquidity crisis has certainly been the 25 years of basically "boom psychology" and inflation that have triggered a rapid rise in debt of

all kinds. We are now reaping the inevitable result of this kind of psychology; if we are not very careful the present "crisis of confidence" could easily lead to a depression like that of 1929.

Beyond these quite evident reasons for PC's downfall lie other factors that are perhaps less obvious. The internal conflicts between the former NYC and former PRR officers—"the green team and the red team"—have been widely noted. Both companies had many very competent managers; but the PRR clearly dominated the top managerial positions in the early days of the merger, and far too many of the young, aggressive team that NYC had built up became discouraged and left. (Interestingly, ex-NYC-ers are now playing a much more prominent role.) As one veteran observer told us, "No corporation is strong enough to stand a civil war in the executive suite."

Then there is this question: did Penn Central's diversification into other types of businesses help or hurt the railroad operation? True, in recent months especially, the non-railroad enterprises of Penn Central did pour many millions of dollars into keeping the railroad in operation.

On the other hand, at the very least, the emphasis on non-railroad affairs must surely have diverted top management time and attention from the urgent problems of the railroad, which after all is the principal business of the company. And, going back to the beginning, didn't the resources that enabled PC to diversify into other businesses—the N&W stock, the money received from the sale of the Long Island, for example—really derive from railroading? And wouldn't it have been wiser to invest such funds in badly needed modernization of the railroad plant and equipment?

We think it would have; but the money managers can point to the low rate of return earned by even the most prosperous of the major railroads as a reason for not putting more money into railroading. Here we come up against the real culprit—government policies toward railroads that neglect their needs but heavily favor and subsidize the other modes; while taking a basically punitive approach in regulating the railroads.

We believe the mad rush to diversify out of railroading is bad, both for the railroads and for the nation, but we cannot really fault the industry's managers for doing so when the government has made it impossible for even the best-run railroads to earn profits comparable to those of other industries.

When all is said and done, most of the problems that combined to force PC to its knees are present on *all* the railroads—even those that still show some black ink in their financial statements. With the biggest railroad in the country already in reorganization, and a number of others either in or close to the same state, surely Congress and the Administration will now recognize the seriousness of the railroad crisis and get behind moves to correct the conditions that caused it.

The time is long past when the railroads could consider themselves as a strictly private enterprise like a department store or a widget-maker. Yet to completely nationalize the U.S. railroads, as has been done in the other countries of the world, would be fantastically expensive.

The answer, it seems to us, is more federal participation short of nationalization. The AAR's ASTRO report, released just at press-time, suggests the lines such participation might take. But before the railroads can expect any real help from Congress, we believe they'll have to demonstrate that they are also working constructively as an industry to help solve their own problems.

At any rate, Penn Central's downfall has demonstrated that the railroads can no longer go it alone. If the *entire industry* will

really get behind a *politically realistic* program, maybe the politician can also be convinced that now is the time for constructive action. We hope so; because otherwise the nation will get nationalization, whether it wants it or not.

Pending reorganization (and that may take many years) Penn Central will be kept running. And if PC's disaster finally leads to a united railroad industry and triggers the overhaul of the federal government's policies toward that industry it may yet prove to be the key to the railroads' bright future!

ENVIRONMENTAL CRISES

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, on September 22 Dr. Ralph E. Lapp delivered an address on "Environmental Crises" at Iowa State University. The crucial question that Dr. Lapp raises is: How can our Nation preserve both the environment and the economy?

In an effort to protect the environment from polluted air, stiffer restrictions will have to be placed on fossil fuels. Yet at the present state of technology these standards might not be met and the amount of necessary power could not be produced. This would result in people living in cold houses in the winter and hot houses in the summer—a fact the east coast is experiencing today.

The per capita consumption of electric energy has risen by a factor of 125 since 1900. At present rate of increase the United States will be generating 10 billion kilowatt-hours of electric power by the year 2000. The question then arises as to what mix of fossil and nuclear fuels will be needed to insure the demands of society are met while at the same time the quality of the environment is protected.

Therefore, we must begin to search out ways to make the best use of our natural resources—ways that will protect our fragile environment and supply the energy to run the country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Dr. Lapp's excellent and timely speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

ENVIRONMENTAL CRISES

Although you have invited me to speak on the "environmental crisis" I have pluralized the title. Unfortunately, we are not permitted the luxury of a single crisis because man's interaction with his environment involves a series of multiple collisions.

One reason why we have been slow to recognize the true nature of the ecological upset wrought by our civilization is that the collisions were highly muffled or remote. Occasionally we were jolted by news of eco-fatalities as for example, 23 years ago when a blanket of poisonous air snuffed out the lives of twenty people at Donora, Pennsylvania. But when these warning blips faded on the screen, society went to sleep—the crisis was soon forgotten.

Meanwhile ecological insults multiplied and intensified. Man's solid and liquid wastes were dumped in ever-increasing quantities into the air, the waterways and onto the soil. Lakes sickened and poisoned marine life and even winged creatures fell victim to the chemical agents that drained into the water. Certain forms of man's chemical warfare were outlawed when birds stopped flying. But in Southeast Asia environmental warfare has been waged with a vengeance, using chemical agents of unparalleled toxicity.

Last month Senator Gaylord Nelson led an attempt to outlaw the "environmental warfare" in Vietnam i.e. the use of herbicides and anti-plant chemicals to defoliate forests and kill food crops. U.S. Armed Forces have sprayed more than 100 million pounds of chemical agents on over 5 million acres of Vietnam. These include ORANGE, a liquid solution of 2,4,5-T and 2,4-D now banned; BLUE an anti-crop dessicant arsenic compound and WHITE, a mixture of 2,4-D and picloram. Senator Nelson's amendment to ban herbicides and anti-plant agents failed to pass but the Senate debate on the subject served to illuminate the issue. It's clear that no substantial body of scientific evidence exists on which to appraise the long-term impact of such chemical assault on the environment.

The toxicity of modern chemical agents is illustrated by a recent tragedy in Carolina's tobacco country. When I was vacationing near there last month I learned that a 7-year-old boy, the son of a tobacco farmer, died as a result of helping his father spray tobacco plants with Big Bad John—a U.S. Dept. of Agriculture-approved insecticide. An environmental crisis may seize a single family in its lethal grip or it may spread itself over a whole nation and persist for many years.

U.S. metropolitan areas are beginning to resemble chemical retorts in which noxious fumes accumulate. In general three classes of pollutants afflict U.S. cities:—the obvious particulates that fall out as soot, ash and grit; the hydrocarbons most of which are emitted by fossil-fuel burning cars and trucks; and the chemical oxides, namely of sulfur, carbon and nitrogen. About 65 million tons of these pollutants are emitted per year in 27 metropolitan areas embracing a total of 140,000 square miles. That averages about 460 tons per square mile or 1450 pounds per acre.

Gross statistics about total emissions are not too meaningful in assessing the pollution hazard; we need to deal with specific concentrations of the hazards within the metropolitan area and with the persistence in time of these pollutants. Metropolitan areas may be thought of as immense pill boxes which form gas chambers whose top is normally open. When sufficient air sweeps into the volume the ventilation serves to remove most of the noxious gases and airborne pollutants. But given an atmospheric static, so to speak, nature slams a lid on the box and the concentration of offensive gases builds up. In effect, the air above the densely populated region becomes a closed system—a huge gas chamber.

The natural geography of the Los Angeles area forms a basin into which vehicular emissions rise and are trapped. Low-lying temperature inversion layers serve to close off the Los Angeles chemical retort and the California sunshine produces photochemicals which are irritating and injurious to human and organic tissue. The resulting smog can be sighted from the air as a massive brownish incursion stretching from the ocean to the barrier mountains. The California experience with smog was viewed as one peculiar to that region, but today the major American cities all are subject to the peril of atmospheric pollution.

Man's lust for energy must be reckoned as the primary cause of air pollution. That—and his concentration of population in a very small fraction of the U.S. land area. Population alone is not the big factor in air pollution; after all, the U.S. population has only tripled since the turn of the century. But the shift from the farm to the city and the advent and mass production of motor cars have compressed the American population so that 76 million people—the total U.S. population in 1900—are crowded into 0.3 of 1 percent of the U.S. land area.

This urban squeeze, by itself, would not have created serious air pollution hazards if

men had been content with a 1900 life style. To illustrate the dramatic changes in American life style I have prepared a series of charts whose base line stretches from 1900 to the year 2000. Such a centurywide time sweep allows us to project our way of life ahead for 3 more decades—assuming, of course, a constancy of change. I shall read off a few 1900 and 1970 comparative values:

ANNUAL VALUES PER CAPITA

	1900	1970	Factor
Electric energy (kw.-hr.)	60	7,500.0	125
Prime mover horse-power	.9	100.0	110
Natural gas (cubic feet)	3,300	100,000.0	30
Petroleum (barrels)	.5	20.0	40
Motor vehicles	.0001	.5	5,000

All of these items involve energy conversion and this is primarily, at least up to now, a matter of burning a fossil fuel. Hydropower is very limited in its potential and nuclear power is just beginning to make its mark in providing electric power.

The effluents from automotive exhaust pipes and from the smoke stacks of power plants constitute the pollution hazards that have overpowered the self-cleansing ability of the atmosphere above U.S. cities. The hazard arises from the inevitable combustion products formed when fossil fuels are burned and from the impurities, such as sulfur, present in coal and oil. A free-wheeling American economy has permitted motor car manufacturers to market automobiles, which until very recently, had no restrictions on their exhaust emissions. Steam-electric generators were allowed to burn high-sulfur coal. As a consequence, city-dwellers conducted a form of gas warfare against themselves.

The control of the motor car and of the fuel-burning plant became a necessity in the late sixties. This was not only because of the present danger but because any realistic projection of the nation's future needs makes graphic the magnitude of the pollution control problem in the coming decades. The U.S. power economy is increasingly shifting to electrification and by the year 2000 we will probably see a total of 10 trillion kilowatt-hours of electric power generated. Engineers have nudged the limits of efficiency in burning fossil fuel and these limits have to be approached with caution in the nuclear power industry. Therefore, we can predict with some confidence the amount of heat that will be required in the year 2000 to supply the U.S. electric power needs.

The generation of 10 trillion kw-hrs of electricity will require the release of almost 10^{17} British thermal units (Btu) of heat energy. If all this energy came from petroleum, it would mean an annual consumption of 15 billion barrels. To this one would have to add the petroleum consumed as gasoline or as non-fuel products. One immediately senses that we are not dealing so much with a pollution problem as we are with a sheer natural resource situation. Where in the world will we get such a flow of oil?

Admittedly, we will not depend on oil for all our electric energy. Nuclear power should supply half the nation's kilowatt needs by the end of the century, but allowing for hydropower, this will still leave some 45 percent to be generated by combustion of fossil fuels—oil, natural gas and coal. Our natural gas is an ideal fuel, both from a transmission and a pollution standpoint but it is going to be in short supply and will probably not be available for central station power in quantities comparable to oil on a Btu basis. Coal reserves are immense but low sulfur bituminous beds are not generally favorable for exploitation in eastern U.S.A. This probably means that fuel oil will have to be used for electric power generation and,

inevitably, this will have to come from a tanker supply route.

The trend of central station power plants to opt for larger and larger power outputs, especially in the case of uranium-burning plants, means that by the year 2000 the most modern plants will all be several thousand megawatts in power rating. This will mean a localized thermal pollution problem i.e. overheating waterways and intruding upon the ecological status quo of larger bodies of water. Higher capacity power plants make for greater efficiency but this advantage is not an unalloyed blessing. Nuclear power is beset with its own species of problems, including the unique radiation hazard which, in my opinion, makes it mandatory that uranium-burning plants be located at sites remote from dense concentrations of population. Wise site selection, careful consideration of reactor design, establishment of adequate radiation standards and prudent regulation of power plant construction and operation should make it possible for nuclear power to provide the nation with clear kilowatts.

Those who spurn the promise of nuclear power must recognize that there are only two alternatives. One, obviously, is to fall back on the conventional fossil fuels, leaving us to solve the problems of pollution and fuel supplies. The other is to "bend the 20th century over" i.e. to depart from the 70 year pattern of providing cheap and plentiful electric power. This would be curtailing the kilowatt and would ration electric energy to present customers and deny it to new ones. At the present time about a third of the kilowatts supply residential power, somewhat more than a fifth go to commerce and the bulk turns the wheels of industry. Consider the consequences of curtailing the electric energy supply for industry. This would not only crimp production and produce unemployment, it would bar productivity increases so essential to a rising Gross National Product. Clamping down on the residential kilowatts would also limit the market for electric-energy appliances and thus affect industry; it would also discourage home-building and set off a wave of unemployment in the building trades. A community caught in a kilowatt squeeze might have to forbid the sales of major electric appliances like air conditioners and clothes dryers.

Given such restrictive measures, a black market in air conditioners and other devices would spring up. After all, there would be a real discomfort felt by a person lacking an air conditioner, especially when his next door neighbor had one. Imagine the plight of apartment dwellers in Manhattan who would be forced to dry their laundry the old-fashioned way—by hanging it on a line. Manhattan would be festooned with a gala bunting.

The fact is that our way of life and our economy is hooked on the kilowatt. We are affluent as a nation because we have enjoyed a generous energy endowment. It is unrealistic to project a leveling off or a decline in the production of electric energy. On the other hand our energy exuberance need not escalate to unnecessary incandescence. The finiteness of our fossil fuel resources makes it essential that the United States practice conservation of its premium fuels, oil and natural gas.

Research and development in the fossil fuel sector, especially in coal, has been a pitifully weak-kneed national effort. High priority should be assigned to the gas conversion of solid coal so that our supply of natural gas can be supplemented. Unless the motor industry manages to curb the pollution of gasoline engines, it may be necessary to turn to a new fuel. It must be understood that motor vehicles account for six-tenths of all air pollution. Specifically, they con-

tribute more than 90 percent of the carbon monoxide pollution, 63 percent of hydrocarbons and 46 percent of nitrogen oxides. The electric car, running on battery power, is a clean solution to the motor vehicle pollution problem, but it is far from being an acceptable substitute for the internal combustion engine. Furthermore, one must remember that the electric power has to be generated for battery power. If nuclear power supplies this electricity then the electric car is truly clean, but if fossil fuel plants generate the power, then all we have done is to transfer the source of pollution from the tailpipe to the smokestack. Of course, there would be some gains, since carbon monoxide levels in metropolitan streets would be drastically lowered. But this would be at the expense of adding to the sulfur oxide emissions from power plants. In the next thirty years it is estimated that sulfur oxide emissions will increase five-fold unless adequate controls are imposed on fossil fuel power plants.

For almost two-thirds of this century industrialists and motorists have polluted the city and the highways with virtually no restraint. With the advent of air travel, beginning in the late twenties, man added a new dimension to air pollution by injecting combustion products into the lower atmosphere. It is now proposed that the United States should undertake development of the supersonic transport (SST) which would fly at an altitude of 65,000 feet. This SST venture involves a third tier of pollution in a rarefied atmosphere where the injection of combustion products and moisture formation may produce ecological effects which are not presently calculable. Aside from the questionable economics of the SST which is keyed to a passenger seat capital cost of three times that of the 747, and possibly much more, it now appears that instead of a cost-benefit analysis, the SST should be viewed in terms of its detrimental eco-effect.

We have relatively little experience in the matter of assessing the adverse effects of technology. In the past we have proceeded almost blindly, genuflecting to the dictates of a technological imperative. In order for a technologically-based project to be authorized, it was sufficient that it be within the realm of feasibility. If an A-bomb could be made—it would be made. If made, it would be used. If an H-bomb could be made, it would be made. And it was. If one could go to the moon, then we would go. And we did. In connection with the H- or superbomb, I would like to go back and discuss some details of the weapons project which may have escaped your notice.

In July of 1953, before the Atomic Energy Commission had tested an operational H-bomb, a group of military men and experts gathered in Santa Monica, California with officials of the RAND Corporation. The single purpose of this conference of 49 people was to assess the worldwide impact of testing a superbomb whose power would be in excess of 10 million tons of TNT equivalent i.e. 10 megatons. It was a highly secret meeting and no word about it leaked out to the public—or even to officials in other government agencies. Yet this conference was essentially for the purpose of evaluating a global health hazard, namely, the entry into the biosphere of highly toxic and long-lived radioactive species such as strontium-90.

Some of the scientists at the RAND-AEC conference were distinguished physicists, even Nobel prizewinners but only one biologist present was really competent in the field of radiation health protection. Consider the complicated chain of events intervening between the splitting of an atom in the bomb and the ultimate fate of these split atoms. The radioactive species attach themselves in various chemical forms to particles of microscopic and macroscopic size. They are injected at various altitudes and may fall out

locally, tropospherically or circle the earth in the stratosphere. They may or may not thereafter drift to various latitudes. Their descent to the far corners of the earth is highly uncertain, varying with the season. Once deposited they become available to enter food-chains of animals and humans. The passage of various radioactive species through the many links in the food-chains is complex and was, in the summer of 1953, largely unknown. Yet in the face of all these uncertainties, scientists were called upon to come up with their estimates of safe levels for testing superbombs.

The veil of secrecy has not been fully pulled aside for us to judge what really happened at the Santa Monica conference, but we do know that no scientist saw fit to protest the *Castle* series of nuclear tests which began March 1, 1954. We have here an example of the Atomic Energy Commission, a single governmental agency, acting on its own in assessing a global health hazard. We are also witness to the obedience of some of the nation's greatest scientists in bowing to the will of the AEC.

On March 1, 1954 the AEC exploded its *Bravo* bomb with a yield of 15 megatons. The globe-circling nuclear debris let loose in this test is in all of us today—the reindeer-eating Lapps bear a body burden of cesium-137 which is taken up in lichen on which the deer feed—our teeth and bones contain measurable amounts of strontium-90 which follows the calcium route in food chains. Those closer to the *Bravo* blast were caught in local fallout and experienced loss of hair, skin lesions and other effects of radiation injury. AEC experts were confident that the effects were transitory and that everyone would be all right but they did not reckon with the delayed effects of radiation. Yet within 12 years after exposure 80 percent of the Marshallese children who were irradiated while under 10 years of age developed thyroid nodules.

In 1954 the experts did not know the ecological consequences of the *Bravo* bomb test; they did not even know enough to consult fully with other experts who might have helped out in analyzing the problem. Technology ruled the day with an assist from a weapons-oriented Atomic Energy Commission.

Today it is fashionable to raise alarm about the harmful or potentially injurious aspects of science and technology. In 1954 it was much more hazardous for a scientist to dissent with the Establishment. Things have even gotten to the point where AEC scientists are quarreling with the AEC! The Atomic Energy Commission doesn't exactly welcome this internal dissent, but it is perplexed by the discord. I am sure that AEC officials long to fire the critics, but they know that this ejection technique would simply fan the fire of controversy.

If we had had effective dissent in 1954 I believe history might have been set on a different course. I personally regret that I was so slow on the draw that it was not until after the *Bravo* test that I started to study fallout and began criticizing the AEC. Had we been able to open up the weapons test issue in 1953 when the secret conference took place at Santa Monica, then it is possible we could have altered events. The Defense Department and the AEC were hell-bent on testing the superbomb and perhaps the momentum was too much to overcome. But if public discussion of the test and its ecological effects had occurred, we might have inhibited the testing of very high-yield bombs. Conceivably, we could have secured a Nuclear Test Ban Treaty long before 1963 and got started on Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) with the Soviets before we fielded a thousand Minuteman ICBMs and the Soviets followed suit.

A policy of official secrecy on nuclear weapons has restricted public discussion of the

most vital issues of the day. It has encouraged a headlong propagation of nuclear weapons and weapons systems and only tardily do we sense the folly of blind obedience to a technological imperative. Our one thousand Minuteman missiles are not only a wasting asset—one costing us in excess of \$20 billion—but we are now told we must throw up ABM defenses to defend them and this will cost another \$8 billion. But, worse yet, it takes us into a non-negotiable area of arms control.

We can depend on the photographic acuity of satellite cameras to inspect for missiles of ICBM quality, but this orbital surveillance is more ambiguous when it comes to inspecting missiles like Sprint and Spartan. In addition, we have pushed forward on MIRV (multiple, independently targeted, reentry vehicles) technology, again prostrating ourselves before the altar of high technology.

Allow me to expand on this MIRV topic. It serves to illustrate the difficulty of dissent in the area of complex technology. We have just concluded Phase II of the SALT talks at Vienna—discussions in which the Administration maintained it was essential for the Congress to approve the Safeguard ABM program as a "bargaining chip" in the negotiations. It was argued that it was necessary for the United States to begin deployment of ABMs in four states to provide protection of Minuteman bases against the threat of a Soviet first strike with SS-9 missiles. Then the Soviets might be induced to stop making more SS-9s. We could agree on a SALT treaty setting a limit to SS-9s and to other missiles as well—and we would dismantle the ABMs. The senators who used the bargaining chip argument did not spell out how a treaty would effectively freeze the Soviet S-99 threat. Merely putting a limit on the deployment of SS-9 launchers would not freeze the strategic threat. One would also have to freeze the number of MIRVs on board each SS-9. No pro-ABM senator explained how this would be done.

The fact is that the SS-9 threat can not be limited unless the U.S. and the Soviet Union enter into a MIRV agreement. We know that the Soviets have the capability of throwing three 5 megaton RVs with their massive SS-9 launcher. They know that our Poseidon missile throws 10 RVs. To be sure these are a hundred times less powerful, but it's the multiplicative technique that counts. What is to prevent the Soviet weapons experts from mounting six or seven 1 megaton warheads on a single SS-9? With the present level of 300 SS-9s, this would give the Soviets a throw potential of 1,800 RVs. This would in effect give the Soviets a first strike capability against 1,000 missile silos housing our Minuteman ICBMs. Providing, of course, that the Soviets can drop these warheads close enough to destroy the silos. This means reliability of launch and RV accuracy. The MIRVing mechanism that dispatches individual warheads on their trajectories to specific aim points must function properly. The accuracies required to achieve a 95 percent probability of knocking out a Minuteman silo correspond to a circular error of probability (CEP) of 280 yards for a 1 megaton warhead.

The Soviets can not hope to achieve such accuracy without extensive testing—missile firings and MIRV dispatches which we can monitor with inspection apparatus located far from the Soviet test sites. Therefore, if the Soviets would agree to a MIRV test ban—and to placing a limit on the SS-9 deployment—we could effectively "freeze" the Soviet first-strike threat of the SS-9.

However, we must consider the Soviet view of a SALT treaty. The Soviets know that the United States has concluded the research and development test phase of its strategic MIRV program for equipping Minuteman III and Poseidon with multiple warheads. We have already deployed some Minuteman III missiles in the North Dakota fields and

Poseidon becomes operational on the *James Madison* submarine next January. From the Soviet viewpoint the MIRV situation is quite asymmetric and a MIRV test ban would be a one-sided affair. From their viewpoint a production-deployment ban on MIRV is required to forge an equitable SALT agreement on missile limitation.

Now this asymmetric situation presents the United States with a dilemma. Given the backward condition of Soviet MIRV technology, we can trust our national means of inspecting for illicit MIRV tests by monitoring the Soviet Union, but the Soviets would have to rely on on-site inspection to make sure that MIRVs were not deployed in Minuteman silos. It is futile to argue that our Minuteman III warheads are much lower power than the SS-9s, being about 0.2 megatons each, and therefore requiring greater accuracy to target SS-9 silos. Actually the difference is less than 100 yards and the Soviets would have to assume the worst, namely, that we are deploying a first strike system. That is, unless they can inspect the silos and verify that each Minuteman contains only one warhead.

The U.S. sophistication in missile weaponry has placed us in an awkward negotiating position. Will we accept what amounts to a unilateral on-site inspection system? Would we allow Soviet inspectors to roam about Montana, North and South Dakota, Wyoming and Missouri? Would these visitors be permitted to peer inside our silos and inspect the missile shrouds? I find it difficult to believe that the present Administration would agree to any such proposal. It would, indeed, insist on on-site inspection of Soviet silos. Our experience in negotiating the Nuclear Test Ban Treaty gives little hope that the Soviets will agree to having U.S. teams check their missile silos. Presumably the U.S. Senate would insist on a mutual on-site inspection system, thus creating a stalemate.

I cite this MIRV missile dilemma to illustrate the complexity of an issue of high technical content which is resolved by introducing it into a political decision-making process. So far as the Safeguard ABM decision was concerned, purely technical consideration should have made the decision an easy one—specifically, the Senate should have refused to authorize deployment funds for it. But only a handful of senators fully comprehend the technology involved; the point here is that a democratic decision on a technical problem is confronted with the difficulty of requiring politicians to vote on it before the public has had a chance to understand it. In the ABM debate it was noteworthy that scientists who opposed Safeguard took their arguments directly to the senators rather than appealing for public support as their primary means of persuasion.

I have also explored the nuclear-missile issue because nuclear war would be the supreme ecological catastrophe for mankind. In the past the United States has been able to remain isolated from strategic assault because of its isolation and expanse. Today a missile can hurl its lethal payload over intercontinental range in a space of 25 minutes. A single warhead carried by an SS-9 reentry vehicle can contain the equivalent of 25 million tons of TNT. A strike force of 300 such RVs adds up to 7,500 megatons or 7.5 billion tons of TNT equivalent. An inherently dirty design for these weapons would lay down the equivalent of 5 billion tons of fission-energy products with a potential for coating 5 million square miles of area with serious-to-lethal radioactive fallout. This is 2 million square miles more than the land area of the U.S.A. A radiation assault on this nation would not only strike at the total human population of our nation, it would kill off animal life on the farms and poison much of the plant life for years to come.

Dissent in an age of sophisticated technology clearly must be based on awareness of potential hazards and a degree of scientific and technical competence to evaluate these. This more or less burdens the scientist with a responsibility to speak out on issues which he feels may bring significant harm to society. I should narrow down the responsibility to independent scientists, thus eliminating those who are employed by industry and with few exceptions those who are dependent on federal funds. This pretty much localizes dissent to the campus.

The voice of the scientist is still strong and will be heard. I have in mind a number of recent instances in which a very few scientists provoked public discussion of a local issue and were productive in causing agencies like the Atomic Energy Commission to pay attention to them. For example, the Colorado Committee for Environmental Information was instrumental in opening up the plutonium contamination issue surrounding the Rocky Flats fire. Scientists were also effective in the case of the AEC's Project Rulison underground nuclear test last year.

Unfortunately the scientific and technical community has no collective conscience and it lacks organization for the easy expression of its dissent. Of course it has the discipline to correct error within itself when dealing with matters of science. Any researcher who publishes is quickly challenged if his results do not check out, but the area of science and public affairs the scientific community is not self-policing. The result is that when experts disagree in public confusion is propagated. The professional societies are most reluctant to engage in settlement of such disputes. The most august organization of science, the National Academy of Sciences, is most prestigious but operates on the slopes of Mt. Olympus. There is thus no High Court of Science to hand down decisions in matters of controversy involving the intersection of science and public affairs.

Environmental problems are particularly difficult to tackle because they involve so many disciplines and so many unknowns. A scientist who is an expert in a specialized field has to make an extraordinary effort to embrace many disciplines when he makes an ecological study. For example, the bomb-to-bone sequence of strontium-90 involves nuclear physics, particle chemistry, meteorology, classical physics, plant sciences, biochemistry, physiology, radiochemistry and other fields. Universities encompass many disciplines and have the potential for mounting the best attack on environmental problems. However, the various departments on campus are difficult to interlink in interdisciplinary activities. In general one requires some kind of institute to penetrate the ramparts of each department. It so happens that the National Aeronautics and Space Administration funded more than a score of Space Institutes on the major campuses. In view of the irrelevance of the U.S. space activity to the nation's pressing environmental problems, I would urge that half of these institutes be converted into Environmental Institutes.

As we attempt to insure the quality of our environment, we must recognize that extremism in cleaning up the atmosphere can produce an energy crisis. In the short term, if we impose restrictions on the sulfur content of fossil fuels on too stringent a basis, we can throttle the power output of many electric power plants, especially on the east coast. This summer the United States experienced power deficiencies which could be the forerunners of more widespread emergencies this winter. This could produce a pollution backlash, especially if the power cutbacks keep plants idle and hard-hat workers are presented with value judgments in the form of paychecks vs possible air pollution.

In a sense, we should be thankful for the power emergencies of 1970 because they draw attention to the long term problem of providing the nation with abundant power. Against this backdrop, a favorable scenario has been set for the creation of a National Commission on Fuels and Energy. Senator Jennings Randolph introduced S. 4092 this summer to authorize such a commission to study overall problem of U.S. energy requirements for the next 20 to 30 years and to make recommendations for a national energy policy. Hearings on the measure were started this month and it appears very likely that the commission will be established. It will permit a thorough-going analysis of a multiplicity of problems which have heretofore never been attacked as a whole.

The nation needs to emulate the Dutch who take a half-century view of reclaiming land from the sea, except that our problem must be assuring an adequate supply of coal, oil, gas and electric power while also making sure that this is clean power. We can certainly find the fuel resources to drive the nation's economy in the year 2000 if we do not worry about pollution. But if so, we may end up coughing our way into the 21st century.

On the other hand, if we go overboard on pollution controls for fossil fuel burning, we may end up with a clean cold America.

I believe that we can protect the environment and provide the necessary power to run our factories, light our streets and warm our homes—if we plan for the year 2000 and examine all the alternatives and explore the research and development possibilities in tapping the vast reserves of energy which still rest untouched in U.S. soil.

MONDALE DEPLORES VIOLENCE AND COLLUSION SURROUNDING FARM-WORKERS' ORGANIZATION EFFORTS

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I must express my deep concern over the reports of violence and collusion against striking farmworkers in the Salinas Valley in California. The organizing effort of the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee is one of the few hopeful movements which promises to end the exploitation of our most powerless citizens—the migrant and seasonal farmworker.

Powerful forces seem determined to perpetuate that powerlessness and to deny these workers the right to select the union of their own choice. I am disturbed by the following reports of violence, intimidation, and harassment from Salinas:

That the general counsel of UFWOC, Jerry Cohen, was beaten unconscious and sustained a concussion and other serious injuries when he was trying to protect the lives and safety of striking farmworkers;

That several striking workers have been shot at and some wounded by gun-wielding vigilantes;

That roving caravans of trucks and cars filled with persons acting without apparent legal authority, have threatened the life of some picketers, and beaten others, smashed windows of cars with baseball bats, and intentionally provoked violence;

That the UFWOC headquarters in Salinas has had to be evacuated because of bomb threats;

That local law enforcement officials have made mass arrests of picketers

under a legally questionable temporary restraining order against picketing, but did not arrest a self-proclaiming citizens justice committee which through mass picketing, in violation of a court order, closed down for a week the trucking plant of Interharvest, a grower that signed with UFWOC;

That many instances of violence reported to the police, including the beating, threatening, and shooting of union workers and organizers, have resulted in few arrests by local law enforcement officials.

Acts of violence, harassment, and intimidation have pervaded the otherwise peaceful and prosperous Salinas Valley in the past month. They are related to the July 27 announcement by UFWOC and the California table grape growers that the 5-year farmworker organization effort had culminated in collective bargaining agreements, and that the international boycott of table grapes was over. Following close on the heels of that settlement, the same vegetable growers in the Salinas Valley who for years had vigorously resisted farmworker organizing efforts, voluntarily approached another union, not UFWOC, and willingly signed contracts covering their farmworkers. Growers apparently feared a UFWOC organization drive in Salinas, and they signed contracts without consulting their workers.

A committee of Catholic bishops, together with both unions involved, was aware of the potential violence of a full-blown jurisdictional dispute and negotiated a settlement agreement.

Pursuant to that agreement, some new contracts were negotiated by UFWOC with amenable growers, but other growers have not yet recognized the expressed interest of their workers in UFWOC representation. In addition to the implication that present contracts may not be with unions that represent their employees, the growers' bitter resistance to signing contracts with UFWOC, while willingly signing with other unions, perpetuates agribusiness' ability to more easily obstruct legitimate farm union organizing. The result of the breakdown of the jurisdictional pact is violence, intimidation, and harassment.

I condemn this resort to violence. It would be unconscionable if farmworkers are denied their right to choose a union of their own because of resort to physical brutality, and varied forms of threats and reprisals. The intimidation, harassment, and interference with legitimate organizing efforts in the Salinas Valley cannot be justified nor tolerated, and is a total anathema to the heretofore expressed, and observed, commitment to the principles of nonviolence to which Cesar Chavez and UFWOC are dedicated. In fact, consistent with those principles, and because of the heightening violence together with legally questionable injunctions against legitimate union organizing activity, UFWOC has called off their strike in the Salinas Valley, and instead, called for a boycott of all non-UFWOC lettuce grown in California and Texas.

I understand that after many requests by union officials and others, an investigation into this violence and intimidation has been initiated by the State attorney general of California. I am hopeful that this investigation will result in the restoration of law and order in the valley and the recognition that agricultural workers have the right to organize and choose their own union without intimidation.

Additionally, as chairman of the Migratory Labor Subcommittee, I intend to watch the situation in Salinas closely, and I have directed the staff of the subcommittee to investigate the recurring charges and allegations of violence and intimidation.

I hope other Senators will also look into this matter.

I think we all have an obligation to assure, in every way possible, a peaceful and nonviolent resolution of the farm-workers' struggle for justice and dignity.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

DIRECT POPULAR ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT AND THE VICE PRESIDENT

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to previous order, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and the Vice President.

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. ALLEN. 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. ALLEN. Mr. President, I am delighted to have the opportunity of speaking in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 1.

First, I wish to commend the distinguished Senator from Indiana for his hard work, and for his dedication to the cause of the resolution which he is espousing. I am glad, though, that he is willing at this time to allow some other Senators to be heard on this question. This matter has been under debate in the Senate for more than a week, and it has been the practice, up until the last legislative day, that the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 1 would be the order of business. The distinguished Senator from Indiana would come in, deliver a speech of from 1 hour to an hour and a half, to 2 hours, and then the matter would be laid aside and the second shift of the Senate would start work. Very little opportunity was given to

those in opposition to this measure to speak. The junior Senator from Alabama on one occasion, did have the opportunity of speaking for an hour or so.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield just briefly?

Mr. ALLEN. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Indiana that I prefer to finish my remarks, because the distinguished Senator from Indiana has, from time to time, asked that those who oppose this resolution take the floor and speak out against it, and then when some of the Senators have done that, the distinguished Senator from Indiana would interrupt to ask questions or carry on colloquy.

So I would suggest to the distinguished Senator from Indiana that the junior Senator from Alabama will be delighted to yield to him on the conclusion of his remarks.

Mr. BAYH. I appreciate that. I am sure the Senator from Alabama does not want to leave the impression that the Senator from Indiana has done something contrary to normal Senate procedure in seeking the opportunity to develop colloquy with his colleagues.

Mr. ALLEN. No. The Senator is within his rights under the rules. If the Senator from Indiana had been here when I started my remarks, he would have heard me commend him for his hard work and for his dedication in this matter.

He has engaged in colloquy with the opponents of the measure, and has consumed considerable time that the opponents of the measure could have been using.

The Senator from Alabama, however, regrets that the distinguished Senator from Indiana has threatened to grind the Senate proceedings to a halt; and in furtherance of that plan, to object to the customary meeting of the Senate committees during sessions of the Senate, and that, now that the period set aside for the transaction of morning business has been closed, the committees, because of the objection of the distinguished Senator from Indiana, are unable to meet.

These committees have many important bills before them, on which they will not be able to hold their sessions, as is the custom in the Senate, the Senator from Alabama understands, because of the objection of the distinguished Senator from Indiana.

He threatens, too, in a letter which all of the Senators received, to do away with the two-shift system under which the Senate has been operating for the last 10 or 12 days, which has resulted, as the distinguished Senator from North Carolina remarked just the other day, in passage of a greater number of important bills by the Senate than in any comparable period of which he had personal knowledge.

So the discussion that has been taking place with regard to Senate Joint Resolution 1 has not stopped consideration of important measures coming before the Senate. It has not prevented, up until today, the meeting of Senate committees. But now all of that is to be a thing of the past, because the proceedings in the Senate are to be ground to a halt by the

distinguished Senator from Indiana, exercising the power that he has under the Senate rules.

The Senator from Alabama certainly does not say that the distinguished Senator from Indiana is acting contrary to the rules, because he is not. I suggest, however, that the Senator, under the state of affairs existing in the Senate at this time, is the filibusterer, rather than those who are opposing the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 1.

Why do I say that? Mr. President, what is a filibusterer? A filibusterer is a person in a parliamentary body, in this case the Senate of the United States, who stops, impedes, or obstructs the flow of legislation and of legislative action through parliamentary devices, artifices, and use of the rules of that body.

So, whereas the limited discussion of those of us who want to be heard with respect to this amendment to the Constitution has, up to now, prevented a vote on the amendment—on one amendment—the action of the distinguished Senator from Indiana is preventing and will prevent action on dozens of important measures pending before the Senate.

So who is the filibusterer in this case? Not, I submit, those who oppose Senate Joint Resolution 1, because they have not been heard on the floor of this body since this bill was laid down as the pending business, I daresay, for as many as 20 hours.

The distinguished Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA) several days ago pointed out that during this Congress, the 91st Congress, the Senate on one occasion considered an amendment to a bill pending before the Senate for 49 days; and during that entire time no cloture motion was filed, no effort was made to choke off that debate, committees were not prevented from meeting, and this Senate debated that measure for 49 days. I believe this is the 12th or 13th day that this matter has been debated. And again I say that the debate that has taken place has been of such short duration that it has permitted the Senate to act on more than a dozen important bills in that time.

Mr. President, we have pending in the Senate some six or seven appropriation bills for the operation of various departments and agencies of this Government, which cover the period from July 1, 1970, to July 1, 1971. We are already into that period. We have been in that period since the first of July. Yet, these bills have not been passed. The distinguished Senator from Indiana says, "You're not going to get an opportunity to pass those bills. You have to act on Senate Joint Resolution 1, or I am not going to let you pass those bills."

So who is the filibusterer? Is it the opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 1, who are speaking against a measure that cannot even be put into effect until 1976? What is so important about it? Yet, weigh that against bills that would carry on the operation of this Government.

So what is the hurry about passing Senate Joint Resolution 1? Between now and 1976, even the distinguished Senator from Indiana might change his mind. The Members of the Senate and the

House might change their minds a half dozen times on what is the right measure to submit to the States for action.

It has not been too many years ago since the distinguished Senator from Indiana was not espousing direct election of the President; he was espousing the automatic system of casting the electoral vote in favor of the successful candidates in the various States. That was not a bad amendment. But the Senator from Indiana has changed from that plan over to the direct election plan.

Mr. President, the Senate itself has changed in recent years. At one time, back in the 1950's, the U.S. Senate passed by in excess of a two-thirds vote the proportional plan, the plan under which each candidate would receive a fractional number of electoral votes in proportion to his popular vote in the various States. That plan was submitted by the Senate.

So here we have the distinguished Senator from Indiana at one time pushing the automatic plan and the Senate itself putting through the proportional plan. Now they say, "Let us try the direct plan."

There is not even unanimity among the various Senators whose names appear on the back of this document, Senate Joint Resolution 1, as sponsors of the amendment. They are not all agreed. I think the most eloquent and scathing, if you please, denunciation of the Bayh plan for the runoff comes from the distinguished Senator from Michigan (Mr. GRIFFIN) and the distinguished Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS). They are highly critical of the runoff plan. Yet, we find their names—Mr. GRIFFIN and Mr. TYDINGS—on the back of Senate Joint Resolution 1, which provides for a 40-percent President, if any candidate receives 40 percent, or, failing in that, going into a runoff.

So Mr. TYDINGS and Mr. GRIFFIN say that we should not have the runoff. Yet, we find them as sponsors of this measure. So where is the unanimity?

Mr. President, where, in fact, is the enthusiasm for this plan? Not one Senator present in the Chamber is for this plan. I beg the pardon of the distinguished Presiding Officer, the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), I believe he has joined as one of the cosponsors. Aside from the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, not one Senator in the Chamber supports Senate Joint Resolution 1. Where is the enthusiasm for this plan?

Here is a plan that cannot take effect until 1976, and yet the Senate is ground to a halt. "No more bills are to be passed," says the distinguished Senator from Indiana, "not until you vote on my joint resolution"—a joint resolution that will become effective with the 1976 presidential election.

Mr. President, what is the hurry? Once this plan is submitted to the States, it is provided that it has 7 years to be adopted.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Alabama yield for several questions, with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor. I am induced to ask them because of the fine and accurate observations the Senator from Alabama made a moment ago.

Mr. ALLEN. I will yield to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina on the theory that we have been challenged by the proponents—I shall not say proponents because there are not enough of them—but we have been challenged by the proponent of the measure to put up our case against Senate Joint Resolution 1. In the firm belief, hope, and understanding that the distinguished Senator from North Carolina will seek to elicit information or make points regarding opposition to the measure, the junior Senator from Alabama is delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. Did the Senator from North Carolina accurately hear the distinguished Senator from Alabama make an observation a few moments ago, to the effect that Senate Joint Resolution 1, even if it were submitted to the States by Congress and ratified by the States, would not be made effective prior to the election of 1976?

Mr. ALLEN. In answer to the question of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, the junior Senator from Alabama would say that that is the practical effect of it, for this reason: The resolution, by its express terms, states that it shall not become effective until 1 year after the first April 15 following its ratification, so that would mean that, in order to be applicable in 1972, this measure would have to be submitted by Congress to the States and ratified by both houses of 38 States, or in the case of Nebraska, the one house, between now and April 15, 1971.

The junior Senator from Alabama submits that that is, in fact, an absolute impossibility, and that a resolution to change the system of electing the President could not become effective or applicable until the 1976 election; that is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator from North Carolina would like to ask the distinguished Senator from Alabama if there does not appear on page 8 of the Senate's Calendar of Thursday, September 24, 1970, that is today, that there is pending before this body, a bill entitled S. 734, introduced by the distinguished Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), which is a bill to revise the Federal election laws.

Mr. ALLEN. Yes, sir. That bill does appear on page 8 of the Senate's Calendar.

Mr. ERVIN. Is the Senator from North Carolina right in the assumption that the bill offered by the distinguished Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON) would be applicable to the election to be held in November 1970 rather than the election to be held in November 1976?

Mr. ALLEN. That is the understanding of the junior Senator from Alabama.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the distinguished Senator from Alabama agree with the Senator from North Carolina that we should be more concerned with the passage of legislation which requires only a majority vote of Congress and which is designed to create rational and fair rules for the conduct of an election in November 1970, rather than to be concerned with an election in November 1976?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes, sir. That would be the view of the junior Senator from Alabama, that we should put first things first, and things that come up first should be attended to ahead of things that would not come up until 1976.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the distinguished Senator from Alabama agree with the Senator from North Carolina that the able and distinguished Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), in the exercise of his undoubted right under the rules of the Senate, insists that we not act upon the proposal of the distinguished Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON) to revise the statutory laws governing Federal elections which relate to the election of November 1970 until after we have dealt with a matter that relates to the election of 1976?

Mr. ALLEN. That is correct, but the junior Senator from Alabama would like to make one qualification at that point and that is that the distinguished, able, and eminent Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) has, thus far, only threatened to prevent Senate Joint Resolution 1 from being laid aside so that other business can be taken up this afternoon.

Now, along, I am sure, with the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, the junior Senator from Alabama received a letter from the distinguished Senator from Indiana, stating that that was his purpose and that was his plan, and that he was going to prevent other matters from coming up. But the junior Senator from Alabama is hopeful that the distinguished Senator from Indiana, realizing the importance to the country of these measures on the Calendar and in Senate committees, will allow these matters to be brought up and will allow Senate Joint Resolution No. 1 to be temporarily laid aside this afternoon. Thus far, we have had only the threat on the part of the distinguished Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH) and we hope that it will not become an actuality.

Mr. ERVIN. Will not the distinguished Senator from Alabama agree with the Senator from North Carolina that, in the words of William Shakespeare, the Bard of Avon, "tis a consummation devoutly to be wish'd."

Mr. ALLEN. Yes indeed. I would agree with the Bard and with the distinguished Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. ERVIN. I would like to ask the distinguished Senator from Alabama if the Senate Calendar for today does not show that Senate Joint Resolution 207, a joint resolution to establish a joint committee on the environment, is pending on the Calendar and would be subject to Senate consideration upon being called up by the majority leader?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes, sir. That is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the Senator think and agree with the Senator from North Carolina that the environment in which we now live certainly demands priority over what is going to happen in the election of 1976?

Mr. ALLEN. That would be the judgment and the opinion of the junior Senator from Alabama.

Mr. ERVIN. I would like to ask the distinguished Senator from Alabama if he does not agree with the Senator from North Carolina that unless we do some-

thing about our environment, many persons now registered voters in the 50 States of the Union may die as a result of pollution and not remain here on earth to vote in the general election of 1976?

MR. ALLEN. That is correct, in the judgment of the junior Senator from Alabama.

MR. ERVIN. I would like to ask the distinguished Senator from Alabama whether the Senate Calendar does not show, on page 9, that House Joint Resolution 1366, to provide for a temporary extension of the Federal Housing Administration Insurance Authority, is pending on the calendar and is in order for Senate consideration when called up by the majority leader.

MR. ALLEN. Yes, sir. That is correct.

MR. ERVIN. Does not the distinguished Senator from Alabama recognize, as does the Senator from North Carolina, that the ability of thousands, indeed of hundreds of thousands, of Americans to purchase homes is dependent upon the extension by Congress of this insurance authority in the Federal Housing Administration?

MR. ALLEN. Yes, I certainly agree.

MR. ERVIN. Does not the distinguished Senator from Alabama agree with the Senator from North Carolina that promoting the health and well-being of hundreds of thousands of Americans in this particular field should have priority over something that is to be applied for the first time in the history of this Nation to the election of 1976?

MR. ALLEN. The junior Senator from Alabama certainly agrees with the distinguished Senator from North Carolina.

MR. ERVIN. I would like to ask the distinguished Senator from Alabama whether the Senate Calendar for today does not disclose, and I refer to page 9, that H.R. 12807, an act to amend the act of February 11, 1903, commonly known as the Expediting Act, and for other purposes, is now upon the Senate Calendar and in a position to be acted upon by the Senate when called up by the majority leader?

MR. ALLEN. The Senator is correct.

MR. ERVIN. Mr. President, does not the Senator from Alabama recognize, as does the Senator from North Carolina, that this is a proposed amendment which would expedite the trial of antitrust actions?

MR. ALLEN. That is the understanding of the junior Senator from Alabama.

MR. ERVIN. And does not the Senator from Alabama agree with the Senator from North Carolina that expediting antitrust trials and the disposition of antitrust actions, which are necessary for the economic protection of the American people, ought to have priority over a proposal which can only take effect for the first time in the general election of 1976?

MR. ALLEN. That is certainly the feeling of the junior Senator from Alabama. Further, it is my hope that the distinguished Senator from Indiana will abandon the Bayh filibuster against the calendar and will allow us to proceed toward the enactment of some of these measures on the calendar.

MR. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the

Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from North Carolina to let the Senator from North Carolina express his hope that the able and distinguished Senator from Indiana will so far resume his customary geniality as to permit these proposals which ought to have priority over what is going to happen in the election of 1976 be acted upon by the Senate?

MR. ALLEN. Mr. President, I yield for that purpose. The junior Senator from Alabama has that hope and expresses the fervent wish that the Senator from Indiana will abandon his obstructionist tactics—which are permitted under the rules, let the junior Senator from Alabama hasten to add.

MR. ERVIN. Mr. President, I would like to invite the attention of the Senator from Alabama to page 9 of today's calendar and ask him if it does not disclose that S. 3650, a bill to amend section 837 of title 18, United States Code, to strengthen the laws concerning illegal use, transportation, or possession of explosives, and the penalties with respect thereto, and for other purposes, is ready for Senate action when called up by the majority leader.

MR. ALLEN. The Senator is correct. It is there and could be called up if the distinguished and eminent Senator from Indiana would permit it.

MR. ERVIN. Mr. President, would the Senator from Alabama agree with the Senator from North Carolina that we are having entirely too many illegal bombings throughout the length and breadth of the United States at this moment?

MR. ALLEN. Very definitely.

MR. ERVIN. Mr. President, does not the Senator from Alabama agree with the Senator from North Carolina that getting adequate legislation to stop, if possible, and to punish, if necessary, such illegal bombings ought to have priority over a proposal which cannot take effect prior to the general election of 1976?

MR. ALLEN. The junior Senator from Alabama has that opinion, and he feels confident that the distinguished Senator from Indiana has the same opinion and that he is going to relent from his conduct of the Bayh filibuster.

MR. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I dislike interrupting this colloquy, but perhaps I could put this question to rest if the Senator would permit me. I am sure there is much to be gained by listening to this intelligent dialog. But if the Senator would permit me to do so, I could answer the question that has been asked 13 times by the distinguished Senator.

MR. ALLEN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Alabama pointed out that the junior Senator from Indiana has called upon the opponents of this measure to state their opposition to this measure. All too often in the past few days, when some of the opponents have risen to speak, the distinguished Senator from Indiana, in his zeal and in his great knowledge and great learning on this subject, has asked the speakers to yield so that he could expound further on the measure.

The junior Senator from Alabama

feels that, until he has concluded his remarks, he would like to seek to present some of the case against this measure, at which time he will be delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Indiana. But he would like to maintain the continuity of his thinking on the subject.

MR. BAYH. Mr. President, one word of explanation. I do not like to interrupt, but the Senator had propounded direct questions to the Senator from Indiana, and I thought, because of the Senator's sincerity, he would want them answered. The Senator from Indiana would be glad to answer them.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield?

MR. ALLEN. The Senator from Alabama has propounded no questions to the Senator from Indiana.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Alabama yield?

MR. ALLEN. The junior Senator from Alabama has told the Senator from Indiana in all courtesy that he will yield to the heart's content of the distinguished Senator from Indiana as soon as the junior Senator from Alabama has concluded his remarks.

MR. ERVIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from North Carolina so that the Senator from North Carolina may propound to the Senator from Alabama some additional interrogations similar to those that the Senator from North Carolina has heretofore propounded to the Senator from Alabama?

MR. ALLEN. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Alabama yields to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina on the theory that the distinguished Senator from North Carolina will elicit information in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 1. And that is what the junior Senator from Alabama is seeking to do at this time.

MR. ERVIN. Mr. President, does not page 10 of today's Senate Calendar disclose that H.R. 16710, an act to amend chapter 37 of title 38, United States Code, to remove the time limitations on the use of entitlement to loan benefits, to authorize guaranteed and direct loans for the purchase of mobile homes, to authorize direct loans for certain disabled veterans and for other purposes, is now ready for Senate consideration and will be so considered whenever the majority leader has an opportunity to call it up?

MR. ALLEN. If the distinguished Senator from Indiana would relent from his attitude, the Senator is correct.

MR. ERVIN. Does not the Senator from Alabama agree with the Senator from North Carolina that it would certainly be a gracious and a just act for the Government of the United States, acting through Congress, to make it possible for disabled veterans who have served their Nation in time of war and bared their breasts to the bullets of the enemy, to acquire loans in order to acquire mobile homes?

MR. ALLEN. Yes, indeed. That would be the opinion of the junior Senator from Alabama.

MR. ERVIN. Mr. President, is it not true that as long as the able and dis-

tinguished Senator from Indiana persists in his present announced plan, this Congress cannot pass this bill to make loans to disabled veterans, veterans who have been disabled in the service of their country?

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina would like to ask the distinguished Senator from Alabama if page 11 of the Senate Calendar for today does not show that Senate Joint Resolution 236, a joint resolution authorizing the publication and printing of a revised edition—

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, may we have order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. Senators will take their seats.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the Senator from North Carolina asks this question of the distinguished Senator from Alabama. Does not page 11 of the Senate Calendar for today show that Senate Joint Resolution 236, a joint resolution authorizing the preparation and printing of a revised edition of the Constitution of the United States of America, is now pending on the Senate Calendar and in due order would be considered by the Senate on motion of the majority leader?

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, does not the Senator from Alabama agree with the Senator from North Carolina that it would be highly desirable to have a revised edition of this great book explaining the Constitution of the United States for the perusal of the Senator from Alabama, the Senator from North Carolina, and also for the perusal of the able and distinguished Senator from Indiana before we vote to change that Constitution?

Mr. ALLEN. That would seem to be wise.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, will it not be impossible for the Congress of the United States to publish such a revised edition of this great book on the Constitution and make it available to Senators and Representatives for their study unless the distinguished Senator from Indiana repents of his present purpose and permits the majority leader to call up this proposed legislation?

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the Senator from Alabama recall that during the present week we had a joint meeting of the Senate and the House of Representatives to hear the distinguished astronaut Col. Frank Borman present to Congress the plea of the wives of those who were serving in our Armed Forces in Southeast Asia, and who are now listed as missing in action or as prisoners of the enemy?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes, we had that session.

Mr. ERVIN. I ask the Senator from Alabama if page 11 of the Senate Calendar for today does not show that there is now pending in the Senate and ready for consideration just as soon as the distinguished Senator from Indiana relents in his present purpose, a bill, S. 3785, to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize educational assistance and home loan benefits to wives of members

of the Armed Forces who are missing in action or prisoners of war.

Mr. ALLEN. Yes, and the junior Senator from Alabama would like to call to the attention of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina that Col. Frank Borman, in his very fine remarks during the joint session urged Congress to do everything it possibly could for the families of the prisoners of war and soldiers who are missing in action. This is one thing Congress could do if the distinguished Senator from Indiana would allow this bill to be brought up.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the Senator from Alabama join the Senator from North Carolina in paying tribute to these wives who have made such great sacrifices on the altar of patriotism, and who endure the agony of not knowing whether their husbands are dead or alive?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes.

Mr. ERVIN. Can the Senator think of any more efficacious manner to manifest our appreciation for their sacrifices than enabling them to have this educational assistance?

Mr. ALLEN. And homes, also.

Mr. ERVIN. Yes. I would like to ask the distinguished Senator from Alabama this question. Does not page 12 of the Senate's Calendar for this day show that there is now pending and ready for Senate consideration H.R. 370, an act to amend chapter 39 of title 38, United States Code, to increase the amount allowed for the purchase of specially equipped automobiles for disabled veterans and to extend benefits under such chapter to certain persons on active duty?

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ERVIN. Does the Senator from Alabama agree with the Senator from North Carolina that nothing could show more deeply the gratitude and appreciation of this Nation to those who have incurred disability in serving their country than the passage of this particular law?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes, indeed.

Mr. ERVIN. Yet these legislative proposals which would give these benefits to disabled American veterans, which would make it possible for wives of American soldiers, sailors, and Marines who are listed as missing in combat or as prisoners of war to acquire educations and homes and which would provide the credit to veterans for acquiring homes, cannot become law unless the able and distinguished Senator from Indiana relents in his announced purpose and permits the Senate to consider these matters.

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator is absolutely correct.

Mr. ERVIN. Will the distinguished Senator from Alabama permit the Senator from North Carolina to say that the Senator from North Carolina agrees with the observation of the distinguished Senator from Alabama that if there is any filibustering going on and if there is any prevention or obstruction of legislation on the floor of the Senate, then it has to be attributed, if the truth is to be observed, to the able and distinguished Senator from Indiana, who is

acting perfectly within his rights as a Member of the Senate.

Mr. ALLEN. It occurs to the Senator from Alabama that the distinguished Senator from Indiana is conducting a filibuster against the entire calendar, whereas the distinguished Senator from North Carolina and the junior Senator from Alabama have sought repeatedly the opportunity of coming to the floor of the Senate and voicing some of their objections to this plan.

Mr. ERVIN. Has it not been the purpose of the distinguished Senator from Alabama, as well as the Senator from North Carolina, merely to educate Members of the Senate, including the able and distinguished Senator from Indiana, and to persuade the able and distinguished Senator from Indiana of the error of his ways and to try to get him to join us and to act in a righteous manner in making a reasonable kind of amendment to the Constitution?

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator is correct, because the junior Senator from Alabama recalls the change of the Senator from Indiana from the automatic plan to the direct plan, and it is possible we might get him to change back to the present electoral plan or some reasonable modification of the electoral college plan.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the fact that the distinguished Senator from Indiana has, on a previous occasion, altered his point of view give some hope to the Senator from Alabama that perhaps on further consideration and especially if he would stay here and heed the debate, he might change his mind a second time and arrive at a correct conclusion on this subject?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes; that is certainly to be hoped and whether he reaches that conclusion or not, as being for some other plan than his present plan, he may relent from his declared purpose of stopping consideration of these measures. Thus far it has only been a threat, but the junior Senator from Alabama would like to point out to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina that not only these bills on the calendar are involved, but the distinguished Senator from Indiana by his action this morning in objecting to the Senate committees meeting while the Senate is in session is choking the Senate committees and is impeding the regular flow of bills from these committees that would go on the calendar for action by the Senate.

Mr. ERVIN. Does not the distinguished Senator from Alabama hear a rather persistent rumor to the effect that a cloture motion will be laid before the Senate tomorrow and under rule XXII it will have to be voted on 1 hour after the Senate meets on next Tuesday?

Mr. ALLEN. The junior Senator from Alabama has heard recurring rumors to that effect, but the junior Senator from Alabama is encouraged by hearing other expressions, not just rumors on the part of Senators who are not greatly pleased with the Bayh filibuster of cutting off the regular flow of legislation and legislative action on the important

bills pending before the Senate, and it may be that the number of Senators who voted against the application of cloture the last time it was tried may go up significantly.

Another thing that the junior Senator from Alabama would like to call to the attention of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina is the fact that in the face of a 54 to 36 vote the press analyzed that vote by saying that the proponents came six votes short of a two-thirds vote.

Either there is something wrong with their arithmetic or with the arithmetic of the junior Senator from Alabama, because when you add six votes to the 54, they add up to 60 votes for cloture, against 36. With 36 against cloture, you have to have 72 to apply cloture, 72 plus 36 is more than the entire membership of the Senate. So they fell far short of six votes in trying to apply cloture.

Does the Senator from North Carolina agree?

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator from North Carolina agrees with the Senator from Alabama.

I put this question to the Senator from Alabama: Does not the arithmetic which the distinguished Senator from Alabama studied in the schools of Alabama agree with the arithmetic that the Senator from North Carolina studied in the schools of North Carolina, which shows that with a vote on cloture of 54 to 36, those seeking to impose the gag rule lack not six votes but 18 votes of the number necessary to impose cloture?

Mr. ALLEN. That is correct—90 Senators voted. The opponents of cloture got 36 votes. So if all 10 of the missing Senators had been here and had voted for cloture, it still would not have been two-thirds, because obviously 34 would prevent there being two-thirds on the other side.

Mr. ERVIN. In other words, is not the Senator from Alabama stating in substance that it would require the presence of 108 Senators in the Senate Chamber with two-thirds of them voting for cloture to impose cloture under those circumstances?

Mr. ALLEN. According to the arithmetic I have read and heard about on the part of those who are proposing that we agree to the resolution.

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator from North Carolina would like to ask the Senator from Alabama if the people of Alabama, as do the people of North Carolina, sometimes use the ancient English or Anglo-Saxon word "mommick up" or "mummick up" to express "messing up things"?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes.

Mr. ERVIN. Does the Senator from Alabama agree with the Senator from North Carolina that Senate Joint Resolution 1 will "mummick up" the Constitution?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes.

Mr. ERVIN. Does the Senator from Alabama agree with the Senator from North Carolina that it would be bad for Senate Joint Resolution 1 to "mummick up" the Constitution, and that it would be almost as bad to "mummick up" plain arithmetic?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes.

Mr. ERVIN. I thank the Senator from Alabama for yielding to me so I could propound these few little interrogatories to him.

Mr. ALLEN. I appreciate these questions, which have brought out some information that the junior Senator from Alabama had not brought out, and which certainly strengthen the case against approval of Senate Joint Resolution No. 1.

Mr. President, the junior Senator from Alabama, before responding to some of the questions of the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, was inquiring as to where the enthusiasm was for this plan. He made the statement a few moments ago that there was not a single Senator in the Chamber who favored Senate Joint Resolution No. 1, but then, looking up on the rostrum and seeing the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), whose name appears as one of the sponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 1, he had to qualify that statement.

The junior Senator from Alabama now is of the opinion, with the distinguished Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT) presiding, there is not now in the Chamber a single Senator who favors passage of Senate Joint Resolution No. 1.

Where is the enthusiasm? It is lacking. And why? Because it cannot be made effective until 1976. Who is worried about what is going to happen in 1976, when the people are wondering how they are going to pay their bills? Why worry about a presidential election in the distant future of 1976 when we have not even had the one in 1972?

The junior Senator from Alabama also pointed out that there has been so much change, so many changed views, with regard to a change in the plan for electing the President and the Vice President that there might be a half dozen more changes in the sentiment in the Senate and in Congress and in the country between now and 1976. So why set up action on Senate Joint Resolution 1 and say that it has priority over 100 bills pending on the calendar and in Senate committees?

As the junior Senator from Alabama pointed out, some of those bills are appropriation bills making appropriations for the fiscal year we started on July 1 of 1970. We are well into the year, and those bills have not been passed. But, under the threatened terms of the Bayh filibuster, we are not going to have an opportunity to vote on those important bills—we will have to take action on Senate Joint Resolution 1.

If that is not a rule-or-ruin attitude, I do not know what such an attitude would be. We have got to vote to make provision for the 1976 election before we take action on bills that are needed today.

That is where the junior Senator from Alabama takes issue with the Senator from Indiana, all the while conceding that the distinguished Senator from Indiana is a shrewd and able parliamentarian and that he is availing himself of the clear rights that he has under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. President, Senate Joint Resolution No. 1, if two-thirds of the Senate

and two-thirds of the House vote approvingly on it, will be sent to the States. That is pretty much like a comet. A comet takes 70 years to go out in its orbit and come back to the same point in space. An amendment to the Constitution is customarily, and in this instance that is the case, sent to the States and given 7 years to come back with ratification by the legislatures of 38 States.

That would mean that for this measure to be used in 1972, it would have to be submitted to the States and be approved in 76 legislative bodies—or 75, because each State except the State of Nebraska has a House and a Senate, Nebraska having a unicameral system.

So it would take a minimum of 75 legislative bodies in 38 States to take action, approvingly—not just take action, but take action approvingly on this amendment—by April 15 next year, before it could apply in 1972, because the wording of the amendment states that it does not become effective until 1 year after the first April 15th following its ratification. So if it were not ratified by 38 States until the 20th day of April, 1971, we would have to go, then, to the 20th day of April, 1972, for the year to start running. That would carry us, then, until April 20, 1973, which would be beyond the date of the 1972 elections.

Mr. President, there are many citizens in the country who believe that the electoral college system of electing the President and Vice President should be modified. So some come up with proposals for direct election.

Direct election: That sounds fine until we start studying it a little bit, and then it does not seem so good.

Change for change's sake should not be resorted to, and every change is not good reform. Every change that is made is not reform in the sense that it is better than what we had. So why exchange the certain for the uncertain? Why change the tried and true for the untried? Why change from a system that has worked well in this country for more than 180 years to a system that creates many more problems than it will solve, that has pitfalls at every turn, that has a potential of tearing this country apart?

Mr. President, if this direct election system is adopted, if the Bayh amendment is adopted, it would make for, not a majority president, but a plurality president; because, amazingly, it provides that if the leading candidate gets as many as 40 percent of the popular votes throughout the country, he is elected President, and his running mate becomes Vice President. Under this plan, of course, the candidates for President and Vice President run as a team, and it would be impossible for one to be elected without the other, which is a theoretical possibility under the present system.

But if the leading candidate receives as many as 40 percent of the votes, he is elected President and his running mate becomes Vice President.

The complaint is made by some of the advocates of Senate Joint Resolution 1 that under the present system the winning candidate does not always have a mandate from the people, that he could possibly have a majority in the electoral

college and be elected, and not have a majority of the popular votes. They argue that that would leave him in such a position, as the distinguished Senator from Indiana has stated over and over, that it would affect his credibility, his power to govern. But yet, under Senate Joint Resolution 1, a 40-percent plurality ticket can be elected.

Mr. President, what sort of mandate is that, 40 percent of the voting?

They say under the present system it is winner take all in a State, that those who did not vote for the winner in that State not only lose, but their votes are added to the winning side, which is hard for me to follow, because someone has to win, anywhere.

Mr. President, in the judgment of the junior Senator from Alabama, we should not at this time take action on Senate Joint Resolution 1, because during the 7-year period that this amendment would be before the States for consideration, it would effectively stop the House of Representatives and the Senate from considering any other type of change or reform, because it would naturally be the attitude of the House of Representatives and the Senate that, "Well, we have got something out there before the States now, some States have adopted it and others are considering it, so why permit something else?"

So for 7 years, any electoral reform would stand little chance, during the pendency of the measure before the States.

So those who favor some type of electoral reform regarding the method of choosing the President and the Vice President should not favor Senate Joint Resolution 1 just because it offers a change, because a change is not sufficient. A change is not always reform. It re-forms, yes, but it does not necessarily reform. There is a difference in the emphasis.

Mr. President, the runoff provision of the Bayh amendment has the potential of tearing this country apart. It would have the effect of proliferating splinter parties.

Why? Well, under the present system, for any party to register in the electoral college, it must carry the votes of at least one State. That has prevented the formation of many splinter parties, because they might know that throughout the country, throughout the 50 States, they might poll as many as 2, 3, 4, or 5 million votes and not get a single electoral vote. Henry Wallace, in 1948, got some 2 million votes and did not get a single electoral vote.

So a splinter party, a party other than the two great parties in the country, would be encouraged to offer candidates. They would mushroom all over the country, because their votes, however few they might be, would be taken into account in ascertaining whether the leading candidate got 40 percent of the vote. They would be taken into account in the runoff. There would be bids of one sort or another for the support of these splinter parties in the runoff.

Mr. President, the 40-percent plan of the distinguished Senator from Indiana would provide that a man would be

elected President of the United States and his running mate the Vice President on receiving as few as 40 percent of the vote, never receiving a majority vote. I submit that under the present plan, the electoral college plan, no person can be elected President or Vice President unless he receives a majority of something. Under Senate Joint Resolution 1, he does not need a majority of anything. Forty percent will elect him if he is the high candidate. Under the present electoral plan, however, a candidate, to be elected, must receive a majority of the electoral votes, which would mean States having a majority of the Members of the House and the Senate. If he does not get a majority in the electoral college under the present plan, the election is thrown into the House of Representatives, and the three highest are voted on by the House.

There is the runoff, Mr. President. Under the present plan, if the candidate gets a majority in the electoral college, there is no runoff. That is the runoff under the present plan. And the candidate must receive a majority of the electoral college votes to win the runoff. So under the present plan, we have the requirement that a candidate receive a majority of something, either the votes of the electoral college or, failing in that, the votes in the House of Representatives, with each delegation having one vote.

Yes, Mr. President, under the plan of the distinguished Senator from Indiana, there would be a proliferation of splinter parties that are discouraged under the present system, because under the present system, unless the party carries at least one State, it will not register in the electoral college.

Another reason why parties would proliferate under the 40-percent plan with the runoff attached is that it would be likely, if not certain, that with a proliferation of parties, with a number of parties involved, there would be a runoff. So that we would find, from a practical point of view, that a voter would be more inclined to vote for the candidate of his geographical affinity or his ideological affinity.

Frequently, we hear a man say, "I would vote for such and such a candidate but I don't think he has a chance, and I am going to vote for another candidate." I think a great deal of that feeling abounded in the 1968 presidential election. The public opinion polls showed that one of the candidates, the third party candidate, approximately a month before election day, had about 21 percent of the popular vote; but on election day, or from that time to election day, there was an erosion in his strength as the voting public realized that he probably would not be one of the top two candidates. So there was a great erosion of his strength down to about thirteen and a half percent on election day. But if those people had known there was going to be a runoff, they would have voted with their hearts the first time, knowing that they would then have another choice in the runoff.

Yes, they talk about the confusion that might be caused by the failure of a candidate to get a majority of the electoral vote under the present system. Look

at the confusion that would be caused in this country if no candidate got the 40 percent; 40 percent would not be desirable. You would have a nonmajority President. You would have a plurality President. But even that would be better than having to go out before the country again in a runoff.

Mr. President, under the direct election plan, splinter parties would be increased in number, because they would have some effect in the runoff; they would have to be talked to, possibly bargained with, assured of political concessions or any, I assume, honorable proposal that could be made.

On page 3 of the committee report on the Pastore bill putting a limit on the amount of money that could be spent by candidates for television and radio, are listed—and I was amazed at the number—in the 1960 Presidential election, 14 other Presidential candidates other than the two major candidates, listed as follows:

C. Benton Coiner, Conservative Party of Virginia; Merritt Curtis, Constitution Party; Lar Daly, Tax Cut Party; Dr. R. L. Decker, Prohibition Party; Farrell Dobbs, Socialist Workers Party, Farmer Labor Party of Iowa.

He apparently got the endorsement of both those powerful parties. Socialist Workers and Farmers Party, Utah; Orval E. Faubus, National States Rights Party; Symon Gould, American Vegetarian Party; Eric Hass, Socialist Labor Party, Industrial Government Party, Minnesota; Clemon King, Afro-American Unity Party; Henry Krajemski, American Third Party; J. Bracken Lee, Conservative Party of New Jersey; Whitney Harp Slocomb, Greenback Party; William Lloyd Smith, American Beat Consensus; Charles Sullivan, Constitution Party of Texas.

Mr. President, I call attention to the splinter parties that existed in 1960 for that particular election, not thinking that any Member of the Senate had heard of more than one or two, but to show that even with the safeguards in our electoral college system, a third party does not register in the electoral college unless it carries at least one State.

We have a proliferation of 14 parties which the committee staff knew of—there were doubtless many more; but if that many would exist where they had no chance whatsoever of carrying a State, think how many would exist if their votes would be taken into account with the direct election system, even if they get no more than 1,000 votes. It would have some effect, because their votes might spell the difference between whether a candidate got 40 percent and was elected President, or 39.999 percent. Thus, every single splinter party would have a direct and important effect on the election. Then we will have in the runoff the possibility of bidding for the support of these parties by the two major candidates.

Someone suggested in the debate, while I was here on the floor, that under the present system with the electoral college, it is entirely likely that the second choice of the people might be elected President, the person receiving fewer of

the popular votes but a majority in the electoral college or a majority in the House of Representatives, if no one got a majority, certainly under the direct election plan, there is a definite possibility, even the likelihood, that the man who comes in second—all candidates getting fewer than 40 percent—might win in the runoff.

Let us assume an election in which there are four parties—and four parties would be a mighty small number of parties in years to come if we had the direct election system. Every time there is a national convention, feelings are real intense one way or another—and we have seen that type of convention in our time—what would there be to prevent a candidate who fails to get the nomination of his party saying, "All right, I am going to start a party of my own."

Politics today is a whole lot more on a personal basis, an image basis, the man basis, than it has been in the past; and less adherence to party and more seeking the best man.

Thus, it is entirely likely that some disgruntled candidate at a national convention, who might have been the people's choice but not the choice of those who had influence in the convention, might decide to run for President, saying, "I am not satisfied with the actions of the convention." There would be nothing to prevent him from running for President. There would be nothing to prevent him from getting 5 million or 10 million votes, just as the third party candidate in 1968 got nearly 10 million votes.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield?

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I am going to yield, on this basis, that I declined to yield to the distinguished Senator from Indiana on the theory that he has challenged the opponents of Senate Joint Resolution 1 to come in and make known their views. In the past, when we have done that, the distinguished Senator from Indiana has interrupted and has interposed his views from time to time, and I have declined now to yield to him until the conclusion of my remarks. But, feeling that the distinguished Senator from Wyoming would like to elicit information that might possibly have a bearing on the opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 1, I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I have been listening with a great deal of interest to the very wise, valid, and logical observations of the distinguished Senator from Alabama. I am particularly intrigued by his most recent comments relating to the fact that Senate Joint Resolution 1 would encourage the proliferation of splinter parties.

The distinguished Senator from Alabama has already spoken about the third-party candidate in 1968. Is it the opinion of the distinguished Senator from Alabama that Senate Joint Resolution 1 would encourage "far out" candidates? I am not trying to identify any one end of the political spectrum; but rather I refer to those who do not find themselves comfortable within either

major party. Would it not be the opinion of the distinguished Senator from Alabama that if this joint resolution were to be passed, a person who could not hope for any significant support as a candidate on one of the two major political party tickets might see an opportunity, under the direct election system, to project himself into public prominence and acquire significant name recognition throughout the United States by espousing causes, issues, and positions that did not necessarily reflect the opinions or have the support of more than a small minority of the people in this country?

Would it not be true that this type of candidate would be entitled to be afforded an opportunity to jump into the ring? If there were a number of candidates that shared the conviction that the two-party system no longer serves this country well, then it is reasonable to expect that these candidates would take votes away from the two major candidates. In view of this fact, would it not be true that there would be every inducement for persons who do not reflect the wishes, the aspirations, the hopes, and the desires of most citizens of this country to get into the race and take strength away from the other candidates? This type of faction would undoubtedly, then, become a vital bargaining force in a runoff election, or in whatever subsequent maneuvers were required?

There are many different kinds of proposals, although I recognize that Senate Joint Resolution 1 provides for a runoff election.

It would seem to the Senator from Wyoming that this sort of amendment to the Constitution would give every encouragement to people who would, indeed, seek to divide and tear the country apart. They would have an inclination not to compromise and not to try to find the mainstream that could be followed, a stream which, I submit, we have followed successfully for almost 150 years. The last time we had any trouble with the present system was in 1824. Would it be the opinion of the Senator from Alabama that this sort of amendment would provide such an opportunity and encouragement?

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I certainly agree with the view expressed by the distinguished Senator from Wyoming. I feel that he has put his finger on a very vital point, a glaring defect in the direct election system. Certainly it would encourage, as the Senator says, way out candidates to run. Certainly it would encourage one-issue candidates to run.

I do not think that it would be very difficult for us to suggest right now four or five one-issue parties that would come in under the direct election plan.

Certainly direct election would tear our two-party system apart. It is entirely likely that it would be a disadvantage to have the endorsement or the nomination of one of the major parties.

There could be something of a television blitz dealing with an image drive. We could wake up one day and find someone whom no one knew, someone whom we had only seen and heard on television, elected President. We would

know absolutely nothing about the extent of his loyalty to the country, what his views were, or how he would conduct the high office of President of the United States.

That is why I say that the direct election plan has the potential of tearing the country apart. That is the reason I oppose it so vigorously, and I feel sure that is the reason why the Senator from Wyoming opposes it so vigorously.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, with the Senator's further indulgence, I should like to ask if he does not share the opinion of the Senator from Wyoming that one of the great strengths of our constitutional Republic, under which we have made such great progress, has been the encouragement that has been given to the two-party system and the urgency and necessity for compromise. It provides a constitutional means to reach accord and get together enough people so as to move forward in a meaningful manner, with the sole conviction that a majority of the citizens are in support of the philosophy, generally, of the banner carrier for one or the other of the two major parties.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, certainly the country has fared well with our system of political parties which the direct election system would tear asunder. I think it is entirely likely that we would have 50 to 100 splinter parties if the direct election system were to go into effect.

I invite the attention of the Senator from Wyoming to a fairly amusing little situation that happened in my State of Alabama. It is easy to start a political party in Alabama. Just a handful of people can start one. A man there who is a great grandson of the last Whig Governor of Alabama—I believe he served in the early 1860's, possibly—conceived the idea of running for Governor. He is running for Governor of Alabama now on the Whig ticket.

Nine people got together in a convention and named the party the Whig Party. They nominated the man, John Watts for Governor. His name has to go on the ballots in Alabama. His name will have to be on every ballot in Alabama.

It would be just as easy, throughout the country, for the way-out candidates we speak of to do likewise. Every kook in the country could come in, set up a little party, and by petition get on the ballot. It might not be as easy as it was in my State. But it is rather easy, by petition, to get on the ballot. The voting machines would not be able to hold the names of all candidates who would qualify from the splinter parties.

The sad part is that they would get some votes. Almost any candidate would get some votes. So their votes would have to be taken into account in determining whether the leading candidate got 39.99 percent of the national vote or whether he got 40 percent and was elected President.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I would like to ask the distinguished Senator from Alabama an additional question: Observation, charges, and counter-charges have been made about what

would happen in the event of a contested election. What is the opinion of the Senator from Alabama as to the implications of this proposed amendment if a charge were made of voter irregularity and a challenge were made with a demand for a recount?

Mr. ALLEN. It would just create chaos, because the direct election plan makes of the present 184,000 election precincts in the country one great big election precinct, as the distinguished Senator from North Carolina has described it.

If there were an allegation of fraud, and it was contested, or even a recount were made, for that matter, it would require an interminable amount of time. If a charge of fraud were made chaos would result throughout the country, because the amendment is silent on that matter.

It does contain the 40-percent requirement, but it does not prescribe any rules and standards. We would not know who certifies the returns. We would not know who made the final certification. Then, too, the amendment is defective because different States have different laws as to voting requirements.

One State might allow practically everybody to vote, whereas another State might have different requirements. The State having loose requirements would obviously have a greater vote than States where the franchise was in any way restricted. That would result in an imbalance among the various States, depending on their laws; whereas under the present system it does not matter what the requirements are so long as it is determined who received the vote in the State, because the election is decided State by State. Under the direct plan all the votes would be thrown into a big pot, and nothing would be certain about how the vote was to be counted, who counted the vote, or who made the final certification.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama to make an introduction, with the understanding that I not lose my right to the floor.

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

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY THE VICE PRESIDENT OF THE GRAND NATIONAL ASSEMBLY OF RUMANIA

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I introduce a distinguished visitor who is with us today, Miss Maria Groza, Vice President of the Grand National Assembly of the Socialist Republic of Rumania. Miss Groza is in the United States as a member of the Rumanian delegation to the 25th session of the United Nations General Assembly and is Chairman, at this session, of the Third Committee of the General Assembly.

The Subcommittee on European Affairs of the Foreign Relations Committee entertained Miss Groza at lunch today. A number of Senators were present and had an opportunity to meet Miss Groza at

that time. The meeting was in the nature of a preface to a visit to Rumania which members of the U.S. delegation to the Interparliamentary Union Conference will be making next week.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD a brief biography of Miss Groza.

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

MISS MARIA GROZA, VICE PRESIDENT OF THE GRAND NATIONAL ASSEMBLY OF THE SOCIALIST REPUBLIC OF ROMANIA

Born in Hunedoara—Romania, on September 1st, 1918; daughter of the late President (1952-1958) and Premier of Romania (1945-1952).

Graduated the Bucharest Academy for Economic Sciences.

PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

Senior officer in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs;

Assistant professor at the Academy for Economic Sciences.

STATE AND PUBLIC ACTIVITIES

Vice President of the Grand National Assembly since 1965;

Vice President of the Women's National Council of Romania since 1958.

ACTIVITY IN THE FOREIGN RELATIONS FIELD

Member of the Romanian delegation to the United Nations General Assembly's 18, 20, 21, 22, 23 and 25 Sessions;

Representative of Romania in the United Nations General Assembly's Third Committee at the 18th, 20th, 21st, 22nd and 23rd Sessions;

Chairman of this Committee at the 25th Session;

Member of the Romanian delegation to the UNESCO World Congress for Education of Youth (Grenoble—France—1964);

Representative of Romania to the U.N. seminars on Woman's Political and Civic Education (Helsinki—1967), on the Woman's Condition in the Family Law (Bucharest—1961) and on the Impact of the Scientific and Technical Development on the Woman's Condition (Yasi—1969).

OTHER ACTIVITIES

Miss Maria Groza is very active in the fields of journalism, international affairs and social-political sciences.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, in order that Senators may meet our distinguished visitor, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for 2 minutes.

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

RECESS

Thereupon, at 2:22 p.m., the Senate took a recess for 2 minutes, during which the Vice President of the Grand National Assembly of the Socialist Republic of Rumania was greeted by Members of the Senate.

On expiration of the recess, the Senate reassembled and was called to order by the Senator from Idaho (Mr. JORDAN).

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2224) to amend the Investment Company Act of 1940 and the Investment Advisers Act of 1940 to define the equitable standards govern-

ing relationships between investment companies and their investment advisers and principal underwriters, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. MOSS, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mr. SPRINGER, and Mr. KEITH were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17255) to amend the Clean Air Act to provide for a more effective program to improve the quality of the Nation's air; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. STAGGERS, Mr. JARMAN, Mr. ROGERS of Florida, Mr. SPRINGER, and Mr. NELSEN were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1346) authorizing the President to declare the week beginning the third Sunday in September 1970 as "National S.S. Hope Week", in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H.J. Res. 1346) authorizing the President to declare the week beginning the third Sunday in September 1970 as "National S.S. Hope Week", was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DIRECT POPULAR ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT AND THE VICE PRESIDENT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and the Vice President.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I was engaged in colloquy with the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HANSEN. I appreciate very much the courtesy of the Senator in extending to me the opportunity better to understand the full impact of Senate Joint Resolution 1. I would like to ask the distinguished Senator if it is not a fact that in 1960 the late President Eisenhower gave serious consideration to requests that were made to him for a recount in that very close election. In pursuing the subject, he had occasion to examine the statutes that apply to the several States and he found the complete lack of uniformity, to which the Senator has just alluded. Because of this fact, he concluded that if a recount were to be undertaken, in even some of the States where there was a close race—despite the relatively obvious ease that would occasion that sort of recount as contrasted with recounting all the votes in each of the 50 States of the United

States and the District of Columbia—he concluded that the time lapse, the interval between the time when the people would know who their President was on the one hand, and the determination of that recount on the other, would pose too great a burden upon our Government.

After having reflected on all the elements involved in the mechanics of a recount, and the delay between the time he would have vacated the office and his successor would have been duly declared. President Eisenhower concluded that the burden on our Government was so great as to convince him not to proceed with the recount. This is true despite the fact that there were many who thought a recount might have resulted in a different outcome.

Mr. ALLEN. That is the understanding of the junior Senator from Alabama from reading publications since that time. I believe the Senator from Wyoming inadvertently said "Eisenhower" instead of "Nixon" at the start of his remarks. Since the Senator referred to the 1960 election, it was President Nixon who had that dilemma.

Mr. HANSEN. No. I meant to say, and perhaps I am wrong; but I did say President Eisenhower deliberately. He was President at that time and continued until the late John F. Kennedy was inaugurated on January 20, 1961, as a recall. It was my understanding that this appeal for a recount was made to the President of the United States, President Eisenhower, and I thought it was he, not Mr. Nixon, who made the decision not to have a recount, however, I would be happy to have that clarified.

Mr. ALLEN. I was under the impression the decision was presented to now President Nixon.

Mr. HANSEN. I see.

Mr. ALLEN. He would have had to make the decision. The Senator is exactly right. That was the conclusion I understand he made.

Mr. HANSEN. The Senator means that as the loser, or the defeated presidential candidate, Nixon at that time had the choice.

Mr. ALLEN. Yes.

Mr. HANSEN. I see.

Mr. ALLEN. It would have thrown the country into turmoil.

One advantage of the present system is that fraud or an inaccurate count is insulated and set aside, with a fence around it, so to speak, and even under that condition it is difficult to contest in time for the count in House Chamber. As the Senator pointed out, magnify that 50 times and we have the problem that would be created by just one precinct, in trying to recount all the votes. It would be an insurmountable task, an absolutely impossible task.

Mr. HANSEN. One further question: I cannot recall whether it was Theodore White, or Professor Bickel, who made the observation that our present system has the capacity or capability of insulating fraud. Whoever the author of the statement is, he likened it to a ship with compartments in it. He said the outside of the ship could be ruptured, but the ship would not flood with water and sink because the water could not get into ev-

ery other part of the ship under our present system. He said we may have fraud in one State, but it cannot destroy the whole election process. It cannot thwart the will of the Republic, because each of the other 50 States, under our present system, is insulated from that fraud.

So, despite what may happen in the State of Illinois, as an illustration, if there should be corruption and fraud there, it cannot spill over into the State of Indiana or the State of Iowa. If there is to be a recount, it is a much simpler task to have it only in the area where fraud is suspected or where there has been a very close race and it is necessary for a recount to take place only in that State.

Does the distinguished Senator from Alabama consider that to be a very vital reason for the retention of some sort of electoral college system of choosing a President as we now have?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes; I think it is a very effective argument and a most persuasive one. I like the analogy of comparing the States to various compartments in a ship where, if there were some fault or flooding of one compartment, it would not necessarily sink the entire ship; it would be localized. That would be the case of fraud or an inaccurate count in a State. It would simplify the problem. The problem would be only one-fiftieth what it would be in trying to recount for the whole Nation.

Another thing that occurs to the junior Senator from Alabama is that the proposed amendment does not provide for who is going to certify those returns. Are they going to continue to be certified in the States? Are they going to set up Federal election boards? Under the present provision, Congress has that power, but nothing is said about it in the amendment. Who makes the final certification? Who counts the votes? Does each State send in an adding machine tape and say, "This is it"? It is not provided for. There is no provision for a joint session of Congress to do it, as presently provided, wherein Congress examines the returns now and the Vice President announces the result. Nothing is said about that in this proposal.

The amendment would create more problems than it would solve. It is so indefinite. The two definite features that are sought to be written into the Constitution are the two worst features. One is election by a 40-percent plurality. That is the worst feature. Then, the second worst feature is the runoff. So the two pernicious features are written into the basic law of the land.

If we submit the amendment to the States and we realize we have made a mistake, it will be difficult to submit another amendment. I do not know whether we could withdraw what had been done or not. Probably not. It would already be out there. I do not know whether it could be repealed while it was going around to the States or not. But it would certainly stop any effort toward meaningful reform if we had this proposed amendment before the States for ratification.

The junior Senator from Alabama pointed out earlier that there had been

a lot of changes in the thinking of individual Senators and of the Senate as a whole in recent years. The distinguished Senator from Indiana at one time was opposed to the direct plan, and he was backing the automatic plan. So he has changed. The Senate passed the proportional change. They are not talking about passing that. They are talking about the direct election. So there has been individual change. There has been a collective change.

The junior Senator from Alabama pointed out that, on a method of electing the President and Vice President that cannot be put into effect until 1976, with 6 years between now and then, there may be a half dozen changes in the thinking, under changing conditions. So why hurry? Why rush this thing through? Why put it ahead of important measures on the Senate Calendar and in committees? The Senator from Indiana, conducting the Bayh filibuster, has already prevented the Senate committees from continuing to meet today during the session of the Senate and he threatens that this afternoon, when the effort is made to lay this business aside and get on to some of the important work of the Senate, he is going to object.

The Senator from Alabama hopes that the Senator from Indiana will relent on that declared intention; that he will not continue this filibuster. It is a filibuster against the calendar. The Senator from Alabama would like to point out to the Senator from Wyoming that the Senator from Indiana is not having a discussion on just one measure, which could not become effective until 1976; his filibuster is applicable to the entire calendar and the entire agenda of each Senate committee.

Mr. HANSEN. Will not the effect of it be essentially to bring to a grinding halt all of the really effective work the Senate might otherwise be able to accomplish?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes; very definitely. The junior Senator from Alabama pointed out we have six or seven appropriation bills, appropriating billions of dollars, one of them the military appropriation bill. All we passed was the authorizations; the appropriation bill has not been passed. If that bill cannot be turned out by the committee, how are we going to vote on that? We are already into this fiscal year, which started July 1. If they are going to say we have to vote on the pending measure, which cannot go into effect until 1976, and on which we might change our minds a half dozen times between now and then, and if we have to hold up action on really important bills to try to put something into effect in 1976, it just seems that, as a matter of priority, we ought to get down to work on the calendar.

But a filibuster is being conducted by the distinguished Senator from Indiana on the calendar, so we will have to just weigh the priorities. Which is more important? Is it the whole calendar, which the Senator from Indiana seeks to prevent us from reaching, or is it this measure, which will not apply until 1976? The issue seems clear to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HANSEN. It seems to the Senator

from Wyoming that it is most unfortunate that the distinguished Senator from Indiana, for whom I have the highest regard and respect, would seek to invoke such a harsh penalty on the Senate, which will, in effect, deprive it of its ability to get on with its work.

What is not generally understood is that, to the casual observer, when he comes into the gallery and looks down upon the Senate, he is unaware of the fact that most of the Senators are engaged in committee hearings; they are considering the respective bills that have been introduced, and that are before Congress, and they are listening to testimony in their various committees. As a member of the Finance Committee, I have been listening for the last several days to testimony on the President's family assistance program. I and my colleagues would like to understand it better. We hope that we can hear from people who know what effect this overhauling of the welfare program may have upon this country. The question is if the program will give the incentive to people now on welfare to move from welfare and to take jobs, or to enroll in job training programs, or in schools, so as to upgrade their abilities and their talents, and thereby enable them to be better qualified for a job.

This is some of the work that will come to a stop if the distinguished Senator from Indiana were to take this extreme measure. But before dwelling further on that, I do wish to go back one step, and ask my distinguished friend from Alabama about one further thing.

I would like to ask the distinguished Senator from Alabama about the provision in the bill whereby we could have a President elected with 40 percent of the vote. As I understand the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 1, if a candidate received 40 percent of the popular vote, and received more than any other one candidate, then, under the provisions of this bill, is it correct that he would be declared to have been elected President of the United States? Am I correct about that?

Mr. ALLEN. Under the resolution, if he was the high man and got as much as 40 percent of the entire popular vote of the country, he and his running mate, running as a team, would be declared elected.

Mr. HANSEN. I recall, as the then Governor of Wyoming, the tragic sequence of events which happened when the late and beloved President John F. Kennedy was assassinated. Each of the 50 Governors was invited to come to Washington to pay the respects of the State he represented to the assassinated President.

I shall not forget that when we assembled for the services in St. Matthew's Cathedral, a very old and hallowed Catholic church, we saw parade before ourselves as well as the newsreel cameras and the television cameras of the world, a deeply saddened entourage of officials from literally everywhere in the world. They had come to America to pay the respects of their countries. A unique feeling overcame me because I realized that many of our visitors were amazed that

such a tragic and traumatic event could take place; and yet, under the process of government and of succession in office that characterizes this Republic of ours, no American citizen for a moment ever considered the possibility of this Government failing, of this country's legal authority being overthrown.

That never entered any American's mind, but it was very much on the minds of a great number of the foreign heads of state who were here, because, as the Senator from Alabama knows, all too often, when a president is assassinated in any of a great number of other nations, that means the end of that government. It means the necessity for bringing a new government into being; and yet here they were, this great entourage of persons who had come to pay their respects, not so much because of their personal friendship or personal knowledge of John F. Kennedy, but rather they were here because they recognized the strength of the Government of the United States. They recognized the important role that the United States plays in world affairs; and I say this with no intent to discredit the hallowed name of John F. Kennedy, but rather as a fact.

There were people who came to that sad occasion who had never met the President of the United States; but they were well aware of the extremely important post he occupied in this country, and the extremely important role that was his and would become that of his successor in world affairs.

So they were here, not so much to view the casket, but rather because they recognized the importance of this country. They were here to pay their respects to the United States as well as its fallen leader.

Our present electoral college system is old, granted, and many say it is antiquated, that it no longer serves us well and, therefore, that we ought to get rid of it, that we should throw it out, that almost anything would do a better job. I disagree. There are all kinds of ideas, as the Senator from Alabama knows, that could be substituted for it, and the sponsors of these various proposals will tell you, "Well, my idea is better, and so is someone else's, and someone else's; almost anything could be better." I would say this: Until we have reasonable assurance that we will be making an improvement, let us not be too hasty to cast aside something that has served us well. And to those who find fault with the system by which we have chosen Presidents, let me say that I know of no country in the world today that can boast of a higher standard of living than that of the average, typical American. I know of no country which has been able to bring into effect the force of its productive capability better than has the United States of America. I suggest that we remember that since the end of World War II, this people, this productive machine that we call the United States of America, has given away, to friend and foe alike, between \$150 billion and \$175 billion if you add together the Marshall plan assistance, all of the foreign aid, and all of the various different kinds of aid we have given to people throughout

the world. It is my contention that any system of government which has the stability we have been able to demonstrate, which has the resiliency that was apparent when President Kennedy was killed, which can carry on in good times and bad, which can stand almost alone—as we have so often stood—in defending freedom in the farflung corners of this world, then I say, let us not be too quick to cast aside a system that is able to deliver this kind of government.

I say, too, that we should not be too hasty to cast our procedures aside, despite the weaknesses we find in our government today, despite the discrimination which we find in some places, despite all of the inequalities of opportunity which are called to our attention by our detractors and by those, as well, who would seek to improve our system. Despite all of these things, I say that I know of no country that has a greater record of achievement for all its people than does the United States.

I happened to hear Al Capp a few weeks ago and he was telling about the achievement made by the average citizen in this country. I am not certain that I recall precisely the figures, but, as I recall in the last decade or two the average American has seen his average annual income increased by 50 percent, and the average black is within about 6 months of having achieved the same level of educational attainment as the average white; and the average black, if I recall the figures that were presented, now has an income that approaches or perhaps exceeds \$7,000 annually.

All I am saying is that any country which can do as good a job as we have done ought to examine very closely and very carefully and very critically those processes by which we have selected our leadership. I am sure that not all our leaders have been great, but, generally speaking, I think we have moved forward; we have made significant social gains; we have made significant gains in extending freedom equally and impartially to all our people. I think we have made gains educationally. We have made gains in the progress of all our people, no matter what minority they may compose.

In Wyoming, we have 2½ times as many Indians as we have blacks. There is much left to be done among the Indians, and I am one of the first to admit that. But I say: Show me another country that has done as well as we have done.

I am not ready to say that simply because this system is nearly two centuries old that it is outmoded, and that it is no longer serving us. I am not sure that I agree with those who say that because one of our electors became faithless to the implied pledge that he took when he agreed to have his name submitted as an elector in 1968, that we should throw the whole system out. I would hope that the people of this country and the Members of the Senate would consider very carefully what we have accomplished and look about the world and compare the United States, compare our Government, compare the stability of our institutions with those of almost any other foreign

country, and ask themselves whether it is not better to have a system which fosters and encourages a strong, viable two-party system, so that regardless of who may be leading this country, we are going to have the steady assurance that comes from the firm knowledge and conviction that the person who has been chosen under this electoral college process has the support of a majority of our people.

To me, these are some of the considerations that I know are very much in the mind of the Senator from Alabama. I think he is making a wonderful contribution to our Government, to a better understanding of this entire issue, in presenting, as he does, in the knowledgeable and lucid way that he does, his observations and comments, spelling matters out in detail. It is important that it be done in this fashion, because things can elude us too easily if we do not take the time to stop and listen and ponder and consider, as we are privileged to do by the presentation of the Senator from Alabama this afternoon.

I would like to express my appreciation to the Senator for his having yielded. I am grateful to him. I ask whether he shares at least some of the views I have just expressed as he has afforded me the opportunity to comment on his very remarks here today.

Mr. ALLEN. I appreciate very much the outstanding contribution which the distinguished Senator from Wyoming has made to this discussion. Certainly, I approve of his inspirational remarks. His remarks have been to the point and have pointed out the greatness that is America, the greatness we have achieved under our Constitution, the fact that we should not depart from the old landmarks that have served us so well, and that we should not abandon them and turn to the untried, the indefinite, the uncertain, the plan that would create many more problems than it would solve.

I think, too, that the Senator from Wyoming has put his finger on one of the factors that does make America great—that makes our system of government the greatest in the world—and that is the matter of the orderly succession about which he has spoken so movingly, the orderly succession to the office of President of the United States.

The distinguished Senator from Wyoming did not state it, but I believe that at the time of the assassination of the late, great John F. Kennedy, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming was serving as Governor of his State and was representing the people of his State; and he saw firsthand and heard firsthand the heads of states of other governments, the surprise—and I am sure the wonder and appreciation—that they expressed at the greatness that is America, the provision for the orderly succession to the office of President of the United States.

Yes, he referred movingly to the late, great President John F. Kennedy. We recall that on the floor of the Senate, time and again, the argument has been made by the distinguished Senator from Indiana that if a given number of voters in one State had voted one way and a

given number of voters in another State had voted another way, President Nixon, then candidate Nixon, in 1960, would have been elected President of the United States, even though he got fewer popular votes than did President Kennedy.

Let us see what Mr. Kennedy, then Senator Kennedy, had to say about the electoral college system. I read, from page 30 of the hearings of the Senate Judiciary Committee, the statement of Theodore H. White:

I would like to use as my text a remark made by John F. Kennedy of Massachusetts on March 5, 1956, in Senate debate. He was discussing an amendment similar to this. He began by saying that "On the whole, our system has given us able Presidents, capable of meeting the increased demands upon our society. No urgent necessity for change has been proven."

Mr. President, those words spoken in debate here today would be just as applicable as when they were uttered on the Senate floor by then Senator John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts.

No urgent necessity for change has been proved.

This is Senator Kennedy, later President, speaking:

When all these factors are considered, it is not only the unit vote for the presidency we are talking about, but the whole solar system of government power. If this proposal changes the balance of power in any one of the elements of the solar system, it is necessary to change all of them.

Those words could be uttered today and would be just as applicable as they were on that occasion.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Alabama yield on that point?

Mr. ALLEN. I am delighted to yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HANSEN. A number of learned students of the subject of elections and electoral reform draw analogies between the electoral system, the federal system, and the composition of the U.S. Congress. As I read their testimony, it goes something like this: The electoral system is a further reflection of the federal system of the 50 States. Except as required by a runoff in the House, where each State has one vote—except in that rare, rare instance—we find reflected in the electoral college system the population of each of the 50 States along with a reflection of the entities of the States. In other words, my State of Wyoming is second only to Alaska in having the smallest population of the 50 States. Wyoming has three votes—three out of 538 electoral college votes, as I understand it.

A much larger State has more than several votes. It has votes that reflect the number of persons present in the State, plus the two votes represented by the Senators of the State. There are those who say the proposed change would give greater strength to the voice of the smaller States. I am unable to follow this logic. I am unable to see how Wyoming would gain in power if this system were to be adopted.

At present, it is my understanding that Wyoming has 3 out of 538 electoral votes. If we were to go into a direct election

process, as is proposed by the distinguished Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), strictly on the basis of the number of people residing in Wyoming compared with the total number in the United States, my arithmetic inclines me to believe that our strength would be diminished from three five hundred and thirty-eight thousandths to about one six hundred and thirty thousandths, because roughly we have in the neighborhood of a third of a million people in Wyoming. If the information I have is correct, there are some 210 million people in the United States today, give or take a million or two.

If Wyoming has a third of a million people, then we would have one six hundred and thirty thousandths of the total power. So I do not see how this can possibly augment the strength, increase the voice, or magnify the influence of a small State.

There are those who take this argument and turn it around and say that it shows the system needs to be changed because it is not wholly fair.

I ask those who make such a statement: If that be true, would it not be logical to take it to the next step, which would be to abolish the Senate? What reason is there to recognize in the Senate the presence of the States if we are going to rule out the electoral college system and the individuality of the States. For very good reasons, the individuality of the States was in the minds of the framers of the Constitution in constructing the election process which has served this country so well to date. If the electoral college is abolished, I suspect it will not be long until someone will come along and say, "We have instituted the one-man one-vote concept. We have had to reapportion all the legislatures which have not faithfully fulfilled the judicial concept of the one-man, one-vote. We have eliminated the electoral college system, so let us go all the way, be consistent, and abolish the Senate."

I leave it to Senators to answer my question. Would that be in the best interests of the country? Can it be demonstrated that our system of government has failed this country?

I have heard, during the few years I have been here, that the Senate is archaic. That statement does not refer exclusively to the age of its Members, but rather to the system; that it has outlived its usefulness; that our rules have made it possible for a willful group of people to hold up and impede legislation; and that this is all bad.

To those who think that, I always have to recall the words of our late, great Senator Dirksen. I regret that I cannot quote him verbatim, but essentially he said something like this:

"I have been around here a few years and have never seen an instance, when an idea came into its time and needed to be adopted, that it was possible for a willful little group of Senators to prevent its accomplishment into law."

He stated further:

"I have seen many times, and thanked God for it, when I have been able to witness that what started out as poorly conceived legislation, not adequately debated

and only partially understood, resulted, thank goodness for a little willful group of men, in further exploration of the idea, further consideration, and the further necessity on the part of all Senators to seek that happy sort of compromise that results in men of somewhat differing ideas joining together and marching forward in one direction, when, without the leveling influence that is so much a part of the character of the Senate, there would have resulted a real loss to our country."

So I am convinced that our system is good. I am convinced that it is unnecessary to seek to justify our system here amid what we have accomplished. All the major nations of the world today agree that the United States of America has the unique distinction of being the oldest continuing form of government on the face of the earth, the only important nation that has not changed its system.

Of course, there are those who predict that our time has about run out, that we have only a few years left. It has not been hard, in going around the country in recent years, to find people who find fault with everything we do. But I am not disillusioned or bereft of hope because of these prognostications of doom.

I look at the young children of the country—our young Americans. For the most part, they are fine, decent, and inspired of just as good ideals as were the people of my generation.

I do not think we are about to give up the ghost in this country. I do not think we are going to lie down and die merely because someone says that we are almost 200 years old. I do not think that this Government is going to collapse or that the system by which we select a President will fail us now simply because some say: "It could be made better. Let us junk the whole process and take in something that has not been tried, something that has all the attributes that have brought about the splintering of opinions and the splintering of parties in Europe, which make that part of the world what it is today."

It is the failure to develop a majority of people in a country wanting to march in one direction that I think is of real concern to many foreign governments today. This is not characteristic of our country, because our system has insured that that will not happen here. I think ours is a great system of government.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wyoming for the contribution he has made.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield without losing his right to the floor?

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Florida without losing my right to the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Florida is recognized.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I have listened with great interest to the colloquy between the distinguished Senator from Alabama and the distinguished Senator from Wyoming on the subject of what Senate Joint Resolution 1 would do as far as some small States are concerned. It has been stated that this measure would take away some of the voting

strength held now under the electoral college system by the small States. And in the case of the very small States, like Wyoming, Vermont, and Nevada, it would take away quite a bit of the leverage those States now enjoy under the electoral college system.

I certainly agree with the remarks heretofore made. That, of course, was the whole idea of setting up the electoral college in the first place by the Founding Fathers, to give the small States a greater leverage and a little more advantage in order that they could make their weight felt in our system as opposed to the States that were considerably larger.

I get the opinion that if this argument was a sound one almost 200 years ago when the country was sparsely populated, with only Thirteen Original States, that the difference was not too great between some of the States then as to population. However, now there is a vast chasm between the population of the State of Wyoming, with one Representative in the other body, and a State like New York which has, I think, 41 Representatives, which is indicative of the massive difference in population.

Certainly I think it makes all kinds of sense. Today, it makes even more sense. There is a stronger argument to preserve the weight of the small States in the presidential election in the whole system of the Federal Republic which we have.

Another thought occurs to me along the lines of small States opposed to the larger States. I think the argument also applies to the larger States that are more in the smaller city class rather than in the larger city class. My State of Florida would be one of those. It is a large State, but it still does not have tremendous cities such as New York, Chicago, Los Angeles, or places like that.

It occurs to me that, if we do away with the electoral college system and substitute this direct-election method which is proposed here in Senate Joint Resolution 1 pending before the Senate, we would run into another problem. It seems to me that we completely over-emphasize the importance of a presidential election in those areas which are large urban areas now and States which contain the great cities. We have the State of New York with the city of New York. We have the State of Illinois with Chicago. We have the State of California with Los Angeles.

Why should presidential candidates be interested in campaigning in a State like Wyoming or a State like Vermont, or even in a State like Alabama, the State of the distinguished Senator, when they can go to just a few areas in the country and get the number of votes they need?

Take the area around New York City. That area encompasses not only the tremendous metropolitan area of New York—the second largest city in the country, I believe—but also includes the contiguous States of Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and Ohio.

While those other States are not large States geographically, they are densely populated areas. Within that one area alone, within 200 miles of the State of New York, we have an enormous per-

centage of the population of this country. For example, compared with California, the Representatives from the States of New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Ohio comprise today more than one-fourth of the total membership of the House of Representatives. That is just those four States out of the 50 States.

Obviously it seems to me that a presidential candidate would concentrate his time there, get on the television stations in New York, Chicago, California, and perhaps in a few other scattered areas in the United States—maybe around Kansas City and St. Louis, which are big cities, and perhaps in Texas, Dallas and Houston. He could cover that area on one television media. That is all he would be interested in.

Of course those areas are important. No one downgrades their importance.

We recognize that our colleagues who represent those States have enormous interests to give voice to here and in the House of Representatives.

The point I want to make is that the problems of the smaller States are just as vital to the people who live there as are the problems of the larger States and the people who live in those areas.

I would think that under the direct election system, such as proposed in Senate Joint Resolution 1, a presidential candidate might completely overlook the problems of the small areas that may be agricultural in nature or perhaps mineral in nature and have nothing whatsoever to do with the problems concentrated in the larger cities.

Certainly the smaller areas have no ghetto problems. There are not any ghettos there. I think there are a great number of the States in the United States that lack those problems.

We know that the Governors of the larger States particularly and the mayors of the larger cities are constantly coming down to Washington for more money. We know they need more money. However, at the same time, we cannot overlook the problems of other States of the Union to take care of just a few.

Yet, if we had this direct election method, I tend to think that a presidential candidate would direct his attention only to those more populous States where the voters are. Certainly all of us in politics and in campaigns know very well how we orient our campaigns. We always say, "Go where our votes are. Do not waste your time in the areas where you cannot get enough votes to sway any election."

It seems to me that the direct election method invites that kind of political direction to only one or two areas in this country, or three or four to the neglect of the other.

Would the Senator from Alabama feel that was a weakness in this direct election method?

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of the distinguished Senator from Florida. I very definitely agree with him. I think he has certainly put his finger on a very important point regarding the small States.

I think that whether a State is a small State, whether it has greater in-

fluence in the electoral college, whether the percentage of the electoral college is larger than its percentage of the total popular vote is of very little importance actually. That is not the important thing, and I do not oppose this measure because I am from the South or because I am from a relatively small State. I oppose it because I am an American and I feel that this provision, the direct election of the President, with the 40-percent proviso or the runoff proviso, would tear this country apart, and the effort of a candidate to receive in excess of 40 percent of the vote rather than to achieve a majority of the electors would, as the Senator so eloquently stated, cause the candidate to go to the great population centers to the exclusion of the other areas of the country in order to carve out his 40-percent plurality.

The dangers that are inherent to our country in that system are what cause me and, I am sure, the Senator from Florida, to oppose the plan—the danger of a plurality President, the danger of proliferation of third parties, the danger of choosing a man for President who represents no views known to the public generally, the danger of electing a President who is a television personality, who with a television blitz in the large areas would be able to necessitate 40 percent of the popular vote.

I think that is the point the Senator stresses and I agree with him on it.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield further?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes, I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. GURNEY. I was extremely interested and taken with the Senator's point of the 40 percent, which I neglected to mention in my argument, and the likelihood of a candidate to go to the larger States. Of course, only a 40-percent requirement—at least on the first go-round—makes it even easier and more likely for a candidate to go to the metropolitan centers. I have pointed out that four States: New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and California, represent better than 25 percent of the representation in the House, so I assume they represent more than 25 percent of the population. One would not have to go to more than one or two other places to pick up the 40 percent.

Another thing occurs to me in this business of concentrating upon the larger States, which I think poses a danger. Here again I use my own State of Florida as an example. I mentioned the rural States and that the presidential candidate would neglect those States. In a larger State, like Florida, which is now No. 8 in size in the United States, a very sizable State, and yet we do not have any really great metropolitan areas, I am not sure a candidate would spend too much time campaigning in my State if he could pick up the votes he needs in those States which have the large cities which would make his campaigning easier.

There is another point I would like to join in discussing with the distinguished Senator from Alabama. Earlier in the

afternoon the Senator engaged in colloquy with the Senator from Wyoming speaking about the danger of splinter parties which would perhaps be encouraged by Senate Joint Resolution 1, which provides for the direct election of the President.

There has been a great deal of discussion about that here in the days we have been spending on the argument on Senate Joint Resolution 1. Certainly, this is a point we all know has troubled scholars throughout this Nation, in and out of universities, about this matter. I know I have read a great deal of copy in newspapers and periodicals by very distinguished and knowledgeable Americans, who are knowledgeable about government and politics, worrying about the growth of splinter parties.

It occurs to me we do not have to speculate this might happen. It seems to me we have a very good example that it is happening. Take the great State of New York, which was first in size in the United States. I think that now that the census has been taken it is No. 2 and California is No. 1, but still it is a sizable State.

Already in this State we have a splintering of the political parties. Where they used to have the Democratic Party and the Republican Party, now they have the Liberal Party and the Conservative Party.

I remember being in New York for a political rally of my own Republican Party about 7 or 8 years ago when I first went to the House of Representatives. At that time the Conservative Party was just beginning in New York. I remember talking to some of the members at that particular gathering at the rally and asking, "Why are you starting this party up here? Won't it weaken the parties you have already established?" The same thing is true of the Liberal Party in New York, which started up about that time. They said, "No, we do not think it will do that. We are more conservative than some of the other people. If we start a new party, we can hold their feet to the fire and bring them around to more philosophical thinking."

I do not think the people I was talking to in the Conservative Party felt the party would amount to much, and neither did I. It is 7 or 8 years later now and we know that both splinter parties, the Conservative and the Liberal Parties, are wielding a good deal of clout. That was particularly true in the election for mayor here recently and the primaries in both parties in New York recently. These splinter parties, these Liberal and Conservative Parties are, indeed, doing the very same thing that the distinguished Senator from Alabama and the distinguished Senator from Wyoming were talking about earlier this afternoon. They are acquiring members and voting strength. They are gaining with each election and as they do this kind of strength gives them the power to negotiate with the other parties and candidates, and perhaps achieve what they want to achieve.

I am not arguing that this is right or wrong, whether it is good or bad, but I think it makes a perfect case in being

right now in New York, one of the greatest States in the country, where you have this very same splinter party effect which we fear under Senate Joint Resolution 1 if it goes into effect.

In New York I suppose it has not made too much difference in the legislative process so far because the parties are too young, but it will. If that same thing happens and we adopt Senate Joint Resolution 1 and we get in this body in which we are now speaking and the other body on the other side of the Capitol four or five or six parties, with Senators and Representatives in these four, five, or six parties, the wheeling and dealing that is going to occur on this floor and on the floor of the other body is something we cannot imagine. It will be something like what happened in France year after year, where De Gaulle was President, and some parties would not last more than 24 hours. There would be splinter parties like leaves falling off the trees in my native State of Maine.

I certainly share the apprehension that the distinguished Senator from Alabama has with respect to the splinter party question.

This is really the question I was going to pose: Does not the Senator see occurring in the U.S. Senate and the House of Representatives what occurred in New York recently, with the four parties they now have, if Senate Joint Resolution 1 is adopted?

Mr. ALLEN. I appreciate the Senator's remarks. I would say definitely that is a harbinger of what will happen throughout the country and here in the Senate and in the House. But the New York situation is not nearly as strong a case to show the proliferation of parties on the national scene as under Senate Joint Resolution No. 1, because Senate Joint Resolution 1 calls for a runoff, and that encourages third parties. In the general election in New York, that ends it; there is no runoff. If there were a runoff, the splinter parties could have an influence on the runoff, and we would see more splinter parties. So in the United States, under the Bayh amendment, with the runoff, we would see more splinter parties, because they would realize that the electorate could vote for their candidate in the first race knowing full well that there was going to be a runoff after the first race.

It would encourage them to form splinter parties so that they could have an influence on the bargaining going into the runoff. So there is a much stronger case to show the proliferation of parties in the United States than to use the example of what occurs in New York, where there is no runoff in the general election.

Of course, another factor that discourages the splinter parties, or third, fourth, or fifth parties, in the United States under the electoral plan is that to register at all in the electoral college, a third party, or any party for that matter, must carry the popular votes of at least one State. So they have to carry one State, and that discourages the formation of a third party. But under the Bayh plan, they would be encouraged

because if they got only 10,000 votes, or 1,000 votes, for that matter, it would have to be a part of the grand total and it might be the difference between the candidate's getting 40 percent of the popular vote and being elected President, along with his running mate, the Vice President, or getting 39.9999 percent of the votes and having to go into a runoff. So they would be very important in the overall scheme of the national election, and the amendment would encourage the formation of third parties so that they could influence the election and it would give them a sense of importance; whereas, under the present plan, if they do not carry one State, they do not get any electoral votes at all.

On the matter of proliferation of parties, I was somewhat surprised to read something in the report on the Pastore bill. The bill provided for a limit candidates can spend on TV and radio advertising. There was a provision for equal time for all candidates for President. Free time, I believe, was arranged for the major candidates. It used to be the rule—it still is; the law has not been finally enacted—that they had to give equal time to all candidates for President. This would work a hardship because there were so many splinter parties. Some of the splinter parties are listed in the report. There were at least 14 that were discovered, going back to 1960. They ran with the provision, of course, that they had to carry a State to get any electoral votes.

Let me mention some of the splinter parties: Conservative Party of Virginia; Constitution Party; Tax Cut Party.

There again we have a proliferation of parties. We have one-issue parties.

The Anti-War Party. Reduced Taxes Party. Every issue one can think of is in there. The proposed amendment would make for more and more one-issue, one-ideology types of parties.

Going on with the list: The Prohibition Party. It had a candidate for the Presidency in 1960. Socialist Workers Party. Farmer Labor Party of Iowa. Socialist Workers and Farmers Party of Utah. National States Rights Party. Afro-American Unity Party. American Third Party. Conservative Party of New Jersey. Greenback Party. And on and on and on in 1960.

So there would be third parties that would have an influence in the election of major party candidates, who would have to offer concessions, or whatever candidates do, to gain support in a runoff. They would be forced to contend with them. So under the proposed plan we would see more and more splinter parties started.

Another fruitful source of splinter parties would be defeated candidates at national conventions where things did not go too harmoniously and a large number of candidates thought they should have been chosen instead of the ones who were chosen. They would be very disgruntled and would say, "Well, if I can't get it they are not going to get it and I will start a party." We would then find some major candidates running for President—

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

Mr. ALLEN. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. That is a point extremely well made, because the possibility of a defeated candidate wanting to start his own rump party and running for the Presidency not only would be likely to happen, but actually would happen, because we have seen instance after instance in just about every election we have in this country now, I suppose, within the States, where people run perhaps for Governor or for Senator. They may not make it in the party primary, if they have a convention-type primary, or, for that matter, if they do not make it in the primary where votes were cast, there is nothing in the world to stop those people from running again in a general election. That frequently happens.

As a matter of fact, one of our distinguished colleagues was telling us only yesterday that in his State the defeated candidate for Governor in the primary has done exactly that. He started his own party and is going to run in the general election as a candidate. He is obviously a spoiler. He is so disgruntled at not having won that he does not want the person who won the primary to win, either. So we have that situation, and we have always had it within our political battles in the primaries in the several States.

The reason for it is that we do not have the majority provision we have under the national election system. If we had a rule which provided that the man receiving a majority of the votes would get the nomination and nobody else would run, that would end it. In fact, that is what the electoral college does. It does not say that, but, in practice, it works that way.

So the Senator from Alabama is exactly right, and we have examples like that right now, in practically every election year. But in the competition for the great big prize, the Presidency of the United States, for somebody to run—and I was not aware of all these splinter parties that exist today; that even surprises me—the temptation would certainly be very great, and I agree with the Senator that that is exactly what we would have, candidates running on every issue, all over the land.

The Senator makes another very good point, which I think ought to be amplified, and he ought to be complimented on it: That if we have this direct election method under Senate Joint Resolution 1, then what we are going to have, as he so aptly put it, is a one-issue President—the Greenback Party, the Prohibition Party, or the Women's Liberation Party, perhaps; that seems to be well up on the docket today. The Peace Party; we certainly have that now. As a matter of fact, in my home State of Florida, we had a party of very liberal people, far left-wingers, last time called the New Party. They were mostly the very long-haired variety; and I suppose they might be a political party in another campaign.

The point of the matter is that this is the very strength of our political system now. We have two great political parties. The distinguished Senator from Alabama

belongs to one and I belong to the other. And yet both of these parties are able to encompass and embrace people of all political shades. Some of us are conservative. The Senator from Alabama and I happen to be of that political persuasion, I would expect, if we were to categorize ourselves. Certain parts of the country tend to produce people of one political philosophy; other parts of the country tend to produce people of another. The fact that all of these people are encompassed within the two great political parties, to me, gives the system strength.

I find nothing wrong with the fact that there are, within my own political party, people who have a different political philosophy than I do. I think it has a good tempering effect upon some of the beliefs that I have; and I would hope that some of the beliefs that I have, perhaps, would have a tempering effect upon those of my party who may differ from me in philosophical matters.

But if we have this Senate Joint Resolution 1 direct election kind of thing, it seems to me we are going to lose that, and we are going to have people who are keenly apprehensive, perhaps, about one small issue, getting into the party that believes in that issue, and we are going to lose the all-encompassing and all-embracing kind of philosophical types we have now.

This would be a great loss to the country. Does the distinguished Senator from Alabama think there is a danger here?

Mr. ALLEN. I think there is a very definite danger, and that is one of the reasons why the junior Senator from Alabama opposes Senate Joint Resolution 1.

The fragmentation of our political party system, the proliferation of third parties and splinter parties, the confusion that would be caused, the great danger of the runoff provision, where all of these various splinter parties and people have been polarized over this specific issue that the Senator from Florida was speaking of—not part of the two political philosophies, conservative or liberal—they would be standing for one issue, and they would have a definite effect on the runoff, so that these one-issue people, by combining forces, might very well cause the election of a person who was not the choice of the people of this Nation.

It might be someone with whose views the people were not familiar. It might be someone who had conducted a television blitz and become something of a household word in a matter of a few days or a few weeks, after an expenditure of large sums on television.

I think that these splinter parties could combine and, in practice, elect a member of one splinter party, or have a major candidate so beholden to them that he could not govern the country effectively. I think there is a very definite and real danger, that might shake the very foundations of our American governmental system, if Senate Joint Resolution 1 is allowed to be passed.

Mr. GURNEY. Will the distinguished Senator yield further at that point?

Mr. ALLEN. I should be delighted.

Mr. GURNEY. The Senator's comment

about the possibility of a candidate for the Presidency who engaged in a television blitz being elected, I think, is a very viable point, and one that could easily happen. And, of course, again in recent years, we have had examples of that. I suppose television has been perhaps the most effective way of politicking, probably, since the beginning of—well, I expect in the Kennedy-Nixon election campaign for the Presidency; and following the very effective use of television in that campaign by the winner, President John F. Kennedy, all candidates began to use television more and more in their political campaigns.

I know when I first ran for the House of Representatives in 1962, I devoted the major portion of my budget in that year to television, and I have constantly done that. I did that also when I ran for the Senate in 1968. But I think the interesting thing is what has happened in very recent years. The very thing that the Senator from Alabama is warning against here, a television blitz, has happened on numerous occasions in the last, I would say, 2 to 4 political years, and, without naming names, so that no one will be embarrassed, or no political party will be embarrassed, there are clearly at least two instances of nominees running for the U.S. Senate right now who are nominees because of a television blitz in their States. And, incidentally, those happen to be very large States, with large metropolitan areas.

One of these candidates was entirely unknown before he launched his television blitz and became the nominee, and he knocked off a candidate that everyone thought was going to win. The only way he was able to do it was by television.

The other one I am thinking of was better known politically in a small area, but not throughout the State. At least two, I think, of the candidates he was running against were better known than he was, but he had a much better financed campaign. He spent a lot more money on television, and he also was nominated. And, of course, I know of an even closer instance, in my own State, where that very thing also happened, where a political unknown, never in politics before, managed to present a very formidable campaign by a very extensive use of television in his county. I think the figures ran nearly a million dollars.

So we have examples. I have mentioned three that I can think of, but, as the distinguished Senator knows and as I know, there are other examples, too.

This year, 2 years ago, and 4 years ago, in the big political campaigns around the country for the Senate, for the governorships, and for the House of Representatives, where a well-packaged, Madison Avenue-type advertising campaign has presented a candidate the same way that you would present Camel cigarettes or Ivory soap, or anything you want to name, a picture that is a best selling item, the candidate was presented that way, and the people have bought him on election day.

So the Senator is eminently correct when he expresses concern and apprehension and fear that this is exactly what might happen if we went this Sen-

ate Joint Resolution 1 route and had a popular election.

More and more, people of great wealth in this country are interesting themselves in politics. I have talked to one or two of these types myself. Their reasoning has been that they have been very successful in business, they have amassed many millions of dollars, the challenge is over as far as business is concerned, now they are interested in something else, so they decide to go into politics and government. I do not say there is anything wrong with that; I simply say that those are the facts of the matter.

So all of a sudden, overnight, they want to be elected to public office. I am not exactly sure whether a person with no experience of any kind in politics and government is best suited to take on the onerous or representing large numbers of people in large areas. But there certainly is that possibility under Senate Joint Resolution 1.

I think it is always true that every election usually has only a few major issues. If we reflect back to 1968, the presidential election of that year, we had, as I recall, three major issues. One, of course, was the war in Vietnam. Another was the law and order business, the rising crime rate and what to do about it. The other issues, of course, was heavy government spending or inflation. As a matter of fact, those three issues are around today. They may have a little different emphasis. I think inflation probably is a bigger issue than the other two. But they are back with us again.

What I am saying is that elections always are concentrated on just a few issues. So let us say that a candidate who never ran for public office before and belonged to one of these splinter groups, never worked within the great Democratic Party of the Senator from Alabama or my great Republican Party, decided that he wanted to be President of the United States. Let us say that the issue happened to be law and order, a great issue, or perhaps the election might occur at a time when there was a Cambodian crisis or perhaps when the price of meat and coffee and bread and potatoes was more severe than at any other time. He could take that one issue and get himself a high priced Madison Avenue, New York, advertising firm and say, "I'm willing to spend x millions of dollars." There is no question that, if he could not win the election, he certainly could win a sizable number of votes, so that neither candidate of the major political parties could win the election.

Then the very thing the Senator from Alabama has spoken of would happen—we would have a runoff election, and perhaps the glamor boy with all the money, who seized upon this one issue and managed to get that message across to the people, would be in the runoff. He might end up as the resident at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, the President of the United States, with little or no experience about politics and government, no knowledge of how it works, no acquaintance with the people in it, either in the Senate or the House, or, for that matter, the executive branch of Govern-

ment, or any of the other people who work in the political arena and the governmental arena of this great country.

I think the distinguished Senator is eminently correct. We have examples now in which that has happened in some of the biggest elections of the country for the Senate or for the governorship, in some of the biggest States, and those elections really are not different from an election for the Presidency of the United States, except that they are a little smaller in size.

So I agree with the Senator that that not only is a very real danger, but also, it has occurred in elections right now.

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the distinguished Senator from Florida for his most eloquent and persuasive contribution to this discussion. Certainly, he has highlighted the danger of the proliferation of third or splinter parties, a danger that would come about by one-issue parties.

I should like to suggest to the distinguished Senator from Florida, for his consideration, that under the runoff provision as provided in the Bayh measure, Senate Joint Resolution 1, this would encourage and foster third parties, in that it would permit members of the splinter parties to vote twice in the election; because with such a proliferation of third parties or splinter parties, it would be almost certain that there would be a runoff. This would allow members of the splinter parties to vote with their hearts rather than with their heads, in the first election as to who they really want to be President of the United States.

Under the present system, each voter is entitled to vote only once. He knows that he is going to be allowed to vote once and that that is final. He will not have a runoff or second chance. So he naturally votes for the man or woman he thinks would make the best President. Not so under the Bayh runoff plan. He would vote for the party or the man in closest affinity to him from the standpoint of geography or ideology, knowing full well that in the runoff he could vote for the person he thought was next best qualified to be President of the United States. This encourages the growth of splinter parties. It encourages their proliferation. So that we would find not the 14 splinter parties that we had in 1960, but we might have 50, 75, or a hundred, or even more, each and every one of them having a definite influence and effect on the outcome of the presidential election; because the votes they receive would be included in the total overall vote, and that would have an effect on whether or not the leading candidate received the 40 percent required for his election without a runoff.

Mr. President, approximately an hour ago, I suggested that some of the proponents of this measure say that under the present system it is possible to elect a man to the Presidency who is the second choice of the people, in that he would receive fewer popular votes than his opponent, even though he might receive a majority in the electoral college, and therefore, the person chosen might be the people's second choice.

Let us see what might happen under the direct election plan. Let us suppose

that in a four-way race—and, as I say, a four-way race certainly would be possible and likely, in addition to several dozen minor candidacies—the leading candidate received 39 percent of the vote, the next candidate received 21 percent of the vote, totaling then 60 percent, and the remaining votes were divided between the other two candidates, 20.5 percent and 19.5 percent. This, of course, would cause a runoff between the 39-percent candidate and the 21-percent candidate. In all likelihood, the 39-percent candidate would have been regarded as the leading candidate, during the race the front runner in the race, and the other candidates would be opposed to him and would band together in the runoff and could very likely cause the election of the 21-percent candidate. So that under this plan we would certainly end up with the second choice of the American people being elected as President of the United States.

Now, Mr. President, I spoke earlier of the lack of unanimity as to this resolution and the wisdom of submitting it in its present form. I call attention to the fact that some of the very sponsors of the legislation have questions about it. Some of the very people whose names are printed on the resolution are highly critical of certain phases in it.

I also call attention to page 16 of the Judiciary Committee report, number 91-1123, and find:

On the other hand, under the 40-percent plurality required for direct election, a minor party or combination of minor parties need only approach 20 percent of the popular vote in order to reach a strong bargaining position. The prospect of two minor party candidates, one regional and one ideological, amassing 20 percent of the vote is quite realistic in the near future of American politics.

In view of this attractive political framework, the direct election plan, as embodied in Senate Joint Resolution 1, opens the door to public political bargaining with the most far-reaching consequences. Concessions wrung from major party candidates either before or after the first election would be made in a heated atmosphere conducive to the creation of public distrust. Given the fact that bargaining before the runoff election would take place under conditions of division and disappointment, cynical political moves might in themselves lead to a crisis of respect and legitimacy in the selection of the President. Undoubtedly, the aura of legitimacy would be all the more in doubt where the runner-up in the initial contest wins the runoff by wooing third-party support. In such a case, the question of legitimacy is sharpened even further if the turnout in the second election is substantially lower than in the first election.

Well, Mr. President, this is the express view, then, of the distinguished Senator from Michigan (Mr. GRIFFIN) and the distinguished Senator from Maryland (Mr. TYDINGS). I note that these Senators are cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 1. Even they are highly critical of it because of the runoff provision. In fact, these two Senators have introduced—and it is the pending business—an amendment to do away with the runoff provision.

The point I make is that there is no unanimity of opinion in the resolution even among those who list themselves as cosponsors of it.

Mr. President, if they are not even agreed on it as the proper plan to submit out to the States for ratification, how could the States feel that the best possible plan is being submitted?

What does the Griffin-Tydings amendment provide that is different from Senate Joint Resolution 1?

Well, it has the same provisions as to 40 percent electing the President. If the leading candidate receives 40 percent, then he and his running mate who, of course, would get 40 percent also, would be declared elected President and Vice President. If the leading candidates receive fewer than 40 percent, if they receive 39.9999 percent of the vote, there would be a runoff. That is where all the pressure will be, to get every last vote counted because it might mean the difference between a runoff or none at all. This would make the vote of every splinter party most important because even a party that got only a thousand votes would have an effect on whether a candidate received 40 percent.

All right. Under Senate Joint Resolution 1, the Bayh plan, if no candidate, no team of candidates for President and Vice President, or no group of candidates received 40 percent, then a runoff is to be held at some unspecified time.

But under the Griffin-Tydings amendment, if no candidate receives 40 percent of the electoral votes, then it goes to the next step, a setup similar to the electoral college. Here again, every single one of the many plans being suggested, except this one providing for direct election, is built in some way around the electoral college or some modification thereof.

So under the Griffin-Tydings amendment, which is pending by these supposed sponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 1, they are taking issue with it to the point of filing a basic change in it. Then, instead of having a runoff, it is to be ascertained whether any candidate receives a majority, or if he carried States that had a majority of Senators and Representatives. Of course the electoral college is based on the number of Senators and Representatives. So that is an electoral college format without the electors. In fact, it is the automatic electoral plan originally sponsored by the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH). Then, if any candidate receives a majority in this counterpart of the electoral college, which would be carrying States that would have a majority of the Members of House and Senate, then such candidates for President and Vice President would be declared elected.

Then, if no candidate received a majority in the pseudo-electoral college, the automatic casting of the electoral votes, then the matter would be decided between the top two candidates, which is different from the existing plan as provided by the 12th amendment, of voting on the top three candidates in the House of Representatives.

The Griffin-Tydings plan or amendment would provide for a joint session of the House and Senate of the incoming Congress to decide between the top two candidates so that there could be

no tieup there in the House of Representatives. The Members of the House and Senate would vote, with each Member casting one vote, rather than voting as States under the present plan.

The point I make, Mr. President, is that two of the sponsors of this measure say they disapprove of it to the extent that they are submitting an amendment, and have submitted it, that would change it to the extent of doing away with the runoff and retaining a vestige of the electoral college system. So, the two Senators, who have been most critical of the runoff provision in Senate Joint Resolution 1, are two of the proposed sponsors of the measure.

Mr. President, there are numerous alternate plans that have been suggested through the years. The Senate itself, back I believe in 1956, long before I came to the U.S. Senate, passed and sent to the House the proportional plan which would divide the States' electoral votes among the candidates in proportion to the popular vote they received in the respective States. That was the Senate plan back in 1956.

The distinguished Senator from Indiana at one time sponsored the automatic plan which is now being espoused by former Attorney General Katzenbach. It would do away with the electoral college and would call for the automatic casting of the electoral vote of each State for the candidate carrying each respective State. That resolution is before the Senate. I believe it is Senate Joint Resolution 191.

The distinguished Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON) and the distinguished Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE) have a plan. Almost everyone has a plan to change this. But the fact remains that all of the plans, except Senate Joint Resolution 1, do have some phases of the electoral college remaining. In the more than 180 years of our existence under the Constitution, there has never been sufficient unanimity of opinion to pass in any Congress any change in the electoral college.

The distinguished Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON) and the distinguished Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE) have what they call a Federal plan. It provides for a popular election. I believe they changed it in recent weeks. There again that shows that no matter what we agree on now, it might not be what we want in 1976, and that is the earliest this provision can become activated. Under the Eagleton-Dole plan there is a popular election. But there is no one runoff.

That is what seems to cause most of the consternation, the idea of the runoff tearing this country asunder. The Dole-Eagleton plan has the popular election provision. It does not have any requirements as to percentage, though I understand they now require that if a candidate got 50 percent, he would be elected automatically. Originally it provided that there would be a popular election and the leading candidate would be declared elected if he carried a majority of the States or if he carried States casting half of the total nationwide vote in the election.

If neither of those circumstances prevailed, if he did not carry 26 States or if he did not carry States casting sufficient votes to constitute a majority of the votes cast throughout the country, then the matter would be submitted to the electoral college. If no one then received a majority of the electoral college votes, we would drop all of the candidates except the top two. We would then divide the electoral votes of the other candidates among the top two candidates in proportion to the vote they received in the States carried by the splinter parties. Of course, that would elect one of the candidates at that time without a runoff. That is a pretty complicated plan.

The point is that is shows the vast difference of opinion among the Members of the Senate as to what the best plan is.

A most intriguing plan was introduced by the Senator from Virginia (Mr. SONG). It provides for the present system, but requires a majority of the electoral college. If the candidate who received a majority in the electoral college did not also lead in the popular vote, then there would be a runoff. In other words, that would do away with the possibility that the distinguished Senator from Indiana mentions time and time again, of the candidate getting a majority in the electoral college not being the popular candidate. That is an intriguing plan.

There is another plan. By the way, this plan has been pushed for about 150 years since the 1824 presidential election when John Quincy Adams, though he ran second in the electoral college, was elected by the House of Representatives.

Gen. Andrew Jackson—possibly it was not until after he became President—supported the district plan. There is a resolution to that effect. Its chief sponsor is the distinguished Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT), who has been ill and has not been able to be present to push it. It provides for allocating the electoral vote to the winner in the respective congressional districts, with two electoral votes for each State going to the State winners. That is the district plan and that was recommended by Andrew Jackson. There has never been unanimity behind that plan or any other plan to get it through Congress.

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

Mr. ALLEN. I am delighted to yield to the distinguished Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it not true that although desirable for some purposes, the district plan still leaves the winner-take-all principle in effect in each district?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is, a minority of citizens find their votes completely eliminated by the final result in the statewide weight of electors in the same way, so that the losers statewide are eliminated entirely and their votes are not counted at all in the final counting for President and Vice President. Is that right?

Mr. ALLEN. The Senator is correct. There would be a winner take all for each congressional district and for the State as regards the two electors as-

signed in effect for the two Senators in the U.S. Senate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ALLEN. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. It seems to the Senator from Florida that for that reason alone the fractional system is preferable because it allows the actual counting down to one-thousandth point of every electoral vote, or the vote of every citizen. Under that system, the electoral votes of the State are proportioned among the several candidates in direct proportion as the popular votes are cast in that State so that everybody's vote counts.

It seems to the Senator from Florida that that feature alone makes the fractional system greatly more desirable than the district plan. The Senator from Florida would prefer the district plan greatly to the present winner-take-all plan under which electors are still left with their personal right to differ entirely from the expressions of those who elected them.

I wonder if the Senator from Alabama agrees with that distinction between the district plan and the fractional plan.

Mr. ALLEN. Certainly the Senator's arguments are most persuasive at that point. He said he would prefer the district plan, I believe, to the present plan; I believe he would also prefer the district plan to the direct election plan, would he not?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator, of course, is correct. The proposal now pending, Senate Joint Resolution 1, would be the most radical departure from the original concept of the Founding Fathers ever advanced here, as the Senator knows, in that it would make our Nation, instead of a republic—a representative government in the selection of President and Vice President—a simple democracy; and nothing was further from the plan and thought and from the principle that was incorporated in the original Constitution, than the pending program, Senate Joint Resolution 1.

The Senator from Florida is glad the Senator from Alabama has called attention to the fact that while the Senator from Florida had indicated the fractional plan was superior in his opinion to the district plan and also to the present plan in the Constitution, it is infinitely preferable to the proposed radical plan that is embodied in Senate Joint Resolution 1.

Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. ALLEN. I am delighted to yield further.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida believes the States still have considerable interest, as States, in who becomes President or Vice President. Does the Senator agree?

Mr. ALLEN. I agree, and that is an integral part of the federal system.

Mr. HOLLAND. The dovetailing of local and State responsibilities and State jurisdiction, and the passage of laws affecting daily lives of citizens with the federal system which is centered at Washington, is such, in my opinion, that the States, as such, always have not only a substantial but a vital interest in the selection of President and Vice Presi-

dent. The Senator from Florida is completely out of sympathy with Senate Joint Resolution 1 because it proposes to downgrade and eliminate entirely any State's right to have anything to say as a State in the selection of President or Vice President.

I hope the Senator from Alabama agrees with that.

Mr. ALLEN. I agree 100 percent. That is one of the major defects in Senate Joint Resolution 1, as the distinguished Senator from Florida so ably pointed out.

Mr. HOLLAND. Knowing the wisdom and sound judgment of the Senator from Alabama, I am not at all surprised to find that is his conclusion and strong feeling.

The Senator from Florida has been particularly anguished by the fact that Senate Joint Resolution 1 proposes to give to the District of Columbia—which has no sovereignty and does not pass laws for the protection and governing of its citizens and it has no jurisdiction as a State—weight at such a great rate that the weight of the District of Columbia would exceed the weight of the 11 sovereign States which happen to have populations smaller than the District of Columbia. To the Senator from Florida that appears to be about the best illustration of the radical nature of the program suggested by Senate Joint Resolution 1.

Does the Senator from Alabama feel that way also?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes, I certainly do. I would like to suggest this to the Senator for thought. With direct election there could very conceivably be as great a difference between the votes of two major candidates in the District of Columbia as there is difference between those candidates in the rest of the country and it could be that the District of Columbia, in effect, would be the tail wagging the dog of 50 States of the Union because its margin for one candidate might be more than the margin of the whole of the United States for the other candidate.

Mr. HOLLAND. Of course, the Senator is completely right, and that is a possibility. Perhaps it would never be a very great probability but it is a possibility and Senators are entitled to look at the things that can happen and would be permitted to happen under Senate Joint Resolution 1.

One of the most abhorrent and one of the most extreme things is that which the Senator from Alabama has suggested. The Senator from Florida has noted that the population in the District of Columbia would enable the District of Columbia in the election of President and Vice President by popular vote to outweigh, in several cases, two States combined. I am sure the Senator from Alabama has knowledge of that fact.

Mr. ALLEN. I have.

Mr. HOLLAND. That seems peculiarly illustrative to the Senator from Florida of the radical nature of this proposal. Here, only a few days ago, we granted the District of Columbia the right to have one nonvoting representative in the House of Representatives at the other end of this Capitol. Yet at the same time we are debating here on the floor a pro-

posal which would give the District of Columbia such very great power, greater weight in a presidential election than that of each of 11 separate States, greater weight than several of them taken together.

It seems to the Senator from Florida that is an illustration of the way we are going—not in one direction, but moving in various directions, one day giving one nonvoting delegate to the District of Columbia in the House of Representatives, the very next day debating on the floor of the Senate a proposal which would give the District of Columbia such tremendous weight in the selection of Presidents and Vice Presidents.

Is the Senator from Alabama of a somewhat similar opinion?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes, sir; that seems to be inconsistent.

Mr. HOLLAND. I suppose we should not expect consistency any more, but the very idea of the Senate having passed one day a proposal which went to the White House, because it had been passed before by the House of Representatives, which has now become law, finally giving to the District of Columbia one nonvoting Member in the House of Representatives, and the very next day taking up this proposal to give the District of Columbia such a disparate weight in the selection of President and Vice President—as if we can do those two things consistently—seems to me to be hopelessly inconsistent and shows unsound thinking of those who support Senate Joint Resolution 1. It leaves the Senator from Florida rather despairing of any idea that we are pursuing a course of action, in debating this particular resolution which is not at all consistent either with the idea of a Federal Government as it has existed so happily for nearly 200 years or with the idea which we carried out in other fields relative to the District of Columbia only a few days ago.

I thank the Senator for yielding to me. I appreciate the fine efforts he is making in this regard, which I hope will be successful. It seems to the Senator from Florida that we are wasting our time in complete futility, because he cannot see that there would be a chance in the world of the smaller States, or, for that matter, the larger States that approved of the Federal form of government, approving or ratifying this amendment if it were submitted to the States for ratification, which the Senator from Florida hopes will never be done.

In this time when the world is in confusion, in this time when we have more to do than we can do, and most of us are tied up in conferences all day long, as the Senator from Florida has been on the farm bill conference for 4 successive days now, it seems like such a great waste of good time and good effort to give all this time in the Senate to such a futile expression as this would be, if it were adopted, because he does not see how it would ever be ratified by the 38 States that would be required to ratify it.

Does the Senator from Alabama feel somewhat that way about it?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes, sir; I certainly do. I do not feel there is any chance that 38 States will ratify it. It cannot become effective, from a practical viewpoint, until the 1976 presidential election. And while we are discussing this matter, why it is insisted that this matter be brought to a conclusion, when it does not apply until 1976 and we have literally dozens of important bills that need the action of the Senate, is something I cannot understand.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida agrees completely, and he thanks the distinguished Senator from Alabama for the sturdy position which he has taken in opposing Senate Joint Resolution 1.

Mr. ALLEN. I thank the distinguished Senator.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, may I commend the Senator for his most eloquent and thoughtful, and what should be most persuasive, exposition of the evils of Senate Joint Resolution 1. I am sure there are so many evils in it that, despite the diligent efforts of the Senator from Alabama on this occasion pointing out those evils, the Senator from North Carolina will have to point out some of its evils in the future.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I am about to yield the floor. I see the Senator from North Carolina—

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Leonard, one of his secretaries.

DIRECT POPULAR ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and the Vice President.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, before I yield the floor, I do wish to comment briefly on the Bayh filibuster in which the Senate is engaged. The distinguished Senator from Indiana this morning, as he has a right to do under the rules, objected to the meeting of the Senate committees during the session of the Senate. He has threatened to object as he has a right to do under the rules to the request when an effort is made around 5 o'clock by the majority leader to lay this business aside so that we can take up some of the most important bills on the calendar.

The measure under discussion, Senate Joint Resolution 1, cannot, from a practical point of view, become effective until the 1976 presidential election. The effort of the opponents of this measure in seeking to make and address remarks to the measure have to do only with one item, a measure to take effect in 1976, whereas the distinguished Senator from Indiana is threatening, under the rules, to prevent consideration of bills that are needed by the country now.

We have some six or seven appropriation bills either in committee or on the calendar, dating from July 1 of this year, covering the period starting July 1, 1970; and we are well into that year.

The distinguished Senator from Indiana states that he is going to object to taking those bills up and require the Senate to stay on the consideration of a measure that would go into effect in 1976. What sort of priority is that?

Mr. President, according to my understanding of a filibuster, and what a filibuster is, I would understand a filibusterer to be a person who stops or impedes the flow of legislation in the Senate or other legislative body by the use of parliamentary devices and rules, as he is permitted to do under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. President, the stopping of the flow of legislation and the consideration of legislation must be laid at the door of the distinguished Senator from Indiana, and I say that in all due respect, because the distinguished Senator from Indiana, by merely agreeing, could allow the Senate to go on to the consideration of these important, urgently needed matters of legislation.

I say that if there is a filibuster in opposition to Senate Joint Resolution 1—and I submit there is not—the Senate debated one issue here in Congress for 49 days, and no cloture motion was filed. We have already had a cloture motion filed as to the consideration of this measure, and it is said that another cloture motion will be filed tomorrow; and we have only been on it for some 12 or 13 days. Moreover, during that time, by laying the matter aside, we have passed more important legislation here in the Senate, in this period, than, according to the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, has been passed by the Senate in any other comparable period during his tenure in the Senate.

So what kind of filibuster is that? There is no filibuster on Senate Joint Resolution 1. But, Mr. President, in the opinion of the junior Senator from Alabama, we are in the midst of what must be, to identify it, called the Bayh filibuster against the calendar. So we see before us the prospect of a filibuster against the calendar on the part of the distinguished Senator from Indiana, acting as he has a right to do, if he chooses to do so, under the Senate rules.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the second section of rule XXII provides, in part, as follows:

Except by unanimous consent, no amendment shall be in order after the vote to bring the debate to a close, unless the same has been presented and read prior to that time.

This being so, I request, in order that certain amendments which I have proposed may be presented and read within the purview of this provision of rule XXII, that the clerk at this time read amendment No. 900, amendment No. 901, amendment No. 931, and amendment No. 942.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may I first address a parliamentary inquiry? Is a parliamentary inquiry in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from North Carolina yield for that purpose?

Mr. ERVIN. Yes, I will yield for a parliamentary inquiry, but for no other purpose.

Mr. BAYH. The Senator from Indiana did not want to interrupt the Senator from North Carolina for any other purpose.

Is the request made by the Senator from North Carolina a request that must be denied for failure of any one Senator to consent?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDWATER). Under the rule, the amendments can be read after the motion has been made, but before the vote.

Mr. BAYH. One further question. Let the record show that the Senator from Indiana did not want to object to the motion made by his friend from North Carolina. But neither did he want to preclude any other Senator who had an amendment either already submitted or to be submitted in the future from having a similar opportunity.

Is it accurate to suggest that if a closure motion is filed, it is necessary to have any amendment read after the time of filing, if it is to be considered after cloture is invoked, but before the vote on final passage?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would have to be presented after that.

Mr. BAYH. After the filing of the closure motion?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. BAYH. I thank the Chair.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ERVIN. Suppose a Senator's proposed amendment cannot get to the floor; what happens to his amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is a situation we have not been confronted with.

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator from North Carolina is prospectively confronted with that situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would observe that he has not noticed that.

Mr. ERVIN. Would it be in order for the Senator from North Carolina to request the Chair to give him some instruction on the Senate rule in that respect, so that the Senator from North Carolina may guide himself accordingly?

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, another parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If a motion is filed, the Senator would take his chances of getting the floor and presenting amendments at that time.

Mr. ERVIN. That would mean that if I could not get the floor, the great work that I am trying to do in behalf of the American people would, like the best laid plans of mice and men, go "agley"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair observes that in his experience, he cannot recall a Senator having too much difficulty in getting the floor, or being denied the floor. That is the right of the Senator.

Mr. ERVIN. The Presiding Officer, I am sure, has observed what has happened in times past. There is such a pos-

sibility as that precedents may be set. We have had the precedents of that past shattered by our able and distinguished friend from Indiana objecting to virtually everything that occurs in the Senate of the United States.

Therefore, Mr. President, I should like to propound a unanimous-consent request. Notwithstanding the fact that no motion to put an end to debate under rule XXII has thus far been filed, I ask unanimous consent that my amendments Nos. 898, 899, 900, 901, 931, 942, and the one I introduced this morning be considered as presented and read in a manner satisfying rule XXII, or in the event a motion to put an end to debate is hereafter filed under rule XXII.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the Senator from Indiana feels that inasmuch as he has been classified as such an objecting individual, perhaps he should not let his reputation be ruined by not living up to it.

I shall feel compelled, at the end of this observation, to take advantage of my right to object. But I suggest to my friend from North Carolina, so that his amendments will not be precluded because of the rule, the Senator from Indiana will not object if he will expand his motion to include all amendments presently pending or to be introduced on the bill. However, the Senator from Indiana feels that, inasmuch as there are some Senators not now present, it is his duty to protect them.

Otherwise, with all deference to the Senator from North Carolina and with personal apologies, I do object.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I deeply regret that the able, distinguished and eminent Senator from Indiana has singled me out as an object of objection on his part. But in order to comply with his suggestion, I hereby make a unanimous-consent request that in the event a motion is filed to bring the debate upon Senate Joint Resolution 1 to a close and in the event such motion is approved by two-thirds of those present and voting, all the amendments I have enumerated and all the amendments which have been submitted heretofore to Senate Joint Resolution 1, and all amendments which may hereafter be submitted to Senate Joint Resolution 1, be considered as present and read as required by rule XXII.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BAYH and Mr. HANSEN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and it is not my intention to object—I should like clarification of this issue.

If such a unanimous-consent request were granted, would it invalidate the germaneness rule?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Not if the Senator is asking, as he has asked, compliance with that portion of rule XXII that requires amendments to have been read before cloture is invoked in order to be considered.

Mr. HANSEN. What is the interpretation of the Chair? Does the Senator make such a request?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The understanding of the Chair is that the Senator from North Carolina has made an all-encompassing request as suggested by the Senator from Indiana, that all of the enumerated amendments be considered as having been read.

Mr. HANSEN. But it does not violate the germaneness rule?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, it does not.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, was it the intention of the Senator from North Carolina in his unanimous-consent request to include amendments which were presented and read, presented after the invocation of rule XXII, or is he seeking to protect only those that are filed up until then?

Mr. ERVIN. I am glad the distinguished Senator from Michigan has raised that point.

I modify my unanimous-consent request so as to make it apply to those amendments which are submitted prior to the time that cloture is invoked, if it should be invoked.

Mr. HART. Continuing the reservation, would not that right be available under rule XXII with respect to such amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the rule, the amendments should be read after the motion is filed but before the vote is called.

The Chair might say that if this unanimous-consent request is granted, it is the opinion of the Chair that this would be in compliance with what the Senator from Michigan is asking.

Is there objection?

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

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana has no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President—

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

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I do not want to interfere with any Senator who has extended remarks to make, but the Senator from Indiana would like to take approximately 5 minutes of the Senate's time to respond to some of the assertions that were made earlier in the day by some of those who addressed themselves to the issue before the Senate.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GOLDWATER). The Senator will state it.

Mr. HANSEN. The Senator from Wyoming is confused. I had suggested the absence of a quorum, and I thought the distinguished Senator from Indiana did not object. Did I misunderstand?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator did not object, and the Senator from North Carolina yielded the floor.

The question now is, will the Senator from Indiana yield for the calling of a quorum?

Mr. BAYH. The Senator from Indiana has no objection to a quorum being

called, but I understand there was a little misunderstanding, and I will proceed with my remarks, so that some other Senator who might have something else to say on this subject will have the opportunity to do so.

Repeated reference has been made to the Senator from Indiana. In fact, as a relatively junior Member of the Senate, I must say that perhaps my name has been referred to more in the last 2 or 3 hours than in the last 8 years that I have had the good fortune to serve in the Senate. Because of this, I feel compelled at least to interject a thought or two at this time.

Repeated reference was made to a letter that the Senator from Indiana addressed to his colleagues. Indeed, the Senator from Indiana did address such a letter to his colleagues, and I think the RECORD will show that the letter went to friend and foe alike, proponents and opponents of the amendment that is now the pending order of business. There was no effort to try to conceal this letter.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed at this point in the RECORD, since it has been referred to.

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

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, D.C., September 23, 1970.

DEAR SENATOR: As you know, the Senate has been debating the question of electoral reform since returning from the Labor Day recess. The Senate already has considered S.J. Res. 1 for a longer period of time than it has devoted to the consideration of any constitutional amendment adopted in the past 100 years.

In view of a public statement by opponents of S.J. Res. 1 to the effect that they would never permit it to come to a vote, the Majority Leader was obliged to file a cloture petition. The first cloture petition failed by only six votes—a rather narrow margin considering past first attempts at cloture. Since that first vote, several Senators have indicated a willingness to consider voting for cloture but only if the Senate would make an all-out effort to debate the matter fully. I intend to see that the Senate has that opportunity.

S.J. Res. 1 was introduced in the Senate on January 10, 1969. Lengthy hearings were held on this and other electoral reform resolutions by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments and by the full Judiciary Committee. The resolution, in amended form, was finally reported out of the Subcommittee on May 26 and became the pending order of business before the full Committee in September, 1969. From September, 1969, until late in February, 1970, the matter was not discussed because the Committee members had been informed of Senator Thurmond's intention of not permitting it to come to a vote.

During that period, and while the Committee was meeting during sessions of the Senate, the Committee calendar was cleared. Of course, it required the consent of the Senate to permit the Committee to meet. By the same token, when I requested permission for the Committee to meet to consider S.J. Res. 1, Senator Thurmond on three occasions interposed objections.

Finally, Senator Thurmond was forced to relent—but only after I refused to continue the practice of laying S.J. Res. 1 aside for other matters. On April 23, the Committee voted 11-6 to report favorably the direct popular vote resolution, S.J. Res. 1. After the

filings of the majority report, the minority required an additional 11 weeks in which to file their views.

During the 12 days that S.J. Res. 1 has been before the Senate, I have not objected to committees meeting during the period of debate on the resolution. Nor have I objected to the laying aside of S.J. Res. 1 during the day so that other legislative matters could be considered and the calendar cleared. In short, the Senate has been afforded the unusual opportunity of conducting business as usual in the midst of a filibuster.

On three different occasions during the course of the debate I have tried to secure a unanimous consent agreement to consider any or all of the 13 amendments introduced to S.J. Res. 1. On each occasion, objection was heard. Ironically, on a number of occasions, the objecting Senator was objecting to the consideration of his own amendment. As a result, I have reluctantly been forced to the conclusion that a concerted effort is underway to deny the Senate an opportunity to vote on any type of electoral reform.

It appears, therefore, that a few of our colleagues are determined to use the rules of the Senate—which is their right—to prevent a vote on this crucial issue. Those of us who are committed to electoral reform, recognizing as we do the imminent danger of a constitutional crisis because of a malfunctioning of the present electoral system, have a sober responsibility to be as resolute in our determination to bring this question to a vote. This responsibility, as you know, weighs heavily on my shoulders as Chairman of the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments and as the principal sponsor of S.J. Res. 1.

After weighing this responsibility against the rush to adjournment, I have reluctantly decided to require those who are filibustering to bear the true burdens of a filibuster. Beginning tomorrow, I will object to committees sitting during the day and I will no longer consent to the laying aside of the unfinished business after only a few hours of speeches. The opponents of electoral reform, therefore, will be forced to speak continuously.

I recognize that this means a certain amount of inconvenience for individual Senators and for the Senate as a whole. I am hopeful that those Senators who are insistent on delaying action will realize this and permit the Senate to vote on—not necessarily for—S.J. Res. 1.

Because of my reluctance to follow this course of action and because I am aware of the hardships it imposes on you, I wanted you to know what events have transpired, thus leaving me no alternative. Again, I deeply regret the inconvenience this is causing you.

With best regards, I am

Sincerely,

BIRCH BAYH.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the purpose of that letter was to explain to my colleagues why the Senator from Indiana was doing what he is doing. The Senator from Indiana did not take this step lightly, but only after serious consideration of the grave consequences that might befall him or the Senate or the country. Although I took this step reluctantly, once having taken this step, I am resolute in my determination to pursue this course until the matter before the Senate is presented to the Senate and we have a chance to vote on it.

I have been accused by one of my very distinguished and illustrious colleagues this afternoon of having prevented the opponents from having the opportunity to present their views. I invite anyone who reads these eloquent remarks to

read back over the RECORD of the past 12 days or so and then judge for himself whether the Senator from Indiana monopolized the floor and prevented the opponents from having the opportunity to be heard.

Also, I invite them to investigate the accusation that I had continuously interrupted the opponents and prevented them from having a reasonable dialogue. I think the RECORD will put that accusation to rest. The Senator from Indiana has on occasion asked questions of his colleagues just as they have asked questions of him. Somehow or other, I thought that was the purpose of the United States Senate—to have a free discourse, a free flow of differing ideas—and I still think that such a discourse is the main vehicle we use to discuss differences and ultimately to work the will of the Senate.

I think the RECORD will show, for anyone who cares to peruse it, that on several occasions the Senator from Indiana suggested that, so far as he was concerned, the proponents had made their case.

Repeatedly, I have invited, and still invite those who share different views, to take advantage of the opportunity to be heard. But, I must say, and I think the RECORD will show, there is a little different interpretation being placed on my invitations. Our distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Nebraska, said there were eight or 10 speakers that had to be heard. But then we went for almost a week without hearing from any of them. Some opponents of the matter sat here and let the pending order of business be put aside. My good friend from North Carolina, who is an eloquent statesman and a good friend of all of us here, on one occasion even suggested that he had a long speech to make, and then, two sentences later, suggested that he did not want to take the time of the Senate on that particular occasion to make that speech. I find a little inconsistency in the argument presented by the opponents today, inconsistency in the thoughts of those who normally have great perception and great consistency. On the one hand they criticize the Senator from Indiana for suggesting that we should not put aside the pending order of business but stay here and debate it. On the other hand, the Senator from Indiana is also being criticized for having permitted the pending order of business to be put aside on previous days, thus supposedly denying us the opportunity to debate.

We have to fish or cut bait. We will either stay here and debate, or we will not. The Senator from Indiana suggests that this matter should be debated, and then we should vote it up or down.

I would take issue with the assessment that has been made by my colleagues here this afternoon that the Senator from Indiana has been arbitrary and dilatory in preventing committees from meeting, in preventing the pending order of business from being put aside, and in preventing a two-shift business from being followed by the Senate, and in stopping all the legislation.

I should like to suggest a reading of

the rules of the Senate for the consideration of my colleagues. Rule XXV, section 5 reads as follows:

No standing committee shall sit without special leave while the Senate is in session. . . .

That is what the Senate rule says about what is happening right now. In other words, we are following a normal course of action.

Little has been said about the fact that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina on three occasions last December actually prohibited the Judiciary Committee from meeting to consider the very matter now before us.

If one Member of this body had not stressed that the rules be complied with, we would not even be here right now. If that same person had not personally filibustered that measure in the Judiciary Committee from September to February, we would not be here right now. If we are going to abide by the rules of the Senate, we should abide by them.

If one group of opponents are going to stick to the rules, then the whole Senate should. That is why we are here. I shall not even deal with the suggestion that I am filibustering because, with all respect, it is too ridiculous to require rebuttal.

The important legislation which is before us is of significant concern to the Senator from Indiana. I have listened with amazement and concern as some of my well-intentioned colleagues have gone down the calendar. Perhaps, since they overlooked some of it, maybe they would want to put the whole calendar in the RECORD, as two or three bills were left out.

But, to suggest that the Senator from Indiana as being against motherhood, orphan children, crippled veterans, against cleaning our streams and lakes and the air—my goodness. Of course these matters are on the calendar. And they are important matters. The Senator from Indiana is extremely anxious to get down to their consideration.

But let me suggest that we will have a chance to vote on them all, as soon as these few individuals who seem to feel they have the right to deny the Senate the opportunity to vote on the pending order of business decide to stop their filibustering.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, pursuant to the questions which were raised between my distinguished friend from Alabama and North Carolina, at 2 o'clock on Tuesday afternoon next, the Senate have a final vote on Senate Joint Resolution 1.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE). Objection is heard.

Mr. BAYH. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President—Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request—permit me to make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. BAYH. I would be very glad to hear the Senator's unanimous-consent request, as soon as I get through with all my own.

Mr. ERVIN. Well—

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I do not want to be impolite to my good friend from North Carolina, as much as I have become accustomed to the Senator's ob-

jections to my unanimous-consent requests—I think he objected to 13 being considered on each of three different occasions, but that is not a bad average; 39 out of 39 is a good record, even in the Senate. I thought, perhaps, in the ensuing period of time, he would change his mind, and his normal wisdom would surface once again and he would permit the Senate temporarily to put aside Senate Joint Resolution No. 1 until 2 o'clock on Tuesday next, and to suggest a final vote at that time, since this was suggested as a way to get some of this legislation considered. We now see that it has been objected to.

One last reference, Mr. President, as I see my 5 minutes have stretched to 7. There has been some concern about dealing with immediate legislation. There has been some reference to the fact that we cannot deal with this problem until 1976.

I do not believe that that is necessarily the case. I would be the first to suggest that we have a difficult job before us, if we are to get this enacted by the Senate, correct all the differences with the House, and then get ratification by three-fourths of the State legislatures. I, for one, do not think anything is impossible. We have a reasonable crack at each legislature. There are 46 legislatures meeting during the period of time which we specified on Senate Joint Resolution 1. Four others might indeed be meeting in special session.

The Senator from Indiana feels that the problem before us is very much like putting a shingle on a leaky roof. When it is raining and the water is pouring down, and the wall, the upholstery, the rugs, and the wallpaper and clothing are all being destroyed, then it is of fundamental importance to correct the hole in the roof. It is a crisis. But, after the rain stops, we will play golf, or mow the lawn, or do something else, because it is not leaking any more.

I suggest that we are not living up to our responsibilities unless we correct this flaw in our system right now, because the rain has stopped, or because the specter of 1968 has dimmed in our minds, or because we hope that this will not be the situation in 1972.

We must not leave it to chance, but move now, because the House has passed this by a 339-to-70 vote. It is before the Senate now. I hopefully and respectfully suggest to my colleagues that we have a responsibility to live up to the finest traditions of the Senate and provide some leadership for the country and correct this flaw now—now. Because, having gone through the ordeal of the 25th amendment, following the terrible assassination of our late beloved President Kennedy, it is the judgment of the Senator from Indiana that the election of 1968 once again pricked the conscience of the Nation and showed another weakness in our constitutional fabric.

Before the passage of the 25th amendment, a weakness existed in the presidential disability provisions. But it took a tragedy to get something done. Now that we have witnessed the near tragedy of 1968, there is heightened public interest.

The further we get from election day

1968, the less this interest is going to be felt in the country. Let me suggest that if we have a crisis, if indeed we have a repeat of 1968 in 1972 and there is a change of 40,000 votes so that a third party candidate is able to go to one of the two major-party candidates and say, "What am I bid to make you President," and a deal is made in a smoke-filled room, that candidate will then become part of the government. And there is no way that we can correct that then. He will then be part of the Government structure.

It seems to me that the case is in. Let us move on.

I have spoken for 10 minutes. I hope that my friends will forgive me, after having listened to them all day, for filibustering for 10 minutes.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT REQUESTS

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that every committee be authorized to meet tomorrow notwithstanding the fact that the Senate may be in session.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences be permitted to meet tomorrow notwithstanding the fact that the Senate may be in session.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I think the Senator from Indiana has made his position very clear.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I have the floor. I do not think it is in order for the Senator from Indiana to do anything more than to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The Senator from North Carolina propounded a unanimous-consent request. The Chair can entertain reservations of objections at his discretion.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I think that the Senator from Indiana has made his position very clear.

With great reluctance, in order to make the Senate move on the pending business, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry be permitted to sit tomorrow notwithstanding the fact that the Senate may be in session.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object respectfully, pursuant to the previous explanation of the Chair. I do in fact object, with great apologies to my friend, the Senator from North Carolina, who I know is trying to pursue the business of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services, which is charged with the duty of protecting the national security of our country, be permitted to sit tomorrow notwithstanding the fact that the Senate may be in session.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, reserving

the right to object, and with all deference to the importance of the security of our country, the Senator from Indiana suggests that the basic security of our country would be greatly enhanced if the Senator from North Carolina uses his influence to pass the pending business of the Senate. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Banking and Currency Committee, which is charged with the primary responsibility of keeping the dollar sound, be permitted to meet tomorrow notwithstanding the fact that the Senate may be in session.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, and recognizing the great interest in finance of my friend, the Senator from North Carolina, and the importance of the Banking and Currency Committee, nevertheless under the previous explanation of the Chair, I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Commerce, which is charged with clearing the channels of interstate and foreign commerce, be permitted to sit tomorrow notwithstanding the fact the Senate may be in session.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the Senator from Indiana would make the observation that perhaps the commerce of the country would come to its knees if we had a constitutional crisis in which no one was elected President. Thus, I am forced to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Indiana lose his fear of George Wallace.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the Senator from Indiana will lose that fear automatically if the Senator from North Carolina will throw his prestige and influence behind the passage of the pending resolution before the Senate.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I cannot do that, because Senate Joint Resolution 1 is an open invitation for George Wallace and everyone else to run for President with the assurance of getting just as many votes as they receive.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Finance, which is charged with the responsibility of recommending legislation to obtain enough taxes to keep our Government operating, be allowed to meet tomorrow notwithstanding the fact that the Senate may be in session.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, would the Senator from North Carolina yield for a question?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I yield to my friend, the distinguished Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, is the Committee on Finance the committee charged with the responsibility of considering the welfare reform proposal that has been passed by the House and which has been subscribed to by a number of Senators, I think not excluding the distinguished Senator from Indiana?

Mr. ERVIN. The Senator is correct. Not only that, but as I understand it, it has a subcommittee that has jurisdiction over veterans' affairs.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield—

Mr. ERVIN. Wait a minute. I would like to know what I am being asked to yield for. I have the right to the floor.

Mr. BAYH. If the Senator will yield without losing his right to the floor.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I would like to know what I am yielding for. I will yield for a question.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the Senator would like to propound a question to his friend, the Senator from North Carolina. The question asked by my distinguished colleague relating to the Finance Committee has struck a compelling note of reason in the heart of the Senator from Indiana. If the Senator from North Carolina would just rephrase that unanimous-consent request referring to the Finance Committee meeting, the Senator would not object.

The Senator from Indiana would suggest to the Senator from North Carolina that if he would extend his request a bit further and ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be permitted to meet tomorrow, and that Senate Joint Resolution 1 be voted on finally at 2 o'clock on Tuesday, the Senator from Indiana would not object.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I want no part of such request. I care too much for the welfare of my country to make such a unanimous-consent request.

I propose again my unanimous-consent request that the Committee on Finance, which is charged with the solemn responsibility of recommending legislation which will bring into the Treasury enough shekels to keep the Government running, be permitted to meet tomorrow, notwithstanding the fact that the Senate may be in session.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I respectfully object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, we live in a most troubled era in this world. It is a very precarious world. We have trouble in the mid-East. We have trouble in Asia. We have trouble looming on all horizons.

For that reason, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, which is charged with grave responsibilities in this field, be permitted to meet tomorrow notwithstanding the fact that the Senate may be in session.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the Senator from Indiana might make the brief observation that perhaps our whole foreign affairs and the impression our country makes on other nations large and small throughout the world would be far

greater if we had a system that guaranteed that the President would be the one who received the most votes in the election and that everyone's vote would count, and that all the people would be permitted to vote for their President.

I must respectfully object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I suggest that we need something better than Senate Joint Resolution 1. It provides that 40 percent of the votes will count and that the other 60 percent will be thrown away.

Mr. President, our great Government has to keep operating. We have to investigate to insure efficiency and economy in the field of Government operations if we are going to act wisely.

For that reason I ask unanimous consent that the Senate Committee on Government Operations, which has jurisdiction of legislation affecting the Federal Government and the structure of the Federal Government and the power to investigate economy and efficiency in all departments and agencies of the Government, be permitted to meet tomorrow notwithstanding the fact that the Senate may be in session.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, the Committee on the Judiciary handles more than 50 percent of all legislative proposals which come to the Senate.

For this reason, I ask unanimous consent that this important committee be permitted to meet tomorrow, notwithstanding the fact that the Senate may be in session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, the Senator from Indiana, who is a member of that committee, has not received notification that that committee has any intention of meeting tomorrow. Therefore, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, while the Senator from Indiana put the objection on specific grounds, his objection prevents that committee from meeting, even though that committee might wish to meet and even though the Senator from Indiana may receive notice that it wishes to meet.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare be permitted to meet tomorrow, notwithstanding the fact that the Senate may be in session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BAYH. I object.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I make the same request with respect to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BAYH. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I make the

same request with respect to the Committee on Public Works.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Carolina repeat that request so that we can hear it in full?

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Public Works, which has jurisdiction over legislation which permits the development of our rivers and harbors and many other important public projects, be permitted to meet tomorrow notwithstanding the fact that the Senate may be in session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as a member of that committee, and not knowing of any planned meetings scheduled, I think it would be very inequitable to other committees if I did not object. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I make the same unanimous consent request that any of these committees which may desire to meet tomorrow be permitted to meet notwithstanding the fact that the Senate may be in session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I have all deference for my friend from North Carolina and his deep concern that the business of the Senate be continued. Sharing his concern that present business be disposed of and believing that the present course of action is the only way to reach that goal, I object to that request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader, if he be so moved, may be permitted to call up tomorrow the bill S. 734 now on the Legislative Calendar, a bill to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, as one member of the Senate, I would consider that request if and when it is presented by the majority leader. Thus, I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the majority leader may call up tomorrow, or tonight, for that matter, S. 3785, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize educational assistance and home loan benefits to wives of members of the Armed Forces who are missing in action or prisoners of war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. BAYH. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, with the same stipulation as before.

Mr. ERVIN. What is the stipulation?

Mr. BAYH. That the Senator from Indiana will be glad to consider that if and when the majority leader presents it to

the Senate. The Senator from Indiana believes the rules of the Senate should be adhered to. Rule XXV, section 5, is clear, and the Senator from Indiana feels compelled at this time to see that we live up to that rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I make these requests to illustrate the fact that I object to action on only one resolution, namely, Senate Joint Resolution 1, until it has been fully debated. I think my unanimous consent requests clearly demonstrate that my able and distinguished friends from Indiana objects to everything.

I am reminded of the story they tell up in Mitchell County, N.C., about John Gudger. John Gudger would never agree with anybody on any proposition. He found out that cabbage did not agree with him and from then on he would not eat anything but cabbage.

I want to warn my good friend from Indiana not to get into a situation such as John Gudger got into by reason of his objecting to everything.

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

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President —

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator withdraw his request for a quorum?

Mr. ERVIN. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I must say I share the dedicated concern of my friend from North Carolina for the interest of our country and for the important business that the committees to which he referred contribute to the well-being of our country.

But, Mr. President, I also feel that the Senator from North Carolina is correct in suggesting that the present matter should not be considered until it is fully debated. I would suggest perhaps that we can actually fully debate Senate Joint Resolution 1 if we stop spending so much time talking about the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. HART and Mr. ERVIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. HART. Mr. President, I shall disregard the counsel which has been given by the Senator from Indiana. I rise only to say that as one Senator I think the Senator from Indiana has been extraordinarily patient over these many, many months. I do not regard his actions now or at any point heretofore as arbitrary. I envy him and the quality of his patience.

Having sat with him on the Committee on the Judiciary and having attempted to support his efforts on this proposal for many, many months and having followed its slow course since then, I think the Nation is blessed in having a man of his patience and yet intense commitment.

The action we now take is the only way we have a fighting chance of permitting this body to exercise its will on a matter which I agree with the Senator from Indiana is of critical importance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina is recognized.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, I would like to say that I think the Senator from North Carolina is a very patient man also. I think the Senator from North Carolina and those associated with him have exactly the same right as the Senator from Indiana or any other Senator to fight for those things that we think the interests of our country require we fight for.

I do not mean any criticism of my good friend from Indiana. I have been charged a number of times with objecting to his requests and I wanted to illustrate the fact that the Senator from Indiana is just as prone to object to things he dislikes.

I wish to commend the Senator from Indiana for his zeal. I have repeatedly stated he has not done a thing except what the rules of the Senate permit him to do; and we have not done a thing except what the rules of the Senate permit us to do.

I am going to respectfully suggest, without saying who is the goose and who is the gander, that what is sauce for the goose under the rules is sauce for the gander.

I do not criticize the Senator from Indiana except I do point out the difference between the efforts of those associated with me in this matter and the efforts of the Senator from Indiana. We only oppose one thing and my good friend from Indiana opposes everything except that one thing. He has a perfect right to do so. I commend him for his zeal, his earnestness, and fighting spirit. I hope to enlist his aid in some just cause in the future.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I propose a unanimous-consent request that we proceed to the immediate consideration of S. 734, a bill by the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), to revise the Federal election laws, and for other purposes, and that it be voted on no later than 1 o'clock on tomorrow; and furthermore that we then proceed to a final vote on Senate Joint Resolution 1 on Tuesday at 1 o'clock.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. ERVIN. Can a Senator propound two matters in one unanimous-consent request? The rules restrict a Senator to just one request; do they not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that it can be done in a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. ERVIN. Is it possible, then, to interpose one objection to one part of the proposed unanimous-consent request and agree to the other part of it, because I do not object to the part of the unanimous-consent request that refers to the bill introduced by the distinguished Senator from Nevada, but I do object to the last part of the unanimous-consent request; and unless I can interpose a half objection, I shall have to interpose a whole objection?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I object. I object only because rule

XII would have to be waived in either case, and such waiver was not included in the Senator's request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is correct.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I appreciate the objection of the Senator from West Virginia. I think it is well taken. Of course, the same point would have to be made on a number of efforts made here this afternoon. I only pursued this course of action—

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. No, if the Senator will yield; that same objection could not have been made to any request which I have distinctly heard since I returned to the Chamber a few minutes ago. Rule XII requires the establishment of a quorum before agreeing on a specific time or date for a final vote on a bill or joint resolution.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President—

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana has the floor; does he not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. BAYH. I must say the point of the Senator from West Virginia is accurately stated. Of course, the Senator from Indiana could rephrase his unanimous-consent request without specifying a time certain, but that would prove nothing.

We have gone through, if I may say this respectfully, an interesting exercise which has not proved anything except the fact that we have spent more time going through the semantics of delay than we have debating the issue before us.

With all due respect to my distinguished friend from Alabama and my distinguished friend from North Carolina—and I know they did not mean to direct any real criticism at their friend from Indiana; we have a fine camaraderie—the first half of the period this morning in which the Senator from Alabama eloquently presented his views was directed not at the issue before us, not at the need to debate the meat of the question, but at the Senator from Indiana. I am complimented by the fact that apparently I am significant enough to be the target of such eloquent discussion, but if we are going to get on with the business of the Senate, let us get on with it. Let us vote the matter up or down and let us stop playing around with it.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, let me say, first of all, I very much appreciated what has been said over the days and the weeks, if indeed the discussion has continued on for that long a time, on this matter. I think it is worthwhile to take note of the fact that this is no ordinary appropriation bill. This is no ordinary authorization bill. This is no insignificant change in the law or the enacting of an ordinary law that we are talking about. We are talking about amending the Constitution of the United States, and I do not think that is something that ought to be taken lightly or ought to be resolved hurriedly or with less than full understanding.

While there may be those who contend that the efforts of some constitute a determination to filibuster, I would suggest that the public at large has indeed had occasion to study this proposal, as those

of us in the Senate have. I know that a number of important columnists; I know that a number of important newspapers and news magazines, have taken positions and have spoken out with clarity and with firmness that was not exhibited earlier.

As a consequence, I do not think it has been a futile effort at all. I do not think it is an effort that ought to be concluded with less than a clear understanding by everybody in this body, because we are talking about changing an instrument that has served this country for a long, long time.

As I said earlier today, the Record will disclose that it has served us very well. As a matter of fact, I know of no comparable government in the world, or any nation anywhere near the size of ours, that can boast the success that is ours.

As a consequence, my belief is that a majority of the people of this country, because of this debate, are deciding whether they favor or whether they oppose Senate Joint Resolution 1. If my mail is any indication, I would say that the people of Wyoming are even more firmly convinced than they were several months ago that this proposed change in the Constitution is not in the public interest.

Rather than deplore what has been said, to make light of it, to criticize those who want to be certain that the people of this country understand, I would suggest that what we ought to do is express our gratitude to those Senators who have taken an important role in this debate, who have gone to the trouble to study the facts, to research the history, to see how our system works, and make comparisons between our system and other systems, in order that we might better understand what it is we are talking about and have a more solid basis of fact from which to make a determination as to the desirability of change.

I suspect that the cloture motion will be voted down. I suspect that if we took a vote on Senate Joint Resolution 1 itself, it would fail to get the votes required in order to submit the proposition to the people of the United States.

I have no doubt at all that, when we look back with the vantage point that time gives us, we will be pleased, indeed, that we did not hurriedly take an action which we might have regretted for a long time.

Earlier, I said one of the things I learned in the few years I have been a Member of this body I learned from the late, great Everett Dirksen. Without presuming to recall precisely what he said, he said essentially this: "I have never seen any idea whose time had arrived denied by this body because of the inability to invoke cloture. But," he said, "on the other hand, I have seen a great many issues more thoroughly debated, more clearly understood, and accommodations reached that resulted in better legislation, sounder legislation, than would have resulted had we proceeded hurriedly and without the sort of debate that characterizes the Senate as the greatest deliberative body on earth. We would have gone down the wrong path a number of times."

I think Senator Dirksen's words are just as applicable today as they were during the times when he expressed them.

With that, let me say that I am not one bit discouraged by what has happened here. I do regret that sometimes we have to go through this sort of exercise in order that everyone can understand more fully. But all I can say is that when we have something that has served the country as well as the Constitution of the United States, an instrument that historians throughout the entire world look upon with great admiration, and indeed great amazement and wonder at how those persons who framed it were able to draw it from their collective intelligence and collective wisdom and education—the variety of experiences that enabled them to hammer out something that would stand the test of time—that could be amended from time to time with these written-in safeguards, then I think we see something of the character of the instrument that we are dealing with, and we can better understand why it is important that we do not amend it hurriedly.

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, I certainly hope that the remarks of the Senator from Indiana were not construed as in any way being critical of those who opposed his views on this particular subject, or demanded that it be discussed adequately and fully. In fact, the Senator from Indiana went through the very difficult process of objecting to those committee meetings just so that we could debate it.

What the Senator from Indiana did suggest, and what he suggests now, is that it is rather inconsistent for some Members—not including his friend from Wyoming—to have suggested, on the one hand, that the Senator from Indiana is imposing a hardship on the Senate by denying committees to meet, and, on the other hand, that he is derelict in his duty by not permitting full debate. That is exactly the nature of the remarks that were made earlier. I was said to be the one responsible for our not having full debate because I sat here 2 or 3 days, or 4 or 5 days, last week, and did not object to going on to other business; after stating that the proponents had consummated their case.

This is inconsistent, and I hope we do have a full debate. That is why we are here. I share the concern of my friend from Wyoming. Indeed, I cannot honestly say how many votes are present on final passage for this matter. But I feel we have an obligation to vote it up or down.

It seems to me, if there is wisdom in the words of our late friend and colleague, Senator Dirksen, that the filibuster rule itself is to give the country time to consider its actions on significant measures, that this test can be applied to one degree if we are debating a measure which requires 51 votes in this body, and in that case, perhaps, an argument can be made that we should have more time; but it seems a bit difficult to the Senator from Indiana to suggest that a matter that needs the votes of two-thirds of this body to support and pass it, the same

number required for cloture, is not getting adequate protection by the number of votes required.

Furthermore, as far as the time is concerned, the Senator from Indiana would like to suggest for the consideration of his friend from Wyoming that not only do we require a higher test of support on the floor of the Senate, namely, two-thirds, for a constitutional amendment, but we require sufficient time, and the ordeal, really, of getting three-fourths of our State legislatures to ratify it.

So I would think that double test, much more strenuous than that applied to normal legislation, would cause the Senate to consider seriously the wisdom, or lack thereof, of filibustering a bill which requires two-thirds of the Senate to support it in the first place, and then the time and struggle necessary to get three-fourths of the legislators to support it.

Although I have sat through several filibusters in my period of time in the Senate, I do not recall any other time when a constitutional amendment has been filibustered.

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

Mr. BAYH. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HANSEN. I would suggest that this, then, would afford the Senator an opportunity to tell his grandchildren of such an experience.

Mr. President, it seems to me that there is a question of semantics involved in trying to determine what is difficult, serious consideration, on the one hand, or filibustering on the other.

Mr. BAYH. I was glad to see that the Senator really did not suggest that he was participating in a filibuster, then. If that is accurate, I do not want the RECORD to show that my friend from Wyoming really believe what is going on now is a filibuster.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, I will leave that to the historians and the press to determine.

Mr. BAYH. I think they will speak eloquently of what has been said, so I shall not pursue the matter further.

Mr. ERVIN. Mr. President, so that Senators may understand, I would like, for the RECORD, to explain the difference between a filibuster and an educational debate.

If those who are delaying matters and those who are speaking at length have views which are similar to yours, it is an educational debate. If those who are delaying matters and speaking at length express views dissimilar to yours, it is a filibuster.

So, by that criterion, I would submit that the Senator from Indiana is correct; since we have expressed views contrary to his, it is a filibuster, but since he expresses views contrary to those of the Senator from Alabama and myself, the filibuster is on the other side and the educational debate is on our side; and that makes the whole problem just as simple and understandable as the noon-day sun in a cloudless sky.

But the fact remains that I have asked for unanimous consent by the Senator

from Indiana, and I have been sharply criticized for so doing. The fact remains that those who are associated with me are opposed to an immediate vote without adequate debate on one proposition only: Senate Joint Resolution 1. My good friend from Indiana, acting perfectly within his rights, has objected to everything else. That is a fact, and I am saying it in the best of humor. I am not exasperated. I am bound to say, though, that from the standpoint of onlookers, it may appear like the fellow up in Watauga County, who went down to county court, and they told him before he left to come back and make a report on court that night at the neighborhood store.

They asked him that night how it was, and he said, "There was the judge, sittin' up high, just like he was the presiding officer; and there was the jury; and there was the witnesses and the parties; and there was the lawyers. Some of the lawyers was objectin', and the others was exceptin', and the costs was pilin' up."

REMOVAL OF INJUNCTION OF SEC- RECY FROM EXECUTIVE M, 91st CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, as in executive session, I ask unanimous consent that the injunction of secrecy be removed from Executive M, 91st Congress, second session, the Nice Agreement Concerning the International Classification of Goods and Services to Which Trademarks Are Applied, signed June 15, 1957, and a copy of that agreement as revised at Stockholm July 14, 1967, transmitted to the Senate today by the President of the United States, and that the agreement, together with the President's message, be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed, and that the President's message be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MONDALE). Without objection it is so ordered.

The message from the President is as follows:

To the Senate of the United States:

With a view to receiving the advice and consent of the Senate to accession, I transmit herewith a certified copy of the Nice Agreement Concerning the International Classification of Goods and Services to which Trademarks are Applied, signed June 15, 1957, together with an English translation thereof, and a certified copy of that Agreement as revised at Stockholm July 14, 1967, together with an English translation thereof. I transmit also, for the information of the Senate, the report of the Secretary of State with respect to the Agreements.

The organization set up by the Agreement is responsible for establishing an international classification of trademarks used in over 60 countries. It is important from the standpoint of the interest of trademark owners and from the standpoint of effective government administration of its trademark functions that the United States accede to the Agreements so that it may participate as a member in the organization.

I recommend that the Senate give early and favorable consideration to the Agreements submitted herewith and give its advice and consent to accession.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 24, 1970.

DIRECT POPULAR ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, what is the pending business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending business is Senate Joint Resolution 1, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and the Vice President.

ADJOURNMENT

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 12 noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, September 25, 1970, at 12 noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 24, 1970:

ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

Artemus E. Weatherbee, of Maine, who was confirmed by the Senate September 1, 1970, as U.S. Director of the Asian Development Bank, to serve on the Bank with the rank of Ambassador.

U.S. DISTRICT COURTS

Edward R. Becker, of Pennsylvania, to be a U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Pennsylvania, vice a new position created under Public Law 91-272 approved June 2, 1970.

U.S. COAST GUARD

The following named officers of the Coast Guard for promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander:

Michael J. Schiro	Richard L. Devries
Richard V. Consigli	Thomas D. Fisher
Clifford E. Banner	George J. Buffleben, Jr.
Thomas F. McGrath	III
Phillip J. Bull	Robert P. Dickenson
Michael H. Dennis	Billy W. Richardson
Alvin Cattalini	David J. Connolly
Carl D. Bossard	Robert L. Kuhnle
Gary F. Van Nevel	Virgil F. Keith, Jr.
Clinton H. Smoke, Jr.	Harry D. Nelson
Frank A. Boersma	Karl L. Reichelt
Richard S. Bizar	Richard A. Walsh
Roger W. Bing	William B. Waff
Joseph B. Coyle	John E. Lindak
William R. Wilkins	Harvey F. Orr
George J. Thompson	David A. Young
Arden B. Chittick	James J. Lantry
William J. Minor	Kent M. Ballantyne
Joseph W. Lersch	Philip R. North
Gerald F. Woolever	Charles B. Mosher
Nelson H. Keeler, Jr.	George H. Brown III
James L. Webster	John W. Greason
Harry T. Suzuki	Robert G. Bates
Robert A. Major	Rudy K. Peschel
C. Richard Mockler	Robert E. P. Fenton
Warren D. Snider	Michael J. Jacobs
Robert L. Vence, Jr.	William M. Baxley
Gill R. Goodman	William A. Caster
Howard B. Gehring	Arthur B. Shepard
	Peter C. Busick

William D. Bechtel
 Daniel K. Shorey
 Jeffrey D. Hartman
 Ernst M. Cummings
 Denis J. Bluett
 Edward E. Demuzzio
 John D. Adams
 Jan F. Smith
 Charles E. Haas
 Dana W. Starkweather
 Roger W. Hassard
 David L. Andrews
 James F. McCahill, Jr.
 Barham F. Thomson
 III
 Nicholas H. Allen
 Richard J. Heym
 Anthony R. Adams
 William A. Monson
 James C. Haldeman
 Karl W. Mirmak
 Gerald D. Mills
 Lyman B. Norton
 Lynn M. Brown
 Phillip J. Kles
 Monette B. J. Ratcliff
 Virgil J. O'Grady
 Dale W. Johnson
 Charles L. Gomez
 Jacob P. Aucoin, Sr.
 Howard H. Lindsay
 Thomas E. Brown
 John P. DeLeonardis
 Frederic J. Grady III
 John W. Lockwood
 Charles W. Peterson
 Marion T. Tilghman
 Charles A. Carleton
 Roderick Martin III
 Warren A. Baker
 Martin F. Heatherman
 William H. Solley, Jr.
 James C. Quinn
 Conley D. Nelson
 Barrett T. Beard
 Richard J. Zwally
 Morgan C. Hutto, Jr.
 Gilbert Shaw
 George G. Bannan
 Charlie R. Polly
 William F. Queen
 Wilbur J. Davis
 Jesse H. Burgess
 Marion O. Simmons
 Calvin W. Pratt
 John E. Dunn
 Thomas E. Bockman
 Edmond R. Harless
 Jackie S. Thornhill
 William L. Taylor
 Francis J. Taddei
 Homer T. Austin, Jr.
 Chester R. Brooks
 Melvin W. Ellis, Jr.
 Edwin M. Smithers
 Penrose C. Dietz

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force, under the appropriate provisions of chapter 835, title 10, United States Code, as amended. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law.

Captain to major

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

Aaron, George B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Abbott, Wayne T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Abell, Maurice A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Acker, William L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Adams, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Adams, Thomas R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Adams, Willis A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Adamson, Cecil L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Agar, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Agniel, David B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ahlborn, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Aho, Arthur C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ahrens, Arthur H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Aird, Donald W., xxx-xx-xxxx

James J. Burley
 Raymond E. Aholt
 Frank J. Miller, Jr.
 Patrick J. Mahon
 Robert C. Sachs
 John P. Hart, Jr.
 Clarence L. Miller
 William M. Rickett
 Mario J. Camuccio
 Ellsworth N. Slater
 Richard J. Kilroy
 Warren B. Barrett
 Cluese Russell
 Charles R. Wilson
 John H. Wiechert
 Donald D. Luedke
 Dalton L. Burrus
 Sewell G. Loggins
 Babbie L. Bentley
 Allie C. Woodcock, Jr.
 Conrad A. Pasbrig
 Charles M. Saylor
 Harold T. Collins
 William H. Speas
 George R. Thomas
 Alfred T. Wilcox
 Hugh A. Dayton
 Edward L. Weilbacher
 Roger R. Roznoski
 Richard R. Bock
 Alfred W. Harrell
 James L. Van Horn
 William A. Swansburg
 Donald P. Billings
 Robert D. Weddell
 Donald J. Strathern
 Jack W. Wrotton
 Dennis R. Kay
 David A. Meadows
 Richard G. Gobble
 Robert C. Wright
 Harold D. Willis
 Roger W. Allison, Jr.
 Gerard Barton
 Karl A. Luck
 Gary T. Morgan
 Joseph A. Fullmer
 Milton C. Richards, Jr.
 Frederick H. Clausen
 Paul A. Dux
 Lawrence A. Minor
 William N. Zensen, Jr.
 David O. Drake
 Robert L. Armacost
 Kurt G. Zimmerman
 John N. Naegle
 Morris D. Helton
 David E. Clements
 Norman T. Saunders
 John R. Harrald
 James C. Card
 Richard D. Herr
 Michael B. Stenger
 Galen R. Siddall
 Ray E. Henderson

Akerlund, Edward T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Akers, Ronald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Albertson, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Albrecht, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Albrecht, Ronald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Alexander, Jimmie M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Alexander, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Alkire, Melvin G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Allen, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Allen, Jimmy W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Allington, Maynard F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Althouse, Clyde R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ames, Ivan G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Anaclerio, Michael, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Anderson, Alan H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Anderson, Arthur D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Anderson, Floyd R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Anderson, Gerald M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Anderson, Jack E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Anderson, John S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Anderson, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Anderson, Melvin J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Anderson, Philip J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Andrews, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Anelli, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Angell, Jerry W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Arbuthnot, Alfred H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Arceneaux, Francis X., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Archie, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Armitage, Merlin E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Armstrong, Frederic C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Arnold, Lawrence D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ashley, Donald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Attarian, Peter J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Aunan, Wallace N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Austin, James T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Austin, Randall R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Autery, Clarence R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Baca, Manuel J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bachem, Fritz M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bachman, Ronald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Backhaus, George J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bailey, Bruce M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bailey, Jackie L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Baird, Orville B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Baisden, Kenneth W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Baker, Duane A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Baker, Hugh H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Baker, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Baker, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bale, William F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Balent, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ball, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Ballot, Charles J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Balo, Ronald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Banaszak, Jerome J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Banholzer, Alfred E., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Banner, Hastings W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bannon, Paul W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Banta, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Barbel, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Barbera, Richard V., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Barckhoff, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Barger, James S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Barkmo, Norman M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Barker, Cole W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Barlow, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Barnes, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Barnes, Kenneth C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Barnes, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Barnt, Pat E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Barrett, Archie D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Barrett, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Barrett, Russell W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Barry, Daniel P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bartholomew, Charles W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bartholomew, Frank C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bartlett, Henry C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bartlett, Ronald A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Basel, Gene I., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bass, Stanley A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bateman, Richard W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bateman, Robert P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bates, David B., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bates, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bates, Neil G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bath, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bathke, Robert K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Batts, James S., xxx-xx-xxxx

Baughman, Harry H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Baumann, Paul K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Baumann, Paul A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Baumann, Walter G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bavousett, Conrad L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bays, Brooks G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Beale, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Beard, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Beckett, Roderick G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Beckett, Ronald C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Beckhan, Donald D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Beers, Alva E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Began, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Belcher, Ronald H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bell, Billy N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Belles, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Belt, Robert K., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Benjamin, Arthur J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bennett, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bennett, William T. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Benoit, Harold H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Benson, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bentley, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bentz, Glen A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bergman, Erwin, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bernd, David P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bernert, George W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Berry, Stanley D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Berthold, Hubert M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bice, Don L. F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Biehn, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bigelow, Daniel J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Billett, Roger H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bilyeu, Lowell D., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bingham, Jack E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bishop, Erastus N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bishop, Richard F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bishop, Ronald J. B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bishop, Warren E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bithell, Wayne, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bitner, Ludie W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Blanch, Claude C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Blankenship, Jesse L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Blanton, William I., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Blaylock, Bobby G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Blevins, Edward A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Blinn, Donald E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Blom, Roger L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bloomfield, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bloss, Stephen R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Blough, Carl W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Boatwright, Charles A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bodington, Mountford E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Boggs, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bond, Parker L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bond, Ronald A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bonner, William T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bonnette, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Boone, Daniel W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Boone, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Boothe, Kenneth W., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Borie, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Boucher, Raymond E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bourcier, Lucien E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bourgeois, Gerald F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bowen, Phillip K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bowie, Donald A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bowldren, Max S., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bowles, Neil H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bowman, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Boyd, John T., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bozeman, Gerald E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bradbury, John N., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Braden, Courtland R., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bradley, Edgar A., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bradley, Martin G., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bradley, Mitchell H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bradley, Olin H., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brammer, John E. II, xxx-xx-xxxx
 Branan, Carl K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Branby, Harlan E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Branch, Leonard J., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Branham, Ruel K., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brant, Raymond F., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Bratcher, Raymond E., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Braue, Harold L., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Braun, Cecil O., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brauner, Henry P., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brazell, Lee M., xxx-xx-xxxx
 Brazelton, Douglas W., xxx-xx-xxxx

Breaud, Alfred A., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Brecher, James D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Breckenridge, James A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Breedlove, William O., III **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Breen, Andrew J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Brehm, Richard L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Brent, Frank N., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Brestel, Max C. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Brewer, George A., III, **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Bright, Mahrlon R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Brininstool, Edward P. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Britos, Peter J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Broers, Deryl D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Broske, Bernard J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Broussard, Ray E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Brown, Charles L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Brown, Clarence E., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Brown, Donald E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Brown, James T., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Brown, Richard A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Brown, Robert M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Brown, Troy M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Brown, Wallace E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Brumley, Wendell E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Bruno, Donald J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Bryan, Kenneth D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Bryant, James W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Bucciarelli, Marco A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Buchanan, Frank A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Buckland, Frank P., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Buddi, John F., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Budzowski, Benjamin M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Bugge, John E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Buglewicz, Francis J., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Bullard, Stanley G. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Bumgarner, Robert R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Buntun, Laurie A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Buoni, Frederick B. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Burdick, Martin M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Burger, Jack T. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Burnthorne, Bryan R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Burress, William R., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Burton, Richard L., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Busbee, John H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Bush, Clarence H., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Bush, Kenneth **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Bussard, Neil C. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Bussell, Gerald Q. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Bustle, Lawrence E., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Butkewicz, Peter J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Butler, Gregory J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Butschek, Robert J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Byrd, William C. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Byrus, Robert L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cadieux, Ronald A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Caley, Don C. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Calkin, Maynard S., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Callis, David M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Calvert, Donald R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Campbell, Bart C. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Campbell, Edward F. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Campbell, Ralph N. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cannon, Daniel P. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cannon, John W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cantrell, Edwin B., III **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cappel, John J., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Carleton, Joseph M., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Carlson, Donald C. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Carlson, Milo L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Carlton, James E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Carney, Jack L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Carnochan, John A. F. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Carroll, Gary K. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Carroll, Harvey C., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Carskadon, Thomas H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Carson, Harold E., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Carter, Donald M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Carter, Robert D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Carter, William T. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Caruso, David **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Casari, Guido J., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cassell, Gerald G. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cassell, James D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cassidy, Philip E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Castleberry, Allan R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cataldi, Robert R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Catalfamo, Philip J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cattee, Eugene P. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Celick, Janet R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Centofanti, Joseph J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Chadwick, Peter D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Chambers, Jerry L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Chambers, William R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Chance, Victor P. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Chaney, Clyde **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Chansler, William A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Chapin, Charles T. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Chapman, Willard T. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Charles, Cecil M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Chase, Arthur L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Chase, Franklin L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Chase, Paul N. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Chason, Lloyd R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Chavez, Gabriel V. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Chesley, Paul L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Chiapetta, Richard L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Chilbert, Dominic F. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Ching, Norman Y. S. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Chiorino, Silvio B. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Christensen, Gary W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Christensen, Merton J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Christensen, Richard W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Christie, Vern W., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Christman, Donald O. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Christy, Frank J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Church, Larry D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Ciambrone, Thomas W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cilek, George R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Clair, Carl F. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Clark, Charles R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Clark, Chester G. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Clark, Don A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Clark, Edwin H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Clark, Gaylord W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Clark, Milton M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Clark, Phillip D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Clark, Robert N. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Clark, Thomas S., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Clark, William R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Clarke, David K. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Clarke, Herbert F. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Clarke, William D., III, **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Clay, Wayne J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Claymore, Paul T. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Clearly, John J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cleary, Patrick J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Clements, Douglas M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Clendeninen, Darby L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Clum, Alfred D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Coats, George E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cobell, Earl G. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cochrane, John H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cockrell, Allen A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Coffey, Robert T. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Coker, Walter J., III, **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Coldwater, Robert E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cole, Alan R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Coleman, Charles E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Collipi, Thomas C. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Colton, Thomas A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Colyer, James A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Combs, Kenneth O. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Comeaux, Paul C. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cone, Ronald L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Confer, Marion E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Connell, David C. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Connolly, Keith B. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Connolly, Michael F. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Conover, Laurence W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cook, George E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cook, Tom R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cook, William A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cooke, James D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cooke, Lowell T. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cooke, Ralph M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cool, Gary D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cooley Anthon E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cooley, Robert B. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Coolidge, John K. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cooney Joseph E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cooper, Leroy D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cooper Sheldon H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Coote, William A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Copley, James E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Corbett, James A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Corder, Charles V., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cordes, Robert A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Corley, Parris L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cormier, Johnny E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cornelison, Walter C., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Corroon, Thomas F. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Corry, George R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Corser James B., III, **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Coss, Donald L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Costas, William T. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Costello, Raymond P. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Costin, James L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cothran, Thurman D., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Couch, Joel M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Coursen, Franklin H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Couture, Donald J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Couture, Marcel A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cowdrey, Donald H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cox, Billy W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cox, Hugh L., III, **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cox, James W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cox, Thomas A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Coyle, Francis N. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Coyle, Harold S., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Coyle Ronald P. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Craft, Richard L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Craig, James T., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Crawford, Gerald P. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Crawford, Harold R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Crawford, John R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cribb, Donald R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Crist Robert B. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Critchley, Harry R., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Crochet, Alex P., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Crochet Calvin J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Croft, Eldred C. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Crook, Richardson H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cross, Charles A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Crowley Richard T. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Croxton, Donovan C. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Crum, Fred B. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Crumroy, Otto F., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cudahy, George F. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cudmore, William T. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cummings, Paul **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cunningham, William F., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cuny, Leroy G. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Curtis, Alan M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Curtis, Billy A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cushenberry, Anthony S. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Custer, Gomer C. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cutler, Harold G. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cyrus, Jack R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Dabbs, Travis D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Dabrowski, Charles T. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Dahl, Sigvard, Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Dalfonso, Edward V. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Dalton, Donald J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Damoth, Donald R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Daniels, Preston J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Darcey, Edward H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Darden, Henry R., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Davenport, Ronald L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Davey, Thomas J., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Davidson, Alfred H., III, **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Davis, David L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Davis, Donald H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Davis, Duane M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Davis, Eddie R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Davis, Edward K. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Davis, Harland M., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Davis, James E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Davis, Jon L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Davis, Melvin T. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Davis, Samuel J., II, **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Daye, Jerry G. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Dayton, Thomas E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Deal, Kenneth L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Deans, William R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Deardorf, Eldon N. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Deas, Robert S. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Debolt, James G. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Deering, Philip A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Dees, Buddy E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Defer, Richard H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Degraaf, John D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Deken, George T. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Dekeyser, Bernard R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Delashaw, Tho B., III, **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Deloach, William A., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Demchuk, Sergi L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Demichiel, Lino F. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Dempsey, George F. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Denard, James M., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Denham, John H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Dennehey, Joseph J., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Dennis, Joseph K. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Denton, Murray B. **xxx-xx-xxxx**

Depoorter, Win E. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Derbyshire, Ronald E. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Derrick, Elbert D., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Derrick, Thales A. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Desenfants, Robert E. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Desmond, William B., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Devito, Peter A. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Devoe, Frederic A., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Dibble, Hugh W. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Dickens, Irvin D. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Dickens, Milford L. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Dickensheets, Richard E. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Dickinson, Arthur L., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Dickson, William E., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Dietz, Albert E. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Dillman, Laurie E. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Dillon, Harley L., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Dillon, Richard T. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Disteldorf, Bernard N. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Dixon, Walter J. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Doby, Herb. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Dolan, William G., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Dolby, Robert C. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Donaldson, Charles A. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Dondero, David E. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Donley, Jack E. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Dooley, Thomas J. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Dorazio, Silvio L. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Douglas, Arthur E. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Douglas, McCleary A. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Dowell, Michael T. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Downey, James L. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Downey, Laurence R. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Downing, Wayne E. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Drexel, Anthony J., IV *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Driscoll, Bruce H. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Dubiel, Joseph J. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Duboise, Donald E. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Ducote, Richard J. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Dufresne, Ronald C. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Duggan, William Y. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Duke, Charles M., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Dundervill, Robert F., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Dunham, Norbert D. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Dunham, Robert A. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Dunlosky, Anthony W., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Dunn, Alden D. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Dupont, Joseph, Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Duriage, Henry J. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Dutt, Wendell A. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Dwinell, Donald W. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Dwyer, Gerald T. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Dwyer, James P. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Dwyer, Paul H. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Dyke, Frank P. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Eakin, William L. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Eary, Verla O., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 East, Roger W. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Easthom, James M. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Ebert, Hugh D., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Eden, Thomas D. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Edinger, Robert G. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Edler, Allan L. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Edmudson, Johnny H. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Edstrom, John K. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Edwards, Donald H. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Edwards, John R. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Edwards, Richard D. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Edwards, Robin W. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Edwards, Roger S. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Egel, Robert W. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Ehrenfried, Charles E. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Eibach, William J. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Einsel, Willis E. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Elder, Robert E. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Eldridge, George E. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Eliason, Norrell B. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Eller, James M. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Ellingson, Richard K. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Ellis, George J., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Ellis, Luard L. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Ellis, William E. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Elmer, Donald W. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Elsby, C. N. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Ely, Arben R., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Emory, James W. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Engebretson, Roger W. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Engel, Carl R. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 English, Delmar L. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Ennever, Robert O., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Ensslin, Kenneth C. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Epifani, Louis R. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Erhart, Robert J. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Erickson, Donald E. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Erni, Charles A. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Essmeier, Charles T. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Evans, Asa L., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Evans, Donald F. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Evgenides, Constantine N. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Ewald, Clarence J. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Ewing, Robert G. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Fabyanic, Thomas A. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Fair, John C. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Fake, Mary L. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Fanelli, William B. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Farina, Anthony F. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Fant, Rodney E. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Farris, Jack K. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Farthing, Fred G., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Faseler, Marion C. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Featherston, Norm F. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Feddern, Louis F. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Federici, Fred J., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Feliciano, Neri A. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Fenstermacher, Gene *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Fergus, John E. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Ferrell, Richard O. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Fessler, George R., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Field, James L. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Field Lawrence H. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Field, Robert W. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Finder, Jack L. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Findlay, Eugene H. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Fink, Barry N. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Finuf, Edward V. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Fisch, Charles T. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Fischer, Lowell W. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Fischer, Sherri H. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Fiscus, John E. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Fisher, John D. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Fisher, Robert B. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Fischer, Sherri H. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Flagg, Richard A., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Flanagan, Joseph J. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Flanik, Roger J. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Fleckenstein, John F. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Fleitz, Richard A. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Fleming, Leon P. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Fletcher, Carlos E. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Fletcher, Gallon K. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Flora, Earl L. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Flora, Roger T. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Flowers, Kenneth H. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Fluh, James F. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Fobair, Roscoe H. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Foote, John A., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Foray, John *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Ford, Joseph S., II *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Ford, Laymond N. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Ford, Richard T. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Forrest, John G., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Forshag, Donald E. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Forsyth, Milton D., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Fosse, James M. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Foster, Harl R. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Foster, Royal E., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Fowler, Charles W. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Fox, John F. C. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 France, John B. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Franco, John J., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Franco, Joseph M., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Franell, Joseph E., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Franklin, Maury A. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Frazier, Lester G. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Freathy, Frederick C., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Fred, Richard E. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Freed, Darryl W. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Freeland, Edward L. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Freeman, Dan W. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Freeman, David E. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 French, Harry L. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Frick, Glenn E. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Friesel, Clarence E. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Friesen, Don D. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Frisbee, John A. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Frische, Norbert W. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Fruehauf, Benjamin F., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Fry, Robert S., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Fuhrman, Richard *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Fujimoto, Leslie I. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Fuller, Glenn L. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Fuller, Hughie E. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Fullwood, Robert G. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Funkhauser, John L. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gadd, Robert F., III *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gaffney, Robert F. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gage, Robert G. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Galbraith, Buren G. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Galbraith, James L. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gamble, Wayne W. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gammons, Norman E. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gano, Donald W. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gantt, Leon O. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gapp, Frank, J. E. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gardner, Lorin R. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gardner, Raymond L. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gardner, Richard A. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gardner, Robert F. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gardner, Ronald E. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Garneau, Armand J. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gary, Roger O., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gasho, James B., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gasior, Kenneth V. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gates, Leo V., II *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gauthier, Ralph A. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gebhardt, Kenneth N. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gee, Edward L. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Geiger, Oswald T., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gentry, Charles W. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gentry, Jerauld R. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gerber, Gerald A. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gerding, Jay D. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gerhardt, Richard C. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gericke, William A., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gerlitz, Gary H. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Germann, David B. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gerrish, Joseph R. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gholson, Lee W. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gibbons, Gerald G. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gibbs, David P., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gibson, Charles H. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gibson, Jimmie A. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gibson, Lester R. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gierhart, Loran W. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Giesler, Richard P. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gift, Ivan J. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gilbert, Billy B. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gilbert, Stephen W. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gilbreath, James B. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gilchrist, William E. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gillespie, Fred D. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gilliland, James N. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gillis, Richard F. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gingrich, Charles E. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gingrich, Franklin J., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Ginwright, John B. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gioco, Frank C. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gionis, Nicholas G. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Glass, Carter M. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Glass, George J. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Glazier, Dean H. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gleason, Francis E., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gleneck, Norman T. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Glyphis, Benedict E. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gober, Edmund S. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gober, Paul D. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Godwin, John B., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Goggins, William B., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Goldberg, William *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Golightly, Robert D. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Golly, Robert T. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Golob, David R. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gomez, Ben I. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gondran, Gerald J. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gonzales, Conrad C. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Goodall, Harry A. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Goodnight, James L. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Goodwin, Flay O., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Goodwin, Reginald S., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Goodwin, Thomas P., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Goold, Kenneth C., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gopsill, Kenneth M., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gosnell, Bruce A. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gossman, Gerald J. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Goubert, Peter A. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Goudy, Dennis L. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Gowen, Richard J. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Graham, Bruce M., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.
 Graham, Raymond L., Jr. *xxx-xx-xxxx*.

Gravis, Jack D. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Gray, Donald E. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Gray, John A. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Gray, Joseph A. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Green, Charles K. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Green, James H. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Green, Stephen D. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Greene, William A. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Greer, Lee V. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Gregorios, Basil D. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Greshel, James T. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Griffin, Donald G. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Griffith, John E. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Griffith, Robert M. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Grim, Harry J. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Grimes, Keith R. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Grissman, Robert J. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Grizzard, John L. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Groeninger, Donald P. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Groll, George W. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Grotte, Richard A. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Grotz, Gerald C. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Groves, Louise L. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Gude, William W. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Guest, Tommy D. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Guidi, Adolph M., Jr. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Guin, Bob W. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Gullick, Thomas E. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Gustafson, Freddie A. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Gutchess, Robert [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Guthrie, Loren V., III [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hable, Richard G. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hackley, William M., Jr. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Haerle, Peter J. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Haertel, Hermann [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hafner, Patrick H. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hagen, James F. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Haight, Lawrence D. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Haight, Walter R. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Halachis, John [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hale, Alan B. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Haliday, James T. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hall, Charles R. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hall, Keith N. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hall, Michael D. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Halliday, Hugh D. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hally, Thomas J. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hamby, Carl L. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hamm, William D. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hamm, William P. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hammond, Claude G., Jr. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hammond, George R. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hamrick, Paul A. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hand, Norbert R., Jr. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hanford, John O. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hankins, Donald J. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hanlon, David E. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hansen, Dewayne T. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hansen, Ernest L. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hanson, Charles A. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hardwick, James R. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hargrave, Charles O. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hargrove, Willis L. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Harkins, Willis W. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Harmon, Kenneth T. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Harmer, Robert A. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Harner, Ronald L. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Harrington, Cyrus R., Jr. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Harrington, Robert N. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Harris, Charles E. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Harris, Eddie W. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Harris, Elmer R. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Harris, George E., Jr. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Harris, Harry G. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Harris, Roland L. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Harrison, Bronwood [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Harrison, Corbet L. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Harrison, Tommy G. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Harston, Alfred L. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hartke, Richard H. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hartman, Delano W. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hartman, Nathan [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hartmann, Henry R. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Harvey, Thomas E. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Harwell, William P. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hastings, Dan K. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hatch, Louis G. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Haupt, Howard F., II [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hausmann, Frank W. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Havard, Robert N. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hawes, Robert W. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hawkins, James R. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Haynes, James E., Jr. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Haynes, William J. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Haynes, William J. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Haynes, Zack T. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hearn, Norman E. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hedge, Richard W. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Heidebaugh, Gary T. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Heinemann, Horst R. H. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Heitman, John H. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hellings, Frazier J. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Helm, Jack [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Helms, Howard E. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Helton, Billy J. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Helton, William G. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Helvie, Gail D. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hemphill, Dewey K. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Henderson, Charles D. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Henderson, Jerry L. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Henderson, Ronald F. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Henderson, William F. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hendren, William L. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hendricks, Clifford U., Jr. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hendricks, Roy J. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hendrickson, Dale R. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hendrix, Jack L. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Henkin, Ernest [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Henry, Eugene M. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Henry, Robert L. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hensel, Robert E. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Herculson, Robert J., Jr. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hering, Harold L. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Herman, Alan I. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hermanson, Robert F. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Herring, John C. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Herring, Russell N. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Herrman, Leroy [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hershon, Alan B. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Heske, William J. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hess, Stanley R. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hesse, Kenneth R. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hetherington, Robert B. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Heverly, Robert E. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hewitt, Larry C. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hickey, Thomas J. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hicks, Jerry N. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Higgins, Norman A. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 High, John M., III [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hill, James T. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hill, Thomas D. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hill, William B. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hill, William C. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hillyer, George W., III [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hinderliter, Stephen B. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hindman, Charles U. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hine, Robert D. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hines, John W. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hines, William C. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hintgen, Roland L. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hirst, Donald L. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hirth, Richard M. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hiskey, Bernell L. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hixon, Russell A. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hixon, Allen D. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hobbs, Terrence E. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hockett, George R. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hockney, James N. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hodge, William E. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hodges, Bob P. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hodgins, Frederick J. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hodgson, Earl E., Jr. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hodgson, Jerry D. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hoffman, Donald W. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hoffman, Joseph C. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hogendorf, Heinrich F. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hogg, Walter L. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hoke, George J., Jr. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Holcombe, Kenneth E. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hollarn, Thomas J. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hollis, Billy R. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Holman, Orville E., Jr. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Holt, Leigh M. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Honan, Martin F., Jr. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hood, Robert N. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hooker, Charles W. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hopkins, David D. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hopkins, Donald J. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hopper, John P. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Horney, Warren R. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hostetler, Connie M. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hottle, James N., Jr. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hough, Robert J. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Houldsworth, Donald C. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Houston, Albert C., Jr. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hover, Robert C. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hovingh, James G. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Howard, Donald P. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Howard, Garnet R. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hoy, Walter S. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hubert, David C. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Huffman, Elmer E. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hughes, Harley A. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hughes, Harold B. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hughes, John D. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hughes, Larry B. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hughes, Richard W. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Huls, Robert G. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hunter, William R. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Huntley, David C. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hurlburt, Richard G. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Hurn, William P. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Huston, Richard C., Jr. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Ingle, Jack C. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Inouye, Roy H. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Ivey, James C., Jr. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Jackson, Billy L. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Jackson, Clifford M. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Jackson, Jerry D. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Jacoby, Jackie L. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Jagrowski, Gerald L. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Jaicks, Frederick B. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 James, Gobel D. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 James, Richard S. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Jamieson, James R. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Jamieson, Richard V. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Janota, Paul [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Janssen, Ronald W. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Jarrett, John W. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Jeffries, Calvin J. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Jenerette, William D., Jr. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Jenkins, Ernest L., Jr. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Jenkins, Frank R. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Jenkins, Robert B. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Jennings, Charles J. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Jenrich, Edwin [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Jensen, Stanley F. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Jensen, Ted W. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Jerman, Robert G. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Jessen, Richard H. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Johns, Clyde L. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Johnson, Allen T. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Johnson, Bobby S. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Johnson, Donald E. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Johnson, Donald E. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Johnson, Harold C. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Johnson, James R. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Johnson, James W. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Johnson, James A. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Johnson, Joe E. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Johnson, John A. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Johnson, Kenneth R. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Johnson, Larry D. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Johnson, Neal G. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Johnson, Stewart W. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Johnson, Theodore E. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Johnson, Thomas N. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Johnson, William F. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Johnston, Roy C. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Jones, Bobbie L. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Jones, Donald L. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Jones, Donald E. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Jones, James T. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Jones, Marvin L. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Jones, Richard A. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Jones, Robert D. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Jordan, Jennie R. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Jorgensen, Robert L. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Jorgensen, Wesley H. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Jowers, William L. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Jowett, Francis W., Jr. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Joyce, William J. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Juhi, Clarence A. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Kagarise, John D. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Kahler, George E. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Kaiser, Edward S. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Kalmar, Jack R. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Kandle, Charles K. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Kane, Donald G. [xxx-xx-xxxx]
 Karaba, Vincent S. [xxx-xx-xxxx]

Karges, Donald D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Karpen, Donald J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Karr, Donald R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kast, Henry G. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kasznia, David J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kavinsky, John E., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kazanjian, Ramon J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Keating, James H., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Keating, Michael E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Keating, Robert J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Keen, Robert I. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Keenan, John H., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Keene, Marcus B., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Keith, Robert C. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Keller, Bruce G. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Keller, Wendell R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kelley, Thomas R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kellogg, Verna S., II. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kellokoski, David E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kelly, Allan J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kelly, Dana K. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kelly, John J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kelly, Nolan R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kelm, James E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kelsey, David S. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kenagy, Lloyd N. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kendall, Robert N., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kennedy, Edward C. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kennedy, Richard E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kenney, Jack W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kerr, Robert R., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kibbey, Richard A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kidd, Clifford S., III. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kidwell, Howard W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kiefel, Ernst P., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kiernan, Philip D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 King, Larry L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kinney, Raymond C. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kinser, Donald B. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kiplinger, Keith E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kirk, Harris W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kirk, Joe R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kirk, Leon S. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kirkpatrick, Richard C. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kirnberger, Richard J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kitch, John I., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kittinger, James D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kjeldgaard, Louis D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Klein, Jack L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kleperis, John V. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Klick, Richard F. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Klinestiver, Lawrence R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Klump, George K. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Knight, James F. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Koerner, William L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kohlhaas, Richard L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kohut, Joseph **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Koppenhaver, Donald N. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kovach, Gerald J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kovacs, John A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kovacs, Stephen F. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kraft, Gottfried H. G. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Krause, Keith E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kreger, Kenneth W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kroppach, James R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Krull, Larry D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kuehn, Joseph W., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kuhns, Thomas J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kunz, Donald A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kuplins, Arnis J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kutulas, John E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kutyna, Donald J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Labonte, Richard L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lacasse, Joseph W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lacasse, Richard E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lace, William H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Laehr, Arthur E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Laifer, Frank L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lally, Richard H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lamb, Amherst R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lambert, Luther E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lammers, Kurt M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Landers, Bobbie J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lange, Gary E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Langer, Peter E., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Langford, John A., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Langmead, Thomas T. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lapine, James E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lapp, Martin F. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Larsen, Bent E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**

Larsen, Earl A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Larson, Eugene L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Larue, Carl A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lasater, John R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lasiter, Carl W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Latham, Patricia D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Laur, William A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lauruhn, Delbert W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lavis, Michael P. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lawton, Timothy G. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Layne, Clyde E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Leach, Harold D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Leal, Lupe S. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Leavitt, Robert E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Leblanc, Lynn L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Leclerc, Richard D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Ledford, Robert E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lee, Charles S. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lee, Norman W., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lee, Robert E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lee, Thomas D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Legate, Gail L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lehigh, Donald L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lehman, Charles A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lehman, Hilbert C. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Leja, Stanley J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lennox, John F. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lenz, William A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Leonard, Carl R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lerner, Maynard G. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lesser, John, Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Leverette, Robert R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Leward, William H., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lewis, Ann H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lewis, Julian R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lewis, Roger C. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lewis, Victor L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Ley, Roger P. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Liberatori, Francis J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lifsey, Truman W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Linder, Edward C., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Linder, Ronald G. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lindley, Ernest K. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lineberger, Harold B. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lininger, Ronald L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lippemier, Robert G. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lippold, Jack R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Litzler, Albert F., Sr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Livesparger, George E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Llewellyn, Arden C., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lofgren, John R. A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Logan, Albert L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Logeais, Donald A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Long, Steven W., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lopina, Robert F. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lord, Ronald H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lott, Quitman W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lougeman, John M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lowry, Stanley M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Loy, Ronald L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lucas, Ray E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Luethke, Fred W., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lumry, Kenneth R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lumsdon, John T. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lupenski, Alex P. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lusk, Wilbur C. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lutz, Norman M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lyall, Donald B. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lydon, John J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lynch, John J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lyon, Donavan L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 MacIntosh, Robert M., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Madison, Leland P. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Magleby, Carvel V. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Magliocca, George J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Magner, Arthur L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Magnuson, Harold R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Maguire, Walter N. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Maheu, Robert F. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Malahy, Vernon M., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Malaney, James C. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Mallette, Elmer, Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Malloy, William M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Manhart, Hershel W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Mann, Russell H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Manning, Frank M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Manning, John M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Marcum, Lawrence F. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Margenthaler, Charles R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Markham, Jerrold E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Markham, Robert F. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Marks, Donald L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Marks, Samuel J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Markwood, Calvin H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Marshall, Patrick G. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Martin, Jerome J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Martin, Jimmie D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Martin, Paul H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Martin, Robert L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Martinez, Ruben H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Martinson, Otto B., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Martucci, Louis M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Masino, Thomas R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Mathieson, William J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Matthews, John A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Matthys, Leroy D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Maves, Roger E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Mavrotheris, Nicholas A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Maxwell, Donald J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 May, Hollis B., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 May, Robert E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Mayo, Robert E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Mays, Melvin W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Mazik, Robert A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McCallion, Gaylord A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McAdoo, Raymond C. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McCannon, Russell E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McCarthy, James P. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McCarthy, Donald R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McCaskill, Ronald E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McCausland, Charles **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McCausland, Roger W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McClintock, Russel, Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McCluney, Cliff A., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McCormick, Dennis A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McCoy, Donald G. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McCoy, Ivy J., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McCoy, John F. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McCoy, Raymond S. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McCoy, Robert P. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McCracken, Hugh D., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McDermith, Clark M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McDonald, Charles C. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McDonald, Ronald D., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McDonald, Walter R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McDonough, Peter J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McElroy, Joseph H., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McFadden, Richard A., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McGhee, Bernice, **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McGill, Bernard G. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McGovern, William F. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McGraw, Jessie M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McGrew, Ralph L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McGukin, John G. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McIndoo, Philip L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McIntyre, Owen O. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McKean, John S. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McKee, Harry L., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McKee, Louis M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McKemie, George W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McKenney, John S. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McKinney, Carl A., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McKinzie, John W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McKoy, William G., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McLaughlin, John E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McLaurin, Floyd A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McLean, Lawrence A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McMahon, Bernard E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McMahon, Brian P. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McMahon, Robert J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McMahon, Thomas V. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McMahon, William W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McMullin, Robert L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McMurray, Char A., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McNeil, Lawrence F. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McNeill, Frederick W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McNew, Edward E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McPeak, Merrill A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McPherson, Douglas A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McPherson, John W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McSpadden, John D., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McWilliams, John R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Means, Lawrence C. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Mecham, Melvin E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Mecham, Norman D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Meek, Forrest P. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Melancon, Clyde J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Melichar, Joseph F. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Mellon, William L., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Melly, Thomas S. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Menees, James S., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Merck, Edward M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**

Menefee, Clayton L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Merritt, Normal L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Merry, John G., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Mesenbourg, John L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Metz, Leo B., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Metz, Richard S., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Metzger, Alfred W., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Meyer, John N., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Meyerholz, William H., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Meyers, Jerome A., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Meyette, Ronald J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Michalski, Jan K., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Mihelcic, Henry M., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Milan, Bobby L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Miles, Richard J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Miles, Victor J., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Millard, Moses K., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Miller, Donald L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Miller, Donald L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Miller, Donald L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Miller, George H., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Miller, Rene J., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Miller, Stanley J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Miller, William R., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Milligan Alexander M., IV, **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Mills, Darrel L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Miner, Norman E., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Mize, Oran D., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Mizner, James J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Moffatt, Edwin N., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Mog, Willis L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Mohler, Harlan J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Mohn, William T., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Mohr, William F., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Molina, Leopold, **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Mollicone, Richard A., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Monroe, Graham D., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Montgomery, Glen D., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Montgomery, Monte D., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Montgomery, Richard D., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Monto, Olgert V., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Moonau, Fred T., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Moon, Robert H., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Moore, Billy L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Moore, Donald L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Moore, Donald L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Moore, Hubert C., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Moore, Norman P., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Mooy, Olin R., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Moran, Carroll G., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Morsch, Herbert O., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Morehouse, David C., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Morelle, Fredric T., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Morey, William F., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Morgan, Dale H., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Morgan, Leonard A., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Morgan, Leonard W., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Morgan, Robert W., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Morozzo, Robert E., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Morphew, Elery P., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Morris, David B., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Morris, Don L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Morris, Krendall E., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Morris, Robert K., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Morris, Troy R., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Morrison, Billie E., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Morrissey, Robert D., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Morrow, John C., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Morthland, Samuel, **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Morton, Allan W., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Moser, Donald D., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Moser, Richard E., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Moser, William H., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Mounce, Clyde A., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Mountcastle, Russell C., II, **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Mouton, Gerald L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Mowbray, Joe A., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Moyer, Donald L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Muckelbauer, Robert R., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Mullen, Lloyd B., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Mullins, William H. L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Murden, Raymond L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Murphy, Dean M., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Murphy, James R., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Murphy, Lawrence J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Murphy, Richard J., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Murphy, William J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Murray, Michael P., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Murray, Reginald A., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Mustico, Richard J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Myer, Jonathan, **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Myers, Clarence C., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Myers, Eugene G., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Myers, James T., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Nagel, Richard A., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Nance, James A., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Navarro, Lloyd T., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Neal, Donald W., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Neal, James D., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Neal, Thomas A., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Nedbalek, Leon C., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Neff, Donald L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Neher, Harold V. J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Neill, Frank D., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Nelson, Charles C., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Nelson, Elmer G., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Nelson, Eric B., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Nelson, Fred R., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Nelson, Haywood B., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Nelson, Jimmie H., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Nelson, Robert D., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Newberg, Robert F., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Newhouse, Peter D., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Newman, John D., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Newsom, John W., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Newton, Jerome L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Nicholas, George R., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Nichols, Albert P., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Nichols, Brady W., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Nicolai, Leland M., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Nicoli, Remo J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Nielson, Merrill G., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Niemeyer, James E., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Nikkola, Edward F., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Nimmo, Edward H., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Nisley, Kermit J., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Nolen, James E., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Nordin, Frederick R., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Norman, Robert A., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Northgraves, John M., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Norwood, Charles E., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Novak, Donald P., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Nowacki, William F., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Nyberg, Donald W., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Nycum, William G., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Nygaard, George M., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Nystuem, Benjamin B., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Oberdieck, Donald R., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Oberg, Duane C., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Oberst, John R., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 O'Brien, Robert J., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Ocampo, Antonio, **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Oconnor, George P., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Oconnor, Thomas H., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Odle, Max L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Officer, Upton D., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Offill, Phillip W., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Ogas, John B., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Ohlemeyer, Rex P., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Ohlemiller, Francis L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Oleary, Brian H., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Oleary, Francis S., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Olivier, Joseph I., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Olmstead, Freeman B., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Olsen, Thomas R., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Olson, Albert H., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Olson, Gerald R., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Olson, Wayne A., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Olvera, Jose J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Omalley, Thomas E., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 O'Neil, Joseph W., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Orean, Richard E., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Orf, Paul E., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 O'Rourke, John M., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Orr, Edmond A., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Orser, David, **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Orsini, Richard A., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Osuchowski, Edward A., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Oswald, Lamont J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Overlock, John F., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Ow, Alexander W., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Owen, Lewis M., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Ownbey, C. J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Oxley, Charles L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Paape, James R., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Pace, Addison N., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Pachares, Anthony G., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Padgett, James M., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Pagani, Albert I., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Page, William F. H., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Paiva, Virgil J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Palanek, Edward J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Paliszewski, Ernest B., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Palmer, Garrett W., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Pandel, Michael, **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Papaccio, Philip N., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Paparozzi, Frank A., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Parker, Bruce M., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Parker, David C., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Parkinson, Bradford W., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Parrish, Roger K., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Parten, Warren K., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Partridge, Thomas H., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Pastorius, Alan S., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Patenall, Thomas P., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Patrick, Robert B., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Patterson, Douglas, **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Patterson, Don A., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Patterson, Robert E., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Patton, David D., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Patton, James F., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Patty, Robert J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Paul, Herbert D., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Paul, Richard D., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Pavlik, Junior A., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Paxson, James B., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Paxson, William C., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Payne, Charles H., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Pease, Ralph W., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Peat, Randall D., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Peck, David W., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Pehr, Frank J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Pentz, Russell H., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Perritano, Frank R., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Pestrichella, Alexander A., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Peters, Richard E., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Petersen, Donald J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Peterson, Bruce J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Peterson, Don L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Peterson, Fred H., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Peterson, John W., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Peterson, Robert L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Petitjean, Robert W., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Petrunic, Michael J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Petrulzzelli, Mario M., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Pettit, Richard J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Petty, Fred A., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Petty, Gerald L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Pharmer, Lamont H., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Phelps, Harold A., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Phillips, Herbert L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Phillips, William F., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Philpott, Tommy R., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Piatt, Homer R., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Pichon, Kenneth W., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Pickens, Jimmy B., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Pierson, Richard A., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Pilkinton, Corinne G., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Pillsbury, Fred T., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Piper, Mahlon L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Piskos, George M., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Pitzer, Lee R., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Place, Stephen B., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Platner, Bruce L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Platt, William P., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Pocreva, Robert S., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Polenske, Dale K., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Polis, Daniel, **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Pollard, Gordon M., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Pollock, Richard B., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Pomajevich, Robert J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Poole, Grover C., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Poorman, Donald L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Pope, William H., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Porell, Alcide L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Porter, David J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Porter, Eugene M., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Posey, Milton L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Potter, Dale L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Pouliot, Richard J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Powell, Clarence E., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Powell, Furney, Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Prather, Vernon L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Pratt, Charles W., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Pratt, Edward B., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Pratt, Edward A., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Prentis, Cecil G., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Preston, Charles R., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Preston, Raymond C., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Price, Jerry O., **xxx-xx-xxxx**

Prichard, Leslie J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Prince, Neil E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Prochko, Robert J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Prudot, Elmer J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Prushinski, Albert A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Purdue, Joseph L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Purdum, Richard L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Putnam, Gerald W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Puzio, Frederick J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Quinn, Thomas D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rabe, Walter J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rachlis, Warren P. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Radlinger, William W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Ragagli, Dino M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Ragsdale, Harry E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Ramberger, James H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Ramirez, Enrique H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rapko, Michael **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rapp, Dennis B. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rasmussen, Robert D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Ravetti, Louis R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rawlings, Peter E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Ray, David P. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rea, Alvin L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Redd, Frank J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Redenbacher, Leon R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Redican, Edward C. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Redman, Allan R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Reed, David E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Reed, Gerald F. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Reed, Lawrence L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Reed, Ralph B. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Reep, Irvin E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rees, William H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Reeves, Jack W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Regenhardt, John D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Reichert, Albert C. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Reid, Robert O. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Reigel, Donald E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Reilly, Leo B., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Reiman, Roy H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Reinhard, Robert F. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Remey, Robert A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Render, William E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rentner, Paul E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Repeta, Henry J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Reyna, Jose G. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rhodes, Jimmy P. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rhodes, Roger T. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rice, Bradley A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rice, Carroll A., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Richard, Robert B., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Richards, Gerald R., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Richards, Jerry W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Richards, Malcolm E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Richards, William L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Riddle, Owen W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Ridolfi, Richard R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Releau, Walter R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rieke, Don M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Riggs, Denton J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Riggs, James A., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Riley, Leonar W., III **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rineheart, Benjamin J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Riner, James W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Ringler, William C. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Ripper, Tommy J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Robbins, Glen A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Roberts, Dan A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Roberts, Joe H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Roberts, Johnnie D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Roberts, Joseph W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Roberts, Kenneth V. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Roberts, Philip T. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Robertson, Bill J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Robertson, John R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Robinson, James M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Robinson, Kent M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Robinson, Kenneth D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Robinson, Roal S., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Roche, James E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rochelle, Herbert R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rockel, Robert H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Roder, John R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rodke, Phillip M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rodriguez, Robert **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Roehm, Richard R., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rogers, Craven C., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rogers, Joe N. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rohde, Roy F. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Roland, Carl J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.

Roland, Ronald J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rowig, Alan B. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rosenberg, Robert A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rothman, Max **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rothwell, Roger D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rounsville, Glo L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rouse, Richard E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rowland, Donald D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rowlands, Bruce H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Ruark, Robert W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Roysdon, Douglas A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rucker, Dean A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Ruby, Earl C., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rudasill, Charles W., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Runge, Norman H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rupple, Marion T., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rush, Thomas A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rushworth, Ralph **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Russ, Robert M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Russell, James F. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Ryan, Glen A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sadowski, Edward J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sahm, Menno J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Salas, Fernando, Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Samborsky, Joseph M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sammet, Peter H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Samson, Dale D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Samson, Walter R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Samuel, Stanley M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sandelin, Thomas E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sanders, James B., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sanders, Stark O., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sanders, Walter H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sands, David A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sands, Earl E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Santee, Russell F. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sapp, Orrin L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sargent, Gordon S. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Savelle, Clarence J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Savickas, Donald V. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sawicki, Raymond S. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Saxton, Robert M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Saylor, Arthur W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Saylor, William T. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sayre, Peter T. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Scarbrough, Robert O. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Scarff, James P., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Schafer, James R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Schafer, John V., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Schalk, Donald W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Scharoun, Robert B. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Scheerer, Paul H., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Schessner, William E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Schiebelin, Gordon W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Schilling, Joseph J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Schleich, John F. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Schlosser, John A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Schmidt, Francis J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Schmidt, Frank J., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Schmucker, Franz **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Schneider, Frank W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Schneider, Stanley P. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Scholz, James J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Scholz, Joachim E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Schuessler, Patricia A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Schultz, Sterling E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Schumaker, Karl H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Schurr, Roger D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Schwab, Leonard D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Schwalm, C. R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Schwartzman, Larry **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Schwemh, Paul J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sci, Frank M., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Scott, John L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Scow, Roger D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Scrivano, Peter J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Scronce, Nicholas E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Seaton, John D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Seats, John H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sedano, John M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Seech, John R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Seeger, Carl E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Seely, Richard R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Segrest, Claud H., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Seh, Robert H., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Seifert, William K. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Seigal, John W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Seinwill, Ronald W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Seirer, Willie L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Self, Loy D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Senac, Ronald C. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sentman, Lyle A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Setnick, John E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sevebeck, James B. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Severance, Donald H., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sexson, Richard W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Shackelford, Billy F. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Shannon, Donald H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sharp, James C. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sharpe, Charles B. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sharples, Russell E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Shaw, Russell E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Shearer, Edwin H., III **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sheats, Benton E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sheely, William C., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Shelton, Richard L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Shelton, Thomas E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Shepherd, Glade E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Shepherd, Harry R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Shepherd, Ralph V. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sherman, Vincent J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Shershun, Carroll S. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Shipley, Dale F. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Shockley, Samuel H., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Shoemaker, Clyde L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Shoemaker, Rollin R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Shore, Willis L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Showalter, Larry A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Shuster, Steve **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Shuttleworth, Jack M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sibert, Robert C. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sickenberger, William L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Siburg, William E., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Siderius, Jerome D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Silver, Edward D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Simanek, Ferdinand A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Simmons, John F. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Simmons, Ross W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Simmons, William W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Simon, Thomas J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Simons, Richard W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Simpson, Ora L., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Simpson, Robert L., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Simpson, William H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sims, Bobby J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sims, Hiram L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sinclair, Vivienne C. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sinclair, Waymon L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sinnott, Gilbert J., III **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sisco, Sanford L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sisson, Lyle A., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Skaggs, Stephen L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Skelly, George F. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Skinner, Eleanor L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Slaney, John H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Slatcher, James R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Slauson, William J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sloan, Harold J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smart, David E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smathers, Edwin D., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smiley, Kenneth S., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, Carl D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, Cecil N. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, Clarence R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, Colin A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, Donald C. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, Donald H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, Earle K., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, Frederic H., III **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, George D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, Harold C. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, Horace D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, Howard H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, James E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, Jedford E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, Lee A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, Leonard H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, Odell F. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, Philip E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, Raymond W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, Richard W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, Robert E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, Samuel F., III **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, Scott W., III **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, Travis M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, William A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, William K. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, William A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smyser, Craig H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Snide, Thomas W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Snovel, Edwin **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Snow, William M., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**.

Snyder, Donald, xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Soderberg, Adolph D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Solana, Frank J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Solberg, Harold A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Solomon, Neal P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Soltesz, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Songer, Hubert D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Sorenson, Franklin W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Sowby, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Sparks, Billy R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Sparks, William I., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Spath, Bernard A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Spearman, Jack L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Speerschneider, Lyle, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Spence, George D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Spencer, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Spotswood, David T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Spriggs, Duane G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Squires, Edward A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Squires, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stalker, Ronald R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stallings, William T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stamm, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stammerjohn, Howard N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stanley, Darrell J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stark, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Starkey, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Staten, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 St. Clair, Gilbert K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stearle, Gerald F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Steinkamp, Henry W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Steinke, Shawn H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stemler, Rodger L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stephens, Glen, xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stephenson, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stephenson, Ralph W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Sterrett, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stevens, Tommy D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stevenson, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stevenson, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Steves, John R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stewart, Ellis C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stewart, George R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stewart, Glen F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stewart, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stewart, Tom E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stiglers, William D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stillwell, Nicholas, xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stimac, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stockton, Douglas W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stollenwerck, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stone, Fred S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stone, Joseph L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stone, Richard, xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stoner, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stoob, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stoops, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stowell, Dibrell C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Strand, Stanley G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Strange, John E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stratford, John J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Strickland, Reginald E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stringer, Harvie L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Strome, Richard H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Strong, Dale L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Strong, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stuart, Floyd R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stuber, Carl D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stuck, John G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stuckey, Savery G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stuntz, Jose E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Stutzman, Melvin F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Suiter, William P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Sullivan, Dennis J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Sullivan, Hiram R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Sullivan, Robert T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Sullivan, William J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Summers, Charles M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Surovic, Arthur F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Surovik, John H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Survil, Edward J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Sutherland, Jack W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Sutton, Glenn H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Swanson, Ralph J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Swanson, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Sweeney, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Swendner, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Swenson, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Swiderski, Donald L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Swihura, Edward J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Swofford, Donald D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Syracuse, Anthony S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Szabo, George J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Taddeo, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Talbert, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Tannen, Peter D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Tanner, John B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Tarvin, Albert L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Tate, Harlan W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Tatum, Walter F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Taylor, Gary W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Taylor, Edwin S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Taylor, Alvin, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Taylor, Henry L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Taylor, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Taylor, Kenneth G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Taylor, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Tedeschi, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Teft, Howard E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Telford, Joe W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Telshaw, Bradley R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Terrell, Joseph E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Terry, Jack E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Texter, Joseph C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Thoeny, Alan R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Thomas, David H., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Thomas, Donald B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Thomas, Frederick L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Thomas, George J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Thomas, John K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Thomas, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Thomas, Kenneth W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Thomas, Lawrence E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Thompson, Andrew C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Thompson, Fred N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Thompson, George E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Thompson, Gerald G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Thompson, Harry C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Thompson, Ian B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Thompson, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Thompson, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Thompson, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Thompson, John V., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Thompson, Leslie B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Thompson, Thomas B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Thompson, Willis M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Thornal, Leroy W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Thornberry, Ronald D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Thorndill, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Thornton, Richard B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Thurston, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Tice, Robert K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Tieber, Julius A., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Tiffault, Raymond J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Tillman, Frederick J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Tillman, John B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Timothy, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Tinsler, Hollie C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Tobias, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Tokash, Frederick E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Tolley, Charles P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Tomasin, Vito, xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Toner, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Tonini, Daryl E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Tortoretti, Joseph, xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Townsend, Cecil R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Townsend, Charles B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Trainor, Philip, xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Traynham, Gene C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Treece, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Trimble, Clifford J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Trimmell, Norman L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Trimpert, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Tringali, Charles J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Tristram, Edward F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Trombley, Donald E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Tschirhart, Ernest S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Tucker, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Tucker, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Tucker, Troy L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Tudor, Ronald F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Turley, Mack C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Turner, Alexander P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Turner, Gene C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Turner, Norman M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Tuso, Joseph F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Tweiss, Ronald G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Uhl, Donald P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Underwood, Rufus D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Uno, Peter K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Upton, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Urbanic, Frank A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Usher, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Vallerie, Eugene M., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Vanarsdale, Doyle L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Vanbrunt, Ralph S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Vance, Jerry D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Vance, Wilson R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Vanderhoop, John O., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Vanduyn, Alfred V., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Vanhulla, Kenneth J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Varweele, Jan M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Vaughan, Robert B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Vaughn, Frank S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Vaught, Wilma L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Vazquez, Francisco, xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Vincent, Alfred W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Vinson, Billy J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Vives, Peter, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Vollmer, Albert C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Vonhake, Richard W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Voyiaziakis, Stanley, xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Vulkooff, R. C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Waddell, Dewey W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Wadman, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Waggener, James S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Wagner, Edward M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Waite, Leland K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Waite, Merrill J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Wakefield, Donald B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Walcott, Gordon M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Walker, David L., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Walker, Donald C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Walker, Gerald D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Walker, Guary O., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Walker, Nathan L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Walker, Phillip J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Walker, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Walker, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Walker, William O., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Wall, Willie R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Wallace, Billy J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Wallace, Kenneth H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Wallace, Roy G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Waller, Benjamin E., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Walls, Francis H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Walpole, Bernard L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Walter, Clair E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Walters, Frank P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Walters, Ralph D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Walton, Gary K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Wampler, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Wanamaker, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Ward, Bobby L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Ward, Johnny M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Warner, Robert E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Warnick, Charles P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Warren, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Washam, Billy M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Watcher, Pete, xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Webb, Clarence L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Webb, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Webb, William B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Weber, Theodore W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Weber, Waldon R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Weed, Marvin J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Weege, Ernest J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Weil, Clinton G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Weimer, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Weinberg, Richard M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Weisbrodt, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Weishuhn, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Weiss, Anthony G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Weissmueller, Courtney E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Welch, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Wells, Frederick L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Wenger, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Wepfer, Gordon G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Werling, David C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 West Gregory R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Westbrook, George W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Westenbarger, David P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Westmoreland, Barney, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Weston, Walter F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Weston, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Westwood, Edward C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Wetzel, Ralph F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Wheat, Ralph F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Wheeler, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Wheeler, Charles H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Whitaker, Joseph T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Whitaker, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
 Whitcomb, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx.

White, Donald D., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 White, Edward B., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 White, Herbert V., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 White, John F., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 White, Joseph, Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 White, Loyce L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 White, Richard T., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Whiteman, Gilbert L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Whitfield, Allen P., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Whiting, Edwin K., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Whitsett, Charles E., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wicker, Charles E., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Widicus, Frederick G., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wiedmaier, Marcel A., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wiegers, Francis A., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wiersma, William E., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wiesenuer, Robert F., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wigal, Ralph E., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wiggins, Frank S., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wilcox, Robert E., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wigglesworth, Richard G., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wiley, Thomas S., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wilks, Carlton O., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Willies, Richard E., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Williams, Allen J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Williams, Alma L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Williams, Bruce, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Williams, Cecil W., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Williams, Charles M., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Williams, Donald E., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Williams, Evans C., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Williams, Gordon E., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Williams, John C., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Williams, Morgan G., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Williams, Robert R., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Williams, Thomas N., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Williamson, Roger C., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Willming, Edward A., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Willson, Richard D., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wilmot, Raymond D., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wilson, Charles J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wilson, Denzel G., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wilson, Donald, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wilson, Duane R., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wilson, George R., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wilson, Robert C., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wilson, Ronald E., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Winn, Bernard J., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Winograd, Sanford M., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Winterfield, Louis A., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wirin, William B., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Witt, George C., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Witte, Duane M., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Witzel, James E., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wodarzak, George P., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wofford, Travis, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wojcik, Joseph J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wolfe, James L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wolfe, Lynn R., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wolinsky, Ivan L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wood, Charles J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wood, Fred D., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wood, Harry F., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wood, Larry S., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Woodbury, Norman B., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Woodward, Eldon D., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Woody, Charles D., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Woody, Harland G., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wooten, John F., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Worch, Peter R., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Working, Raymond W., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Worley, John N., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Worn, Robert W., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Worthington E. L., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wright, David I., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wright, James H., III, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wright, John H. S., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wright, William E., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wubker, Robert J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wucher, Jerome M., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wyse, David L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Yackiel, Thomas F., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Yarrish, Joseph, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Yaryan, John S., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Yingling, William A., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Yochum, Henry M., II, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Yohe, Robert S., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Yoneteck, Frederick, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Yoshizawa, Tadashi, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Young, Carl E., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Young, Howard D., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.

Young, Joe F., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Young, Reid C., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Yount, John F., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Yovin, Joseph A., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Zahn, Harry F., III, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Zeberlein, James W., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Zempel, William K., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Ziernicki, Robert S., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Zimmer, James W., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Zirkle, William S., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Zock, Richard, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.

CHAPLAINS

Alewine, Francis T., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Arrendell, Cammid O., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Brucato, Robert A., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Bumpus, Anthony J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Collins, John A., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Dangelo, Salvatore J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Downing, Don, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Fahey, Kevin C., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Flattery, John J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Johnson, Carroll L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Jones, Douglas O., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Jordan, James E., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Kelley, Benjamin F., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Kramer, George C., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Labinger, Marvin L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 McCausland, Joseph E., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Millian, Ronald A., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Nelson, Waldemar H., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Olivier, Stephen J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Parker, James P., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Payne, S. J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rice, Jerry L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rushe, George M., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Seiber, Richard A., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Shelley, Patrick J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Spongberg, Edward G., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Steege, Mark W., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Ullrich, Donald W., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wantz, Earl B., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Whalen, Robert B., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.

DENTAL CORPS

Bailey, Ronald W., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Barton, Ralph T., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Bourne, William F., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Brown, Velpo B., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Bryk, Clarence C., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Childress, Joseph H., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Clark, Lawrence L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Cowan, Robert D., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Coyne, Arthur B., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Davis, Fredric C., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Durkin, William J., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Farnie, John E., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Fliss, Sheldon D., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Francis, Michael R., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Gault, Clovis G., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Green, Larry E., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Hale, Robert H., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Hecht, Arnold, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Hersho, Robert M., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Holmes, Philip J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Jerman, Albert C., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Kunberger, George L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Lindner, Marshall W., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Long, William H., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Masi, Victor A., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Mauthe, Donald J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 McDaniel, Raymond K., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 McLees, James K., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Morley, Ronald B., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Neurock, Isadore, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Noderer, William H., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Park, Paul R., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Penn, Paul D., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Plotzke, Anthony E., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Pullen, Wayne G., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rosen, Ronald, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Savers, Norman C., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Schultheis, William J., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Skaer, Wilbur C., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, Howard F., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Streeter, Arthur H., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Williams, Earl O., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Windeler, Alfred S., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.

MEDICAL CORPS

Allen, Benjamin R., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Ames, Bruce A., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.

Atkinson, Samuel M., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Blacker, Gerry J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Box, Benjamin E., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Brundick, Edward L., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Buckley, Richard E., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Burns, Matthew L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Corker, Frank T., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Costanzi, John J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Cryan, David M., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Dodge, Billy G., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Dunne, John V., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Fettus, George H., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Fisher, James M., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Gilman, Robert T., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Harris, Robert E., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Ivey, David M., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Jaegers, Kenneth R., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Jones, Frank L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Keffer, Joseph H., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Kirschner, Leonard J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Koch, Howard F., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Kramer, Edward F., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Leachman, Wallace R., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Lewis, Sidney T., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Lowe, James C., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Mahoney, Jerome J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Maloney, Thomas R., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Manaker, Philip A., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Mayes, George R., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 McAlister, Bradwell R., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 McCullough, Charles T., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 McNaughton, Grant B., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Morris, John R., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Moser, Royce, Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Myers, John E., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Narboni, Gino R., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Nixon, William H., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Obriant, Charles R., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Orr, Edwin R., III, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Pace, Harrell S., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Pate, William E., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Perkins, John C., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Perkins, Robert S., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Polis, Charles T., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Price, Terrill E., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Raine, Charles H., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rayman, Russell B., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rieffel, Clement N., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rodgin, David W., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rodriguez, Lopez Ensor, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rowe, Lynn B., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Schaller, Laird F., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Schultz, John L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Shelton, Leslie W., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Short, John G., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sisson, Charles A., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Skeel, David A., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Slarve, Richard N., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sobiesk, Emory J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sowell, Ellis M., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Stinebiser, James H., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sturge, Karl, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Taylor, Williams S., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Tigner, Milton R., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Tolar, Patrick M., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Townsend, Amos R., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Triebwasser, John H., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Victor, Martin I., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Vonhazmburg, Romulus S., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Walker, Wesley C., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Warren, Glen C., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Watson, Clarence F., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wesche, Daniel L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 White, John W., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wildemann, Mark F., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Willis, John C., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.

NURSE CORPS

Arndt, Carole L., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Bergeron, James E., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Bianchi, Lucile A., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Candella, Josephine M., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Clark, Mary H., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Condon, Charles R., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Connolly, Janet M., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Cotter, Elizabeth, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Crown, Mary F. G., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Dame, Margaret A., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Dohrman, Marjorie J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Dotter, Patsy D., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Ellis, Helen V., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.

Farrar, Catherine L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Fecteau, Donna M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Francescotto, Paula **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Gengler, Rita E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Gorseth, Winifred L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Gotsch, Geneva **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Guarino, Vincent A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Gudzan, Christina **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Hansen, William P. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Hargrave, David R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Hastings, Lois E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Jackson, Bernice M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Joyce, Claire S. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kallinick, Dolores M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kreasky, Anna M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kuhl, Shirley A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lane, Joy A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Maxim, Elizabeth M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Nelson, Ethel A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Parry, Barbara Jay **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Pearce, Warren T. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Perry, Allan J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Ronaghan, James T. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Ross, Betsy L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Shea, Delia A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Smilke, Franklin R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Spores, Kathleen D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Tegen, Gerald C. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Todd, John L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Wilson, Eleanor M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Witmer, Joseph D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Youtzy, Cynthia R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS
 Batiste, Harold E., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Bauman, Willard H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Betron, Richard E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Boes, Robert L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Briggs, Edgar M., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Brown, Dewey F. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Brown, Duane C. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Burton, Donald E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Cavanaugh, Patrick D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Clemons, Keith. **xxx-xx-xxxx**

Cox, Willis D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Dodson, Burt, Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Fairless, David S. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Fresques, Frank J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Fudge, Forest W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Gillis, John R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Glenn, Clark L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Gregory, Joseph B. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Hill, Robert D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Jacquin, John H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Jobe, George W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Johnson, Glenn E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Katz, Stewart H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kennedy, Charles L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 McKinney, Dana F. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Middleton, Richard V. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Nestor, Aloysius F. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Parker, Lester B. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Perri, Frank J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Poole, Nathan E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Redman, Ronald A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Rowney, Stanley V. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Silfen, Arthur M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Slivka, William R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Suiter, Robert W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Tamse, Jacob G., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Watson, John R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Whittemore, Warren W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Yates, John R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Yeomans, Richard C. **xxx-xx-xxxx**

VETERINARY CORPS

Barker, Russell B. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Boster, Richard A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Erickson, Howard H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Flentge, Robert L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Jackson, Wesley E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lynn, Marvin. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 New, Albert E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Phillips, Jere M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Rhoads, Dallas W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Schwichtenberg, Alan E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Vanriper, Donald C. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Wood, David H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**

BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES CORPS

Black, Gerald N. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Braatz, James H. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Briggs, Thomas H., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Eggert, Clarence V. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Farrell, Hugh R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Greene, Omar V., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Harkleroad, Lionel E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Johnston, Lloyd W. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kilton, Roger M. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Kuchta, John C., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Lahood, George A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Marraro, Robert V. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Mockler, Nedd D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Newman, Harold L. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Nikolewski, Robert F. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Olson, Robert N. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Silva, Donald G. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Sparks, George P. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Stansell, Marion J. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Targove, Bertram D. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Weddington, George R. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
 Wilder, Nelson E. **xxx-xx-xxxx**

The following persons 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 captain, Medical
 Harada, William S. **xxx-xx-xxxx**

To be captain, Dental
 Ellerbruch, Eldon S. **xxx-xx-xxxx**

To be first lieutenant, Dental
 Buchanan, William E., Jr. **xxx-xx-xxxx**
To be first lieutenant, Judge Advocate
 Johnson, Phillip A. **xxx-xx-xxxx**

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, September 24, 1970

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

My meat is to do the will of Him who sent me and to finish His work. John 4: 34.

O God of truth and love, who art worthy of a nobler praise than our lips can utter and of a greater love than our minds can understand and our hearts can give, in Thy presence we bow in all reverence and gratitude.

We thank Thee for people great and good, for homes where love and loyalty live, for friends tried and true, for everyone who has urged us to leave the valley of discontent and to climb the heights of devotion to the highest, and for every example of confidence and courage, given us by persons in high places and low. Our gratitude to Thee for the goodness of life and the greatness of love.

We commend our Nation to Thy providential care. Guide our people as they choose their leaders, increase our fellowship with one another, and make us one in spirit and one in purpose as we face the crucial days that lie ahead. Through all of life make us mindful of Thy presence and eager to do Thy will.

In the Master's name we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 18127) entitled "An act making appropriations for public works for water, pollution control, and power development, including the Corps of Engineers—Civil, the Panama Canal, the Federal Water Quality Administration, the Bureau of Reclamation, power agencies of the Department of the Interior, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Atomic Energy Commission, and related independent agencies and commissions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4 to the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 3637) entitled "An act to amend section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 with respect to equal-time requirements for candidates for public office, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment in

which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 17255. An act to amend the Clean Air Act to provide for a more effective program to improve the quality of the Nation's air.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and joint resolutions of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2984. An act to permit certain Federal employment to be counted toward retirement;

S. 3220. An act to protect a person's right of privacy by providing for the designation of sexually oriented advertisements and for the return of any such unrequested advertisements at the expense of the sender;

S. 3765. An act to amend the Flammable Fabrics Act to increase the protection afforded consumers against injurious flammable fabrics;

S. 3958. An act to adjust the pay of the police forces at Washington and Dulles Airports;

S.J. Res. 74. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the first full calendar week in May of each year as "National Employ the Older Worker Week";

S.J. Res. 110. Joint Resolution to amend the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish the first week in October of each year as National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week", approved August 11, 1945 (59 Stat. 530), so as to broaden the applicability of such resolution to all handicapped workers;