

ployment Compensation Act of 1970 to permit the States to suspend the application of the 120-percent requirement for purposes of determining whether there has been a State "off" indicator; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. BURTON, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. ST GERMAIN, and Mr. TIERNAN):

H.R. 15444. A bill to provide for a 6-month extension of the emergency unemployment compensation program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. MILLS of Arkansas, Mr. RODINO, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey, Mr. CONTE, Mr. MINISH, Mr. BIAGGI, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. HICKS of Washington, Mr. BYRNES of Pennsylvania, Mr. BLATNIK, Mr. CAREY of New York, Mrs. GRASSO, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. KARTH, Mrs. GRIFFITHS, Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD, Mr. McFALL, Mr. GIAMMO, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. MOSS, and Mr. FRASER):

H.R. 15445. A bill to provide for a 6-month extension of the emergency unemployment compensation programs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts (for himself, Mr. MURPHY of New York, Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. DANIELSON, Mr. BURTON, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. WALDIE, Mr. MIKVA, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. ST GERMAIN, and Mr. TIERNAN):

H.R. 15446. A bill to amend section 203(e) (2) of the Federal-State Extended Unemployment Compensation Act of 1970 to permit the States to suspend the application of the 120-percent requirement for purposes of determining whether there has been a State "off" indicator; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts:

H.R. 15447. A bill to improve the quality of

child development programs by attracting and training personnel for those programs; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MILLS of Arkansas (for himself, and Mr. SCHNEEBELI):

H.R. 15448. A bill to amend section 101(1) (3) of the Tax Reform Act of 1969; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 15449. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that payments made by airlines to aircraft hijackers shall not be deductible; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILTON:

H.J. Res. 1225. Joint resolution to provide for the termination of hostilities in Indochina, subject to the release of all American prisoners of war and the safe withdrawal of the remaining U.S. forces from Indochina, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.J. Res. 1226. Joint resolution providing for the designation of the second week of June 1972 as "Plumbing and Piping Industry Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAILSBACK:

H. Con. Res. 631. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the establishment of peace in Indochina; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. WINN:

H. Con. Res. 632. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that an Asian peace conference should be established under the auspices of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BROOMFIELD:

H. Res. 1014. Resolution calling upon Radio Free Europe to initiate radio broadcasts to the people of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KYROS (for himself, Mr. BEGICH, Mr. BOLAND, Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts, Mr. CONTE, Mr. DANIEL of Virginia, Mr. DONOHUE, Mr. DRINAN, Mr. EILBERG, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. HATHAWAY, Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts, Mr. HELSTOSKI,

Mrs. HICKS of Massachusetts, Mr. O'NEILL, Mr. ST GERMAIN, Mr. SANDMAN, and Mr. WYMAN):

H. Res. 1015. Resolution urging the President to impose export controls on cattle hides; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

398. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the massacre at Lod Airport, Israel, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

H.R. 15450. A bill for the relief of Chiu Wong (aka Roberto Sing); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLIER:

H.R. 15451. A bill for the relief of Romano Lohar; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.R. 15452. A bill for the relief of Dedrick A. Maanum; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACOBS:

H.R. 15453. A bill to incorporate in the District of Columbia the National Inconvenient Sportsmen's Association; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MILLS of Arkansas:

H.R. 15454. A bill for the relief of Joseph P. Connolly, master sergeant, U.S. Air Force Reserve (retired); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALDIE:

H.R. 15455. A bill for the relief of Donald C. Talkington; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE—Monday, June 12, 1972

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

### PRAYER

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

Gracious Father, who hast brought us to this time and place, give us a true purpose for the new world men dream about. Give us a renewed hope for the moral and spiritual renewal of the world Thou hast created. We ask not to be delivered from responsibility but to labor more responsibly and with higher wisdom for justice and peace everywhere. And for this purpose anoint Thy servants here with a full measure of Thy grace.

O Lord, look upon this good land which Thou hast given us for our heritage. Relieve and comfort those who suffer from floods or disasters of nature, and bring us all closer to one another in compassion and sympathy. May our human striving lead us to the shrine of Thine eternal love and the plan Thou hast for Thy coming kingdom.

We pray in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

### REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of June 8, 1972, the following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. WILLIAMS, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with amendments:

S. 1861. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended, to extend its protection to additional employees, to raise the minimum wage to \$2.25 an hour, to provide for an 8-hour workday, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-842).

By Mr. WILLIAMS, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, without recommendation:

H.R. 7130. An act to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to increase the minimum wage under that act, to extend its coverage, to establish procedures to relieve domestic industries and workers injured by increased imports from low-wage areas, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-843).

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 8, 1972, be dispensed with.

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

### WAIVER OF THE CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the call of the legislative calendar, under rule VIII, be dispensed with.

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

### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

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

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

### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider a nomination on the Executive Calendar. There being no objection, the Senate

proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

#### DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The second assistant legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas Patrick Melady, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Uganda.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed; and, without objection, the President will be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

#### UNITED NATIONS FUND FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Concurrent Resolution 82, Calendar No. 803.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be stated by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows: (S. Con. Res. 82) to express the sense of the Congress that the U.S. Government urge the establishment of a United Nations Voluntary Fund for the Environment to which the United States would contribute its fair share.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with amendments, on page 2, line 5, after the word "Environment", strike out "to consist of a first year budget of" and insert "in"; in line 6, after the word "of", where it appears the second time, insert "\$100,000,000"; in the same line, after the amendment just above stated, strike out "\$50,000,000 and to increase the annual budget for the Fund by the same amount each year for the next two years,"; in line 9, after the word "to", strike out "pay its" and insert "contribute such"; in line 10, after the word "of", insert "that amount as is generally comparable to United States participation in the United Nations and its Specialized Agencies and Organs,"; and, in line 12, after the amendment just above stated, strike out "such annual budget,"; so as to make the concurrent resolution read:

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the United States delegation to the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, June 5-16, 1972, should urge the establishment of a United Nations Voluntary Fund for the Environment in the amount of \$100,000,000, and the United States Government should agree*

to contribute such fair share of that amount as is generally comparable to United States participation in the United Nations and its Specialized Agencies and Organs.

The amendments were agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, as amended, with its preamble reads as follows:

S. CON. RES. 82

Whereas the peoples of the world have from time immemorial sought to improve their general well-being to the common detriment of the environment;

Whereas this degradation of the environment has resulted in deteriorating air and water and depleted natural resources;

Whereas the lack of collective action on the behalf of the environment has resulted in a challenge to all nations for human survival;

Whereas nations of the world have accepted that challenge and agreed to meet in Stockholm, Sweden, June 5-16, 1972, for the first United Nations Conference on the Human Environment;

Whereas the success of this historic conference will be determined primarily by the institutions agreed upon to deal effectively with the problems of the environment which transcend national jurisdictions;

Whereas an international environmental institution within the United Nations, created to deal with all problems of the international environment, will require adequate funding for its first year and additional funding for subsequent years; and

Whereas the United States share of such a fund should reflect this Nation's commitment to global environmental quality as a leading consumer of resources: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the United States delegation to the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, June 5-16, 1972, should urge the establishment of a United Nations Voluntary Fund for the Environment in the amount of \$100,000,000, and the United States Government should agree to contribute such fair share of that amount as is generally comparable to United States participation in the United Nations and its Specialized Agencies and Organs.*

#### THREE COMMENCEMENT ADDRESSES—1972

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, during the past 2 weeks, I have been privileged to address the graduating class at Rocky Mountain College, Billings, Mont.; Foxcroft School, Middleburg, Va.; and Montana State University, Bozeman, Mont.

In these addresses, I have tried to relate my thoughts and feelings in the field of foreign policy with what I hoped were the thoughts and feelings of these young men and women going out into the world. As an overall group, they will have much to say, to do and, perhaps, to re-do and reenact. Whether or not I have succeeded in expressing my views to them in such a manner as to give them something to think about today and tomorrow remains to be seen.

May I say that I was impressed with all three student bodies. I have great faith and confidence in this new generation. They can be expected, at least in part, to undo the errors and the mistakes of the past, even as they may make some of their own, as they build upon the reali-

ties of today and deal with the problems of tomorrow.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the commencement address at Rocky Mountain College, Billings, Mont., on May 29, 1972, entitled "China: A New Relationship"; the commencement address at the Foxcroft School, Middleburg, Va., June 9, 1972, entitled "China: Myths and Realities"; and the commencement address given at the Montana State University, in Bozeman, Mont., on June 10, 1972, entitled "Toward a Foreign Policy of Mutuality."

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

#### CHINA: A NEW RELATIONSHIP

I would like to share with you on this day which is of great importance to you some thoughts of world affairs. One aspect of this subject, in particular, begs for your understanding and attention. That is the relationship between the United States and China. It is uppermost in my mind, at this time, because I have only this month returned from a journey to Peking. The impressions of the visit to that capital and several other Chinese cities are still very vivid. So, too, are my discussions with leaders of the People's Republic.

This is a notable year in U.S.-China relations. The first significant steps in 25 years have been taken towards a general revision of dealings with China. The initiative was long overdue and, hence the backlog of unfinished business is very heavy.

Almost a quarter of a century ago, we cut ourselves off, as a matter of deliberate policy, from all normal relations with the largest nation on earth. We did so by misreading or distorting, in an official sense, the implications of the Chinese revolution which brought a new government to Peking in 1949. Thereafter, we acted on the legal pretense that the People's Republic of China did not exist. Even as we pretended it was not there, we invested heavily in an elaborate system of costly constraints to curtail that government.

The price of this detachment from reality was not trivial. Quite apart from billions spent for counterpoises to China throughout Asia, our present involvement in Viet Nam can be considered, in large measure, to be part of the price of this constraint. So, too, was our earlier involvement in Korea.

These and other military actions were undertaken in the name of a policy called "containment" which was based on a set of assumptions about the nature of events in China, as we guessed or persuaded ourselves to believe them to be. These assumptions were made in a vacuum because of our isolation from the Chinese mainland. Not surprisingly, many of them turned out to be highly inaccurate.

The tragic cost of the miscalculations can be stated in terms of the lives lost, the bodies maimed and the resources squandered all around the rimlands of Asia, particularly in Korea and Indochina. To be sure, we cannot estimate what the alternative costs might have been had we acted on more accurate assumptions, or had we taken no action at all. Simply on the basis of what did happen, however, history may well record these miscalculations regarding China, as among the most costly of all time.

I might say, parenthetically, that we are at a crucial point, at the present time, in determining whether we will persist in this mistaken course. I refer to events in Viet Nam during the past few weeks. The new U.S. air and sea actions are vestigial responses which arise from the old, not the new China policy which was signaled by the



President's visit to Peking. Whatever the success of these new war measures, they will not alter in any way the overwhelming need of this nation to disengage completely from the Indochina conflict. We need to do so, not to satisfy Hanoi or Peking or Moscow, but in order to serve our own national interests. If we have learned anything to date from this conflict, it is that we have no national stake in that conflict except an end to further casualties and the return of the prisoners of war and the missing in action. The course of action best calculated to serve these national needs remains to negotiate the best political solution without further recourse to arms and to get out of Indochina, lock, stock and barrel.

But, to return to the central theme of my remarks, it is revealing to ask ourselves how we became involved in Viet Nam in the first place. How did we permit ourselves to make such faulty commitments with such disastrous consequences? We get some clues, I think, when we review the spectrum of our relationship with China over the last two centuries.

More than with other nations, our relationship with China has been subject to the ebb and flow of popular myth. We have tended to oscillate from the one oversimplified view of China to another. For almost two centuries, China has been viewed, alternately, as benign or virulent, friendly or hostile, wise or foolish.

Like the "yin" and "yang" of Chinese cosmology which holds that life is the product of a dualism of opposites, our image of China has gone from one extreme to the other. On the one hand, there has been the image of the China of wisdom, intelligence, industry, piety, stoicism and strength. That is the benign China of Marco Polo and Pearl S. Buck; it is the China of the Charlie Chan movies and of the stories of heroic resistance to Japan in the 1930's.

On the other hand, there has been the image of the China of cruelty, barbarism, violence, and faceless hordes. This is the China of drum-head trials, opium dens, bandits, summary executions, Fu Manchu, and the Boxer Rebellion.

In the late 18th century, we looked up to China as an ancient civilization—superior in many aspects of technology, culture, and social order and surrounded by an air of splendid and imperial mystery. In that period, the China trade was sought eagerly by the Clipper ships and Chinese produce was highly valued notably along the Eastern Seaboard and in Europe.

Respect turned to contempt, however, with China's quick defeat in the Opium War of 1840. There followed acts of humiliation of China such as our participation in extra-territorial treaty rights and the Chinese Exclusion Act of the last half of the 19th century.

In the early 20th century, attitudes shifted again to benevolence. American missionaries of many faiths made China a favored field for proselytizing and education. In this period, the Chinese became, for this nation, a guided, guarded, and adored people.

Chinese resistance to the Japanese invasion in 1937 produced another shift from benevolence to admiration. At the end of the Second World War, admiration was displaced by disappointment and frustration, as the wartime truce between Nationalist and Communist forces collapsed in internal strife. This nation became profoundly disenchanted with China, a disenchantment which was replaced abruptly in 1949 by hostility. U.S. Secretaries of State turned their backs on Chinese leaders and spoke of the menace of "Chinese hordes" as predecessors had spoken with similar revulsion of the "yellow peril."

The hostility was largely a reaction, of course, to the coming to power of a Communist regime on the Chinese mainland. We were not only dismayed by this development,

we saw it almost as a national affront. Peking was viewed as a treacherous extension of the Soviet steamroller which had reduced Eastern and Central Europe to subservience at the end of World War II. China became in our eyes the Eastern puppet of world communism, to be manipulated by strings pulled in Moscow.

After Chinese forces intervened in the war in Korea where, incidentally, Mao Tse-tung lost his eldest son, U.S. policy was cast anew on the premise that the government on the Chinese mainland was an aggressor. It was seen as ready to use force to impose international Communism anywhere in Asia. Conversely, it was assumed that if the endorsement of the free nations were withheld, this regime which was said to be "alien" to the Chinese people would wither and collapse.

On this premise, it was rationalized that recognition must not be extended to Peking. Instead, the official American view was that the Chinese National Government, which had retreated to the island of Taiwan, continued to speak for all of China. We cut off trade with the Chinese mainland and did whatever could be done to encourage other countries to follow suit. In a similar fashion, a diplomatic campaign was conducted year after year against the seating of the Chinese People's Republic in the United Nations.

We drew an arc of military alliances on the seaward side of China and undergirded them with the deployment of massive U.S. military power in bases throughout the Western Pacific. Tens of billions of dollars were expended in this process. Much of this immense outpouring of effort and money seems incredible now in the light of the President's recent visits to Peking and to Moscow. Yet, it has continued for 20 years and, of course, is still going on, notably, in Indochina.

As has been suggested, this last quarter century of China policy has been characterized by delusion and miscalculation. We assumed, for example, that the Chinese Communists would be unable to govern. We assumed that the Peking government would be an extension of Soviet Communism and a willing accomplice to Soviet purpose and design. And we assumed that the Chinese government would be bent on territorial aggrandizement.

All of these assumptions have proved to be erroneous. In the first place, of the numerous divisions which have arisen within the Communist world, the differences between Moscow and Peking have been the most significant. They so remain today although the rasping edges of the conflict appear somewhat tempered by the periodic flare-ups of the war in Viet Nam.

At the same time, the government of the People's Republic has not only survived, it has provided the Chinese people with effective leadership. Chinese society has achieved a considerable degree of economic, scientific and social progress. A modern technology has been developed which is sophisticated enough to turn out products ranging from needles and hand-tools to thermonuclear devices, earth satellites and the rockets to place them in orbit. A powerful national momentum has been generated which is proving sufficient to supply an enormous population with the wherewithal of decent survival and an improving livelihood.

Notwithstanding assumptions to the contrary, the Chinese government has not shown any great eagerness to use its own armed forces to spread its control abroad. Where Chinese armies have been employed they have been used to assert traditional territorial claims, or in expression of concern for the safety of China's borders. China has not become enmeshed in foreign military adventures. In Viet Nam, for example, the Chinese military involvement has been peripheral. There is Chinese equipment in South Viet Nam but there are no Chinese battalions. In North Viet Nam reports have indicated

the presence, from time to time, not of Chinese combat units, but of labor troops engaged in repairing bomb damage to roads, railroads, bridges and the like.

Chinese actions in Tibet, and along the Himalayan frontier with India, are often cited as examples of militant Communist aggression. Nevertheless, for centuries, Tibet has been universally regarded as falling within China's over-all boundaries. If the Peking government claims that Tibet belongs to China, so, too, does the Chinese National Government on Taiwan. India also acknowledges such to be the case and American policy has never officially recognized Tibet as other than Chinese territory.

Even in Korea, the direct Chinese military involvement did not begin until United Nations forces approached China's borders. In any event, the last Chinese battalions left North Korea years ago.

Looking ahead, it would seem to me that Chinese energies and resources are going to be so preempted by internal needs over the next two decades that there is little likelihood that China could pose a serious military danger to the United States even if that were the inclination.

The evidence, in short, is ample to dispel some of the most alarming assumptions on which our past policies have been based. Of course, there is an immense potential danger in China. There is also an immense potential danger in every other powerful nation in a world which has not yet learned how to maintain civilized survival in a nuclear age except on the razor's edge. Insofar as China is concerned, the fundamental question for us is not so much whether it is a danger, but whether our policies will act to alleviate or to exacerbate the danger.

In my judgment, these policies can alleviate the danger only to the extent that they are based on premises that correspond more nearly to realities than has been the case in the past. It will serve no useful purpose to flail at windmills. Now that we have, in 1972, at last penetrated the shroud of obscurity surrounding China, there is reason to hope that our judgments and actions regarding China and Asia, henceforth, will be better informed.

In this new phase of our relations with China, we must beware, of course, that the old pendulum of myth does not now swing to the other extreme, thereby creating a new image of China which is as unreal as the old. We must guard against becoming too enamored of the splendors of a newly revived amity. Banquets and toasts and shark's fin soup do not of themselves assure a new order of world affairs.

To keep the pendulum in equilibrium in our current approach to China, it would be well to heed a rule laid down by Lord Palmerston, the prime Minister of Great Britain in the 1860's, who declared:

"We have no eternal allies, and we have no perpetual enemies. . . ."

Our experiences in postwar World War II relations with Germany and Japan underscore this observation.

We have not always been very astute about defining where our real interests lie. We have often tended to confuse them with fleeting and transitory images of friendliness or animosity. This is all too true in the case of China where, for 25 years, we have been obsessed with the assumed threat of a perpetual enemy. In fact, we might well have avoided the untold misery and loss of life and resources of the peripheral war in Indochina, had we forgone the *poses of power* and, instead, taken a harder view of our national interests.

While we cannot identify national interests with exactitude, we do have it within our means to determine much more clearly where it is that they do *not* lie. The President has shown the way in this connection. Even before his visit to Peking, he had laid the

groundwork for reestablishing more normal contact with the People's Republic of China by the removal of discriminatory restrictions on travel of Americans to the Chinese mainland and by ending the embargo on trade with China. The embargo had been imposed during the Korean War and was of a design so tight as to exclude even chopsticks. The fact is, however, that for two decades, it had had no economic impact in China and had served only to injure our own traders. By ending the boycott on the eve of his visit to China, the President removed what was, at most, an irritant to China but which would have hampered his efforts to bring about the beginnings of a reconciliation.

As it was, President Nixon was able to lay the groundwork for the growth of contact between the two nations. The chances are good that the months and years ahead will see a gradual increase in exchanges between China and the United States in medicine and health, science, journalism, athletics, the arts and other pursuits.

An increase in trade is also to be anticipated. The Chinese are in an excellent position to move forward in this connection. It has been their practice to keep imports and exports, worldwide, in rough balance. They have neither external nor internal debt. They have ample exchange reserves. Their international reputation for integrity and reliability in commercial transactions is already very good. A great range of Chinese products is available for sale in the world markets and the Chinese also have a substantial shopping list for imports which will help to speed their own development and strengthen their economic self-reliance.

Exchanges can take place, in my judgment, even though the issue of Taiwan's remains finally, to be resolved. President Nixon has acknowledged as valid, Peking's claim that the island is part of China. That claim, incidentally, is sustained by the Chinese government on Taiwan. With the assurance that the United States will not pursue a two-China policy, Peking is prepared to go ahead in reestablishing contact with this nation while exploring in its own fashion the road to reunification of the island with the mainland.

Beyond exchanges between China and the United States, there loom larger questions of peace and security in the Western Pacific. Even as we meet here today, we await the consequences of the latest escalation of the U.S. involvement in Viet Nam as well as the full import of the President's discussions in Moscow. One can only hope that we have seen the last resort to retaliation in Indochina, the final burst of this wasting conflict and that progress can now be expected toward a genuine political settlement.

In all candor, the record of this tragic war provides little grounds for optimism in this respect. The invasion of Cambodia did not produce peace. Nor did the invasion of Laos. Nor did the earlier bombing enterprises over North Viet Nam.

Peace was the promise attached, in turn, to each of these escalations of the U.S. involvement. Each, in turn, led not to the promised peace but to more killed and maimed, more prisoners of war, more missing in action, more and more billions in expenditures to produce more and more devastation throughout Indochina.

The end of this war has yet to come and it is not clear yet when it will come. We would do well, nevertheless, to begin to examine the possibilities of a new security system, based on the realities of the 70's. These realities urge us to seek, in my judgment, an equilibrium of this nation's interests with those of China, Japan, the Soviet Union and the smaller nations of the Western Pacific. All have a stake in the peace of the region.

The restoration of contact with China furthers the possibility that at some time tripartite discussions might be held between

China, Japan, and the United States, if not quadripartite talks, which would also include the Soviet Union. A development of this kind could do much to allay unfounded mutual fears and to begin to come to grips with the question of adjustment of valid national interests. It could provide insights into such vital questions as the intentions of the various powers in the Western Pacific and how they relate to one another, the economic needs of the Asian nations, and the prospects for curbing nuclear conflict. Most important, such discussions might provide a vehicle for general stabilization of the Indochina peninsula and Southeast Asia in the post-war era.

Adjustments of this kind require fresh perspectives. We need to see the situation as it is today, not as it appeared 20 years ago in the cataclysmic upheaval of the Chinese revolution. We need to see the situation not through the fog of an old and stagnant hostility but in the light of the enduring interests of the United States in the Western Pacific which are no less than a peace of equality and mutuality which will permit a flowering of relations with all Asian nations. Nor, may I add, are they any more.

I see great relevance in young men and women thinking deeply of the issues which divide China and the United States to determine how they can be recast in new and uncluttered molds. Unlike my generation, you have already learned much about Asia. You have a greater awareness of its importance to this nation and to the world. Furthermore, you have not had the experience of national trauma in moving abruptly from an era marked by an almost fawning benevolence toward China to one of thorough disenchantment. You were spared the fierce hostilities which rent this nation internally, as a sense of warmth, sympathy, and security regarding China gave way to feelings of revulsion, hatred and insecurity.

You young Americans and your counterparts in China will live your adult years in an era in which much of the world's history will be written in the Pacific. What you do, how you relate to one another—Chinese and Americans—will have much to do with whether or not that history is written in terms of peace and civilized human survival.

I have seen China off and on since I served there in the Marines in the 1920's. I have seen you, your parents and your grandparents much closer up and for a much longer period of time.

I am confident about a future that belongs to your generation, both in China and in this country of ours. This Republic is worthy of your best efforts not only in terms of developing Chinese and U.S. relations, but with regard to the entire world. You can do no more than try to achieve mutual understanding and a peace with all peoples. You can and should do no less.

#### CHINA: MYTHS AND REALITIES

Whenever I talk with people of your age, I am struck by your candor and honesty. You raise questions as to the values of our society, the integrity of our public affairs and the wisdom with which government is being run. This is as it should be. Only through constant reexamination will our policies and our system be shaped to meet the ever-changing needs of the nation.

There is a human tendency to cling to the ways of the past. It is desirable in that it gives continuity to our national life. If carried too far, however, it can be a straight-jacket. Persons in public life, perhaps, tend to be very susceptible to this tendency. Hence, the mistakes or irrelevances of the past may be over-reflected in current policies. Until very recently, for example, your government's position on China seems to have been based largely on inadequate or erroneous assumptions of what was going on inside that nation of 800 million. Now that the President has visited Peking, the fictions about China

are falling away. We are beginning, at last, to see what really confronts us in the great nation on the other side of the globe.

I would like to talk to you, therefore, about myths and realities regarding China. I do so because what happens in our relations with that nation will have profound meaning to you throughout your adult lives. A few weeks ago, I had the experience of spending 16 days traveling in China. It was not my first visit but it was in 1946 that I had last been there. So for a quarter of a century, that vast land has been to me as it has been to almost all Americans, as remote as the moon. In fact, since the space program began, we have spent more time and energy—and much more of the federal treasury—thousands of times more—in attempting to fathom the moon's secrets than in trying to learn the truth about China.

Since 1949, our concepts of China have been compounded of ignorance, half truth and untruth. This concoction produced a U.S. policy which was designed on the basis of a China seen as a malignant dragon breathing fire and lashing out aggressively at the world.

Before most of you who are graduating were born, your government had already begun to erect a Great Wall of isolation against this presumed menace. A ring of military treaties was established in Asia to choke off what were thought to be China's imperial ambitions. To nail these treaties into place, moreover, U.S. bases were established all over that region. U.S. troops were sent to man the bases. Tens of billions of dollars in military aid were distributed among foreign governments who did not have to do much more to obtain such aid than to give us assurances of their hostility to Communism.

While we were seeing China as a reckless, belligerent and powerful ally of Communist Russia, China was struggling to build on the ruins of World War II and a great revolution, a political and economic system which would serve the needs of the Chinese people. If we sought to contain China, in turn, the Chinese sought to keep us from interfering in their affairs. The Chinese view of U.S. policy in those days was that it was a logical extension of the over-all Western effort to dominate and exploit their country which had persisted for 150 years. They saw us as implacable enemies.

If the Chinese did not read our intentions correctly, we did not read theirs any more accurately. The fact is that China did not engage in aggressive seizures of neighboring nations. Whatever territorial changes they have sought, with the Soviet Union, Burma and India, had also previously been those pursued by predecessor Chinese governments, notably the government of Chiang Kai-shek on Taiwan.

In retrospect, U.S. policy with regard to China since 1949 has been ill-informed and misguided. I say that not as a Monday morning quarter-back. All of us who lived through those years share, to some degree, the writing of this unfortunate chapter in U.S.-Chinese relations. The fact is that we let our fears get the best of us. In looking at China for the past two decades, we saw much that was not there.

It is still difficult even now to form impressions of China free of these past distortions. Nevertheless, the distortions can be tempered by perspective in the sense that a bottle can be judged as half full or as half empty. If China is measured by some of our common yardsticks, whether they be highway mileage, the number of cars, television sets, kitchen gadgets, political parties, or newspaper editors—the bottle will be seen as half empty. If China is viewed in the light of its own past, the bottle is half full and rapidly filling.

That is the way the Chinese people look at their situation. They are not comparing their way of life with ours or with India's or



even Taiwan's. They are looking inward at where they were yesterday, where they are today and where they will be tomorrow. It is no wonder, then, that there are many signs of popular acceptance of the new China and very little to indicate popular discontent. The fact is that the contrast of the new China with the old is nothing short of extraordinary.

If the new China is a closely controlled society, it is also true that political freedom was not a preeminent characteristic of the old China. Yet, there are sharp contrasts between the old and the new. Unlike the past, the current political controls have resulted in a China free of the ever-present threat of famine, pestilence, flood and other calamities. It is also a China largely free of exploitation, free of political corruption and free of indifferent government.

By comparison with the past, there is every visible indication that the Chinese people, today, live in a well-fed, adequately clothed and housed, and reasonably healthy society. The cities are clean, orderly and safe. The shops are well stocked with food, clothing and modest consumer items. Crime, begging, drug addiction, alcoholism, delinquency are conspicuous in their absence.

Personal integrity is scrupulous to an extreme. In Canton, for example, I saw a display case for lost and found articles in the lobby of the People's Hotel. It contained, among other things, a half-empty package of cigarettes and a pencil!

Today's China is an effectively organized, hard-working, early-to-bed, early-to-rise society. In both urban and rural areas, the people appear to be well motivated and cooperative. Women and men work side by side for equal pay. There is no visible distinction of rank on the farms, in the factories, in the armed services or government offices. A casual sense of freedom and mutual tolerance pervades personal relationships. There is an air of easy egalitarianism. There is now bowing down or kowtowing, not even to the highest officials.

The accent in China is on today and tomorrow, but a new interest is also evidenced in China's rich past. Everywhere there are striking restorations of cultural shrines even as the search continues for more of the ancient heritage. Excavations of the historic sites are underway throughout China and the archeological finds, to date, have been very impressive.

Conservation of natural resources has also received great emphasis. So many trees have been planted in and around Peking, for example, that the local weather has been altered for the better. Throughout China a new productivity is being developed by the reclamation of wastelands and by massive water control projects.

Only a few years ago, no medical care to speak of was available to the great preponderance of China's people. Now, along with regular physicians, so-called "barefoot" doctors who, in the tens of thousands, constitute a kind of basic civilian medical corps, are active in every region of China. The help which they give is often based on a limited medical knowledge but it is sustained by an unlimited enthusiasm to serve the sick.

Along with modern medicine, the Chinese are also using traditional herb treatment and acupuncture techniques. The latter is a Chinese healing practice which is over three thousand years old. It has been revived as a highly effective anesthesia in surgery and is also being put to widespread experimental use as a treatment for many ailments.

Intestinal and other epidemic diseases—the terrors of old China—have been drastically reduced or eliminated. The heavy accent which has been placed on personal cleanliness and order has been a major factor in this achievement. In addition, there have been repeated mobilizations of the population in mass campaigns to eradicate disease-carrying

snails, flies and mosquitoes. Not only in health but in every aspect of society there is evidence of a China being rebuilt. The Chinese people have swept away much of the inequity, the ineffectiveness and the despair of the past.

Notwithstanding reports to the contrary, the family remains as the basic social unit of China. It is a unit, however, which is no longer permitted to function on the sole basis of family interests, indifferent to the fate of the community and the nation. In short, the Chinese are fashioning a modern society, with a way of life which is rooted in the past but meets the needs of the present, and seems to offer hope for the future.

While these vast changes have been taking place in China, we have gone on fighting a war in Indochina. Our involvement in that war is derived in large part from the policies towards China which were adopted in 1949. As a former President put it some years ago: "Over this war (in Indochina), and all Asia is another reality: The deepening shadow of Communist China." To say it another way, we had engaged ourselves in Indochina, in major part, to block an aggressive China. For all practical purposes, President Nixon no longer sees the situation that way. On his visit he found a China not turned outward for aggressive ends but a China intent on solving its many internal problems. He initiated further contact on the basis of this finding.

The fact is that the Chinese, themselves, reject the status of "super-power" and insist that their system does not permit them to impose their views on others by force. Their armed forces are maintained inside China's borders and there are no appeals for military crusades abroad. They have no military outposts or bases in Korea, Southeast Asia or anywhere else on the Asian continent.

In a book written after a recent visit to China, Ross Terrill summed up the Chinese view of the world in these words:

"Here is a superior people . . . but whose sense of their superiority is rooted in contentment with their own mountains and rivers—not an active sense of superiority which pants to convert the world to its excellence. A passive sense of superiority, which basks, inward-turned, within its own possessed excellence."

There is little reason to expect a radical change in the basic direction of China's present course. Mao Tse-tung has already become a living legend in China and his writings are likely to illuminate the path of China's social, political, and economic development for the foreseeable future. What is to be anticipated, I believe is more rapid progress in building China's economy, with continued emphasis on production. China's resources are so diverse, its population so vast, and its needs so great that the emphasis could continue to be placed on internal development for many years to come.

I would anticipate that there will be an expansion of contacts between China and the rest of the world, including the United States. So far as I can see, the steps taken thus far by the President and the Chinese Premier to normalize relations are irreversible provided, I repeat, provided that this nation's course out of Viet Nam is also irreversible. Without peace in Indochina, there is little likelihood of a significant expansion of peaceful contact with China.

As for future relations between the Chinese and ourselves, I believe that we can dissolve the fears of the past by an honest exchange of viewpoints, mutual consideration, and decent restraints in dealing with one another. The differences which exist and will continue to exist need not lead to conflict. On the contrary, they can be adjusted to mutual gain.

We are a young national culture relative to China, hundreds of years compared with thousands of years. There is much to be

learned and gained on both sides, in agriculture, industry, pollution control, health, education and many other fields.

There are human values to be examined and weighed. The mutual educative process has begun anew. The process must be maintained on the basis of equality of treatment and respect. The days of the one-sided relationship which once existed with China—of teacher-pupil, master-servant, benefactor and dependent, and so on back into the 19th Century's "enlightened and heathen," are gone and it is hard to see who in contemporary China or in this nation will mourn their passing.

Chou En-lai noted that it had taken "100 years since the Opium Wars for the Chinese people to stand up." Today, they are standing up. Self-reliance is their watchword and on that basis they are building a new China. In the years ahead, you will also be building, as each generation does, a new nation here in the United States. I would hope that it will remain rooted in the soil of the past even as it is redesigned for living in the present and to provide hope and confidence for the future.

I regret to say that the legacy which has been left to you with regard to our relations with China contains a high percentage of distortion which, in turn, has helped to distort relations with other parts of the globe. It is no accident, for example, that we have spent and are continuing to spend the lives of tens of thousands of Americans in Indochina and tens of billions of dollars in that tragic conflict. These sacrifices are a part of the price of two decades of distortion in China policy and the sooner we face up to this underlying cause of the Indochina war the better.

You, who are not saddled with the myths of the past, can play a large role in clearing away this debris. On the heels of the President's initiative, the reality of China is beginning to trickle into the consciousness of government. The enlightenment of your generation can speed that process. I am confident that you will not be fettered with the fears of the past, that you will look at the world around you with fresh clarity and find the courage to think your own thoughts. To think your own thoughts is the well-spring of freedom. May you draw deeply on it to help shape a better relationship between this nation and China and with all nations.

#### TOWARDS A FOREIGN POLICY OF MUTUALITY

I come here today to convey a word of optimism regarding the nation's foreign relations. Optimism in this connection is long overdue; still, I hope my reference to it at this time is not premature. Whatever the case, my expectation is that history may well record 1972 as the year in which a corner was turned for peace. There are indications that the world is headed back towards constructive human purpose in its major international relationships. A water-shed appears to have been reached after a quarter century of dangerous dallying in the murky detours of the Cold War.

Insofar as the government of this nation is concerned, except in the case of Indochina, I believe the President is responding in a new fashion to international circumstances. He is projecting not as adversary but as conciliator. In so doing, he is paying heed to the legitimate claims of a public sentiment grown impatient with the words of peace, sung to the cadence of war.

So, I address a word of hope especially to you men and women of this graduating class. Your generation can take a great deal of credit for bringing about this change. Your manifest disenchantment with the foreign policies of the past and with the tragic travesty in the name of peace in Indochina has been impressed on Washington. You have underscored the point that government is itself governed, in the final analysis, by

the depth and degree of public support which can be commanded for its policies.

You have helped to inject balance into official channels and, hopefully, to assure that government will not soon again indulge in meaningless adventures abroad, largely at the expense of young life. If we are, in fact, going through the last Viet Nam, if we are, in fact, getting out at last, as I devoutly hope, you have done your share to that end.

To be sure, the millennium has not yet arrived. Domsday missiles in the United States point at doomsday missiles several thousand miles and a few minutes away. We still have vast garrisons on the mainland of Southeast Asia. Planes are still engaged in raining terror out of the Indochina skies. Ships sow the instruments of destruction in the waters south of China. Indeed, the Secretary of Defense has just told us that the spread of conflict, by sea and air, once again into North Viet Nam—this latest episode in the continuing agony of the Indochina War, will cost the people of the nation an additional \$5 billion this year, not to speak of more lives, more prisoners-of-war, and more missing in action.

Nor should we overlook, in any note of optimism, the social and economic overload which arises at home from these and other wasting demands abroad; the capacities of the nation are great but they are not unlimited. The strain of serving, for a quarter-of-a-century as the world's leading policeman, banker, pioneer in space and what-not shows in the prices that are paid in every store in the nation. It shows, too, in the neglect of the environment, in the decay of cities and in the rise of crime, drug addiction and other barometers of social breakdown within our society.

Before we can speak of any real light at the end of the tunnel, we must face up to the immediate problems of the transition from the exertions of war to the work of peace. That the adjustments can be difficult and painful has been brought home to us by the President's announcement that the ABM site at Malmstrom will become inoperative under the terms of the Nixon-Brezhnev treaty. In this case, as in many others, we must find—the federal government has an obligation to assist in finding—constructive alternatives.

These qualifications aside, however, the fact is that the world has come a long distance towards sanity and order in the short space of a few months. That is why, in my judgment, the class of 1972 can look with some confidence to the future. There is a chance that the evil genies which have plagued us for a quarter century can be put back securely in the bottle.

Consider what has been achieved by the diplomacy of the past year. What comes to mind most vividly, of course, is the President's just completed journey to Moscow. The accords which were concluded there were highly significant in themselves. Yet, the most important result of the Moscow summit may be found not in specific achievements. Rather, it may emerge from the changes of national attitude on both sides which were reflected in the meetings.

The results of the Nixon-Brezhnev talks indicated a clear acceptance of mutual self-interest as the basis for the future relationship between the Soviet Union and the United States. We have not always been very prompt in the past to recognize national self-interest as a basis for a policy of peace. To be sure, we have sometimes over-assumed a national interest, as in Viet Nam and on that basis, spent the lives of tens of thousands of Americans and permitted over \$130 billion dollars to be sucked up by the destructive sponge of that conflict. Now, after years of this deadly wastage we have at last discovered that our only valid national concern is to get back the prisoners of war

and the recoverable missing in action. We have come at last to realize that our only national interest is to get out of the Indochina involvement, lock, stock and barrel.

If on some occasions we have over-assumed national interests, on others, we have ignored them almost as though they were not fitting to a great power. So, we have hesitated to define our bona fide concerns and pursued, instead, the will o' the wisp of ideological conflict. We have done so on the basis of such slogans as "Make the World Safe for Democracy," and most recently the "Battle for the Minds of Men" or the "Containment of Communism." The pursuit of ideological struggle has not led us to any victories. Rather, it has projected us into a hodge-podge of foreign aid, military alliances and into overseas propaganda and other dubious manipulative operations. The warm human concern of Americans for other peoples has been distorted by ideological warfare and we have plunged, without warrant, into the internal political and social affairs of other nations everywhere in the world. For two decades this costly exercise has become a way of life for hundreds of thousands of Americans, some of whom have scarcely set foot in the United States for many years. If there is a new light of hope, it is in large part because this random flailing appears to be coming to an end. In place of the cacophony of the Cold War, the recent Moscow conference spoke softly of "Basic Principles of Mutual Relations between the United States and the U.S.S.R." In these principles, the two nations recognized that there is no feasible answer in a nuclear age to the prospect of mutual annihilation other than mutual collaboration.

The two powers have begun, now, to move toward what President Nixon has called a position of "mutually agreed restraint" in armaments. To that end, a treaty has been negotiated by President Nixon to limit offensive and defensive strategic nuclear weapons on both sides. As I have already indicated, this treaty has a special meaning for Montana because it is expected that Malmstrom will not be developed now as an ABM site. In the circumstances, what I told the Senate in opposing the ABM program three years ago bears repeating today. On April 1, 1969, I said: "If this proposed ABM missile system . . . is right for the nation, it will be right for Montana. If it is wrong for the nation, however, the location of one site at Malmstrom cannot make it right."

"What economic benefit to a Montana community will equal the additional tax burdens and the new inflation which will weigh on all the people of Montana . . . ? If the system becomes an insatiable maw for the consumption of public resources, who will pay for the neglect of other urgent needs, if not all the people of the nation including Montanans?"

That was my position on the ABM three years ago. It remains my position. I will support the President in regard to the Nixon-Brezhnev Treaty because I think it is a step on the road to peace—a goal devoutly hoped for by all mankind.

The diplomacy by which the treaty was negotiated is similar to that which led the President to take the first steps in breaking down the barriers of isolation and separation with the People's Republic of China. To digress for a moment for a personal note, let me say that on March 29, 1968, I gave the first lecture sponsored by the Mike and Maureen Mansfield Foundation at the University. The subject was "China: Retrospect and Prospect." My remarks, four years ago, contained this statement:

"It ought to be made unequivocal that we are prepared at all times to meet with Chinese representatives—formally or informally—in order to consider differences between

China and the United States over Viet Nam or any other question of common concern."

The President's visit to Peking early this year which was followed by the journey of the Senate Minority Leader and myself a few weeks ago, has now made unequivocal the readiness of this nation to meet with China to the end that difficulties may be dissolved and civil contact restored between the two peoples. Four years is a long time. It is a long delay—but it is a beginning. The Great Wall of separation has commenced to crumble and the way to a stable peace in Asia is opening at last.

What the President has done with regard to the Chinese People's Republic is to remove a self-imposed straight-jacket on the foreign policies of the nation. Following World War II, for example, rather than face the great upheaval which had taken place in China, we chose not to recognize but to quarantine it. We cut ourselves off from contact with these monumental changes, thinking all the while that by so doing we somehow could exercise political control over them. In retrospect, it is clear that we had little or no effect over the course of events.

The fact is that there was a viable and independent government in control in China for many years before we chose to acknowledge that such was the case. It availed us nothing to ignore and isolate ourselves from that government. Yet, we continued to do so long after this policy had lost the last shred of a rationale.

Now that myths have begun to be replaced by realities, we can proceed to explore with the People's Republic of China, as the President has started to do with the Soviet Union, the possibilities of mutual accommodation. The change comes very late. Already, as I have indicated, the economy of the nation reveals the stresses imposed by unrealistic and excessively costly foreign-defense policies. Last year, for example, it was necessary to devalue the dollar, to raise import duties and to impose domestic controls to prevent a catastrophic breakdown in the nation's financial grid. The process of adjustment had been delayed too long to make a graceful and painless transition and it will be prudent to anticipate still other shocks in the future.

Nevertheless, we are now moving in the direction of mutuality, of a sharing of responsibilities and leadership with other nations. In part, this process depends on negotiations. In part, however, it is possible to take unilateral actions. It is not always necessary to await the pleasure of others in order to lighten our self-imposed burdens. I have, for example, not hesitated to urge unilateral action at various times with regard to Viet Nam in an effort to bring the involvement to a more rapid conclusion. I have done so because the ending of this mistaken and tragic adventure is our problem and our problem alone. Every day that the involvement persists adds to the burdens of the people of this nation, to the list of dead and wounded and to the devastation of the hapless people of Indochina. Others may have an interest in our withdrawal from this conflict. But none has a more vital interest than this nation in getting out without delay.

I have also urged unilateral action to bring about a substantial reduction of U.S. forces in Europe. There is no rhyme or reason, in my judgment, to keep more than half-million U.S. military personnel and dependents in Western Europe a quarter of a century after World War II at the expense of the people of the United States. Whatever purposes of foreign policy the U.S. garrison in Europe may still serve, the same purposes can be met by a far smaller contingent. As it is now, this enormous deployment is a drain on U.S. revenues; it is fuel for inflation in the United States and it is a major source of the weakness of the dollar in relation to the currencies of other nations.



I have stressed this issue time and again against the resistance of the Executive Branch under the Administrations of three Presidents. Insofar as I am concerned, it will continue to be stressed, notwithstanding the Moscow agreements which call for negotiation of mutual and balanced reductions of forces in Europe. The fact is that the Soviet Union does not pay for this antiquated and largely irrelevant U.S. deployment. The Europeans do not pay for it. The people of this nation pay the cost in their taxes. I see no particular virtue in prolonged negotiations with the Russians to bring about a reduction of U.S. forces which should have been done years ago in our own interest. I am appalled to think of the billions which have already been wasted in this long waiting game.

There was a time within the clear remembrance of many of us here today, when the rhetoric of Cold War was part and parcel of policy. That was a time when there did not appear to be any mutuality of interests between East and West and when it would have been futile to urge unilateral steps to reduce tensions. Those were the days when each nation was what George Washington so correctly described as the "slave of its own animosity."

The essential fact in precipitating the Cold War was that two powerful new forces—ideology and technology—came together at the close of World War II. This fusion vastly complicated the whole interplay of international affairs. The technological problem was awesome in its simplicity. With the great flood of scientific and engineering advances, governments came into possession of the power of instant and worldwide destruction. In consequence, the processes of statecraft were compressed in time and altered radically in conduct.

In this country there was a Constitutional fall-out from these technological developments. The power of the Executive Branch in foreign affairs increased drastically even as the power of the national legislature, the Congress and especially the Senate, shrank in proportion. In crises, so it was reasoned, there would not be time to make political decisions, much less debate the issues. At the same time, the new technology of war, by its scope and complexity, became more than ever a partner of government, with a vested interest in its own perpetuity and a high potential for distorting public decisions about war and peace.

The other aspect of the Cold War—the ideological problem—arose from the fact that two of the victors in World War II—the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China—were revolutionary states committed to a system of social and economic organization which was anathema to this nation. The conspiratorial aspect of Communism posed a particularly painful problem for the United States, breeding suspicion, distrust and division in government. It became difficult to separate valid threats to national security from the bombast of the power-seekers. Enlightened public debate became constrained and as a result public policy was not always subjected as fully as it should have been to the purgative of critical challenge. So the political paroxysms of the '50's led to the rigid policies of the '60's.

History may well record that we pursued the correct foreign policies into the early 1960's; that we bought time, through containment and counterforce, to permit the gradual moderation of Communist power, thereby reducing the Marxist states to the political dimensions of other nations. However that may be, it has been apparent for some time that we persisted in these policies too long. We were blind to changes elsewhere and to the possibilities of adjusting to mutual interest. In the end, we came to the disaster of Viet Nam. It is part of the price

which has been exacted for the obstinate pursuit of the obsolete in foreign policy.

How can it be prevented from happening again? Quite possibly the world will not soon see a repetition of the particular confluence of historical forces—ideology and technology—which produced the rigidities of the Cold War. Possibly, the awareness of our own electorate may now be such that prolonged periods of national self-delusion will no longer be countenanced. Perhaps, more effective techniques will be found in the art of government which will act to limber the dead weight of massive bureaucracy and so bring about a greater responsiveness to changing circumstances both at home and abroad. Perhaps, the addition of the under-21-voters to the electorate which I consider the highlight of my career—will revitalize the entire political process. In any event, it is doubtful that your generation—seared as it has been by the folly and outrage of Viet Nam—will long suffer in silence a foreign policy which is based on the outdated.

In the final analysis it comes down to the degree to which an enlightened and vigorous electorate will probe and test and call to account the policies of its own government. President Brewster of Yale has put it in these words:

"Exposure, questioning, reappraisal are often painful, even agonizing; their price is nothing, however, compared to the resentment aroused by a feeling of manipulated ignorance."

Your generation has some reason to feel, I'm sure, that it has paid the high price of "manipulated ignorance." At least you have the advantage of knowing clearly what your generation must avoid. I am confident that you can and will not only skirt the pitfalls of the past, but being thus spared the old burdens, you will be free to explore the vast possibilities of mutual accommodation with all peoples in a world which is now beginning to be liberated from its obsolete fears.

You can do no more. You should do no less.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the distinguished Senator from California (Mr. TUNNEY) is now recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

#### QUORUM CALL

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

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be recognized as in the morning hour, pending arrival of the distinguished Senator from California (Mr. TUNNEY).

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, permit me to ask that the time for the quorum call, just had, be taken out of my time under the order, and I shall yield to the distinguished majority leader such

time as he may require from my time under the order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered and the Senator from Montana is recognized.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I appreciate the usual courtesy and graciousness of the distinguished deputy majority leader, the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD).

#### THE SECURITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, over the weekend, I received a letter from the President of the United States. As long as there has been some reference to it in the press, I think it should be read in open session at this time.

It is my understanding that the same letter was addressed to the distinguished minority leader, the senior Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT).

The letter is dated June 9, 1972, and it reads:

DEAR MIKE: In my special report to the joint session of the Congress on June 1, the evening of my return from the summit discussions in Moscow, I said that the door to the agreements that we reached there had been opened because the United States had maintained the strength it needed to protect its interests. A vital and indispensable element of that strength has been our continuing security assistance program.

The Foreign Assistance Authorization bill for fiscal year 1973, a significant portion of which is devoted to security assistance, is of direct and fundamental importance to the continued maintenance of our strength and the protection of our interests. As you know, the Senate will soon begin consideration of this bill, S. 3390.

Mr. President, S. 3390 is the unfinished business of the Senate and will be taken up shortly.

At Guam in 1969, I made clear that the United States would look increasingly to its friends and allies to play a greater role in providing for their own defense. Since that time we have moved forward steadily toward that objective with full recognition that our own security depends importantly upon the independence, the progress and the stability of our friends. But if we are to reach that goal, we must help others to develop the ability to defend themselves. My Foreign Assistance program requests for fiscal year 1973 are based on these imperatives.

The severe cuts in my fiscal year 1972 requests, and the restrictive amendments which were imposed, significantly limited our ability to move toward the basic objectives of the program—the maintenance of the strength necessary to secure a lasting peace.

When I forwarded my fiscal year 1973 requests on March 10, 1972, I reported that the foreign assistance appropriations for fiscal year 1972 were below the minimum level required to attain our foreign policy and national security goals. Such reductions and restrictions, if imposed by the Congress again in 1973, will call into serious question the firmness of our commitments abroad. Such Congressional action could have a destabilizing effect at a time when confidence in our support and perseverance will be critically needed.

In recent months we have taken bold and decisive steps in our continuing search for peace. I believe that through these efforts we have done much to enhance America's security and that of the entire world, primarily by diminishing the likelihood of direct

confrontation with the Soviet Union and the Peoples Republic of China. Though we are making every effort to expand on these initial and significant steps, the process of building the structure of lasting peace will be long and arduous.

I share with you the desire to withdraw our remaining forces from Indochina in a timely and honorable manner. But Congressional amendments which can be misconstrued by our adversaries to be hostile to my peace proposals of May 8 do not serve this objective. As I have reported to you and to the people of the United States, we are continuing to pursue every possible avenue toward peace in Southeast Asia. I have made clear to the North Vietnamese that we are fully prepared to participate in meaningful negotiations to achieve a settlement and I am hopeful that they will be convinced that such negotiations are in the best interests of all parties.

I am firmly convinced that the amendment of our purposes—in Vietnam and elsewhere—will be far more likely if this bill is passed in substantially the form in which I submitted it. As brought to the floor, however, the bill is incompatible with these objectives.

I have always appreciated the assistance you have given me in formulating programs to ensure this nation's welfare and security. We seek the same ends—the maintenance of our strength and will, a lessening of tensions and an amelioration of the plight of the less privileged. I am confident that I can count on your firm support in further pursuit of the goals.

Sincerely,

RICHARD NIXON.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, how much time remains to me

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from West Virginia was to be recognized for a period of not to exceed 15 minutes. Nine minutes of that time has been yielded to the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Presiding Officer. I ask unanimous consent that the remaining 6 minutes of my time be allotted to the Senator from California.

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

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, I thank the able and distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California previously had an order for 15 minutes. The Senator from California now has 21 minutes.

#### THE BANK SECRECY ACT

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, on October 26, 1970, Public Law 91-508 was approved by the President. A portion of that law, which has been referred to euphemistically by some as the "Bank Secrecy Act," requires the maintenance of certain bank records and the creation and rendering of certain reports where such reports or records have a "high degree of usefulness in criminal, tax or regulatory investigations or proceedings." Except for articulating the "high degree of usefulness" standard as the one to be applied, the Congress gave the Secretary of the Treasury extremely wide latitude in his power to promulgate regulations implementing the law. I am fearful, Mr.

President, that the Congress may have made a great mistake in delegating such sweeping powers.

On April 5 of this year, the regulations were promulgated in final form and are scheduled to take effect July 1, 1972. In my view, these regulations as written, appear to be so sweeping that the privacy of millions of Americans may be subject to invasion.

The Senate report on the bill said that the purpose of the law was to reduce the incidence of white-collar crime and was particularly directed to obtaining more information on the use of secret foreign bank accounts by U.S. citizens or residents. The law, says the report, was also to facilitate the enforcement of the U.S. security laws, trading-in-gold laws and tax laws.

Although some of the regulations accomplish this task, others seem to have little to do with stopping crime.

One of the regulations in particular disturbs me. It requires banks to keep for 5 years copies of both sides of every check, money order, and draft, payable by the bank. There are certain exceptions not pertinent to most ordinary people, such as payroll checks, insurance claims, medical benefits, checking accounts which average over 100 checks per month and the like. But there is no limitation as to a maximum or a minimum amount of money involved in a transaction the records of which are to be maintained.

I fail to comprehend how a person's \$5 per month newspaper subscription, milk bill, liquor purchases, subscriptions to journals, or financial contributions to organizations will be useful in any degree to a criminal tax or regulatory investigation or proceeding much less to a high degree of usefulness. This regulation might, however, pave the way for massively indiscriminate fishing expeditions of incredible dimensions.

The Senate report says "the legislation in no way authorizes unlimited fishing expeditions into bank records on the part of law enforcement officials" and that access to such records would "be only pursuant to subpoena or other lawful process as is presently the case." However, there have been reported instances where branch banks, apparently in an effort to maintain good relations with Federal agencies such as the FBI, willingly turn over bank information to such agencies without the benefit of a subpoena or court order and without notice to the bank customer whose account is to be scrutinized.

I was made aware of this alarming fact in April this year by an article in the Marin County Independent Journal. It told a frightening tale of a Californian, a financial supporter of "radical" causes—which it is his constitutional right to be so long as no laws are violated—who found out that his monthly bank statement was being scrutinized by the FBI before it was mailed to him. It was brought to his attention one month when he opened his envelope and found an interdepartmental memo wrapped around his checks. The memo said, "this memo is to authorize you to read checks to the FBI before sending this statement to the customer."

In his "Washington Merry-Go-Round" column dated May 12, 1972, in the Washington Post, Jack Anderson published a story on the monitoring of movie actress Jane Fonda's bank account without a subpoena or court order. According to Anderson, the FBI file on Miss Fonda took cognizance of the law only by noting that the information already obtained by the Bureau should not be made public until after a subpoena directed to the bank was issued and served upon the bank.

I am alarmed by the fact that this sort of Government snooping goes on without the benefit of a subpoena or court order.

The sweep of these regulations only exacerbates the situation because much more information will be made available to the Government for purposes other than "criminal, tax, or regulatory" cases.

In our world of today, a person's personal, political and business life may be scrutinized in detail by examining his bank account. Most Americans do not wish their every expenditure known or scrutinized. Most Americans have nothing to hide, but they resent this looking over their shoulder, this surveillance ostensibly to assure that they are not criminals, or tax evaders.

For people who may financially support politically unpopular causes or organizations or subscribe to unpopular publications, the apprehension that their affairs may not remain private cannot help but have a chilling effect on their constitutional right freely to associate.

It seems to me that Americans simply are not protected from unlimited fishing expeditions if banks comply with Federal agency requests in the absence of notice to the affected person and if no subpoena or court process is undergone prior to obtaining those records. If there are to be any safeguards to protect America's banking privacy. The treasury regulations do not say so.

Mr. President, I am puzzled by another of the new regulations. That one requires the filing of a report by a financial institution whenever a person deposits, withdraws, exchanges or transfers more than \$10,000.

There is a very interesting loophole in this regulations, namely, that no report is required of those persons who maintain accounts with balances which the bank determines do not exceed amounts "commensurate with the customary conduct of the business—or profession of the customer concerned."

Although this regulation is presumably to assist in the investigation of suspected criminals, with this loophole, a big-time criminal who regularly has large banking transactions will sail through this regulation like a gust of wind.

The reports on persons whose banking transactions in excess of \$10,000 will be available for scrutiny by agencies other than the Treasury Department.

The regulations provide that any other Federal agency or department may obtain such information upon request when it relates to some criminal tax or regulatory investigation or proceeding. It would appear that under this arrangement, any Federal agency may begin its "investigation" by fishing through all those reports to see if something "sus-



picious" is found. There is nothing in the regulations which safeguard the reports from further dissemination once it is in the hands of any other Federal agency or department. Who knows where the information may wind up.

Mr. President, because of the importance of these matters, on June 7, 1972, I sent a letter to the Secretary of the Treasury asking some questions with regard to current practices and the new regulations.

I hope that other Senators will join with me in carefully scrutinizing this recent Treasury effort prior to its effective date.

I ask unanimous consent to have a copy of that letter printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY,

Washington, D.C., June 7, 1972.

Hon. JOHN B. CONNALLY, Jr.,  
Secretary of the Treasury,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Since the promulgation on April 5, 1972, of the Regulations on Financial Record Keeping and Reporting of Currency in Foreign Transactions, which are presumably designed to implement Public Law 91-508 and are scheduled to become effective July 1, 1972, I have been besieged by complaints from California citizens who feel that their right to confidential and private banking affairs has been seriously breached by the Department of the Treasury.

Although I support the stated purpose of the statute to require the maintenance and creation of records which are highly useful in criminal, tax or regulatory investigations or proceedings, I am very fearful that the new regulations are overbroad and may have the concomitant effect of invidiously invading the privacy of millions of Americans. This effect might be avoidable if the regulations were more narrowly drawn. I am deeply concerned with both the regulations as written as well as current practices in connection with federal access to bank information. It is for those reasons that I write you today.

Within a week following the promulgation of those regulations, an article appeared in the *Marin County Independent Journal* outlining a story of the FBI's being allowed access to bank records of a Californian without a court order and without notice to the person whose account was being scrutinized. I enclose a copy of that article herein.

I have outlined below some very specific questions with regard to current practices and the new regulations to which I should greatly appreciate some detailed responses in the order the questions are raised. I should also appreciate your including in your response the steps you intend to take to safeguard the privacy of our citizens from being grossly violated by what appears to be "big brother" government tactics described in that article.

1. (a) The statute authorizes retention and reports of records which are found to have "a high degree of usefulness in criminal, tax or regulatory investigations or proceedings." (Emphasis added.) By what criteria did you determine that this test was met in drawing up regulations section 103.34(b) (2), (3), (4), (10), and why did you not distinguish between the amount or size of the transactions involved? Please respond with particularity to each subsection I have mentioned.

(b) What are the reasons for the exemptions in section 103.34(b) (3), and how do the exemptions fulfill the above-stated test?

2. (a) Will reports required under title II

Chapter 2 be accepted by the Secretary if both the domestic institutions and at least one party to the transaction have not signed it?

(b) How many parties to the transaction will be required to sign a report? Will the parties and the banks be permitted or required to submit separate reports?

(c) What requirements exist or are contemplated for notifying bank customers of the submission of such reports to the Secretary about his or her account.

(d) If no notification is contemplated or required, (1) what is the reason for such non-notification and, (2) what protection does a bank customer have against errors contained in such reports?

3. With reference to regulation section 103.43:

(a) What do you mean by the words "proceeding" and "investigation"?

(b) What is your understanding of the term "fishing expedition", and how do you distinguish an "investigation" of a person from a "fishing expedition" in connection with such a person?

(c) Do you contemplate notifying any person as to whom a report is requested by a federal agency at the time such a request is complied with? (1) If so, what procedures will be followed? (2) If not, what are your reasons for not doing so?

(d) What limits if any, will be placed upon the varying types of information made available to other federal agencies?

(e) What limits, if any, will be placed upon the use made by other agencies of such information?

(f) What limits, if any, will be placed upon subsequent dissemination of such information by such agencies?

(g) Is it contemplated that any non-federal agency or organization will have access to such information? (1) If so, under what circumstances? (2) What safeguards have been established or are contemplated to guarantee against non-dissemination?

(h) Under what circumstances, if any, will the existence of the reports themselves be disclosed to other federal agencies in the absence of a specific request? (1) If no such disclosure is contemplated, how is it to be expected that any other federal agency will be aware of the fact that there is information to be requested?

4. With reference to regulation section 103.34:

(a) What is the reason it does not apply to transactions in connection with bank accounts established prior to June 30, 1972, thereby rendering all future transactions immune from regulation with respect to existing bank accounts?

(b) (1) What procedure does the Treasury Department use to obtain access to records currently maintained by financial institutions?

(2) Is the Department contemplating any different procedure for obtaining any information required to be maintained under Section 103.34? If so, how will it differ and for what reason?

(3) What is the present procedure for the issuance of subpoenas by the FBI, the IRS, or any other federal department wishing to obtain copies of records presently maintained by financial institutions?

a. Can IRS agents issue their own subpoenas without undergoing a court procedure? Can FBI agents do so?

b. Does there exist or is there contemplated a practice of going before a judge or undergoing a court procedure prior to the issuance of subpoenas?

(4) Are you aware of any practice on the part of any federal department or agency of requesting information from banks on specific accounts without use of a subpoena? If so, please give all pertinent details of such practice.

(5) Is there any provision for notice to an

affected person whose records are to be scrutinized pursuant to subpoena or otherwise by the Treasury Department or any other federal department or agency under current or prospective procedures?

(6) What is your understanding of bank practices in connection with notifying bank customers prior to divulging any bank information or records to any federal department or agency?

5. With reference to regulation section 103.45:

(a) Does the Secretary contemplate publishing in advance in the Federal Register any proposed exceptions, exemptions, or modifications prior to implementation of same?

(b) What sort of "particular persons" or "classes of persons" are contemplated by the regulation?

(c) Will requests for such singling out made by other federal agencies be honored as a matter of course, or will a procedure be devised for honoring such requests? Please describe the mechanics of any such procedure.

6. With respect to regulation section 103.22 (b) (3), will not a hypothetical criminal who has been conducting large scale banking regularly in the past be able to continue his illegal activities undetected through this exemption?

7. How will prospective and current customers of all affected financial institutions be notified of the impact of the regulations prior to their implementation?

8. Finally, would you be kind enough to provide me with a copy of all forms you have prepared for use in implementing the regulations?

Thank you very much for your prompt consideration of the questions raised herein.

Very truly yours,

JOHN V. TUNNEY,  
U.S. Senator.

FBI PROBES ACCOUNTS IN SAN ANSELMO BANK

Revelation that the checking account of a Corte Madera man was exposed by his bank to scrutiny by the Federal Bureau of Investigation today brought announcement that starting July 1, all banks will be doing the same thing to clients.

Richard Stark, 29, an artist and patron of radical causes discovered recently that his checking account at the San Anselmo branch of the Wells Fargo Bank had been reviewed by FBI agents.

He opened the envelope with his monthly statement and found an inter-department memo wrapped around his checks. The memo, which bank officials said was included in the envelope by mistake read: "This memo is to authorize you to read checks to the FBI before sending the statement to the customer."

Lawrence Hoge, a spokesman for Wells Fargo Bank, explained, "Sometimes if a guy flashes a badge, they'll come right through here. No employee is going to run to those thick memos to see if they can talk with him."

The bank spokesman said that as of July 1, all bank transactions exceeding \$10,000 will be recorded on microfilm and forwarded to the Internal Revenue Service, in compliance with recently issued Treasury Department regulations.

"I presume these records will be made available to the FBI," Hoge said.

The Treasury Department regulations were received at Wells Fargo Bank last week, according to Hoge, confirming a report published in the *Independent-Journal* on March 1 that checking account surveillance was underway.

Stark, who lives at 122 Willow Avenue, Corte Madera, is the beneficiary of a trust fund set up years ago by his mother. He has conferred with his lawyer about a possible lawsuit against Wells Fargo bank for breach of contract and invasion of privacy.

When Stark first discovered the misplaced memo, he was glad to find out, said his room-

mate, Richard Schwartz: "He was overjoyed. A lot of people, who aren't aware that the FBI does things like this, can now be aware it."

Stark has been funding radical organizations and causes since 1964. Most recently, he sponsored the White Panther Party in Marin County and gave his home as its headquarters.

As a result, it came as no great surprise to him to learn that he was being watched.

In reaction to the disclosure, Wells Fargo Bank has circulated a staff memo to all its branches reminding its employees not to release financial information to government agents until July 1 unless there is a court order.

The bank has also notified the FBI, according to Orion A. Hill, chief auditor, that it will not monitor accounts in the future without a subpoena or a valid written order.

(The remarks of Mr. TUNNEY on the submission of Senate Resolutions 15, 16, and 17, dealing with the situation in Burundi are printed in the Record under Submission of Resolutions.)

#### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, which will not exceed 30 minutes, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

#### MRS. CONSUELO NORTHRUP BAILEY, OF SOUTH BURLINGTON, VT.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. President, during this present period of highly organized and highly publicized efforts by the women of America to achieve true equality, it is easy to overlook the fact that our Nation's history has been highlighted by the accomplishments of many remarkable women.

One such woman is a Vermonter, Mrs. Consuelo Northrup Bailey, of South Burlington. Mrs. Bailey has achieved success in many careers: as a wife, a teacher, a lawyer, and in politics and public service.

A former State prosecutor, Speaker of the Vermont House of Representatives, and Lieutenant Governor of Vermont, Mrs. Bailey continues to serve with distinction as Vermont's Republican National Committeewoman and as an official of the Republican National Committee.

In this Chamber of political achievement, may I point out just two of her many accomplishments in the field of politics, as evidence of her remarkable talents. She is widely acknowledged as the most successful fundraiser of the Vermont Republican Party, and she ran 22 times for political office without a single defeat.

A newspaper article dealing with the achievements of Mrs. Bailey was published recently in the Springfield, Vt., Times-Reporter.

I believe this article is of interest to Members of this body and to all Americans, particularly to those concerned with the talents of the women of this Nation. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the article

was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FIRST WOMAN LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR: CONSUELO WAS LIBERATED BEFORE THE SUBJECT CAME UP

(By Cora Cheney)

SOUTH BURLINGTON.—When the subject of liberated women arises, Vermont's Consuelo Northrup Bailey comes to mind.

Long before the term "Women's Lib" was coined, an intrepid young girl from Fairfield, decided that she would become a lawyer and a politician.

And she did, eventually becoming the nation's only woman lieutenant governor.

Consuelo Northrup was born in Fairfield in 1899 into an old family. Her father's people had come to Vermont from Connecticut in 1790. After finishing at St. Albans High School in 1917 she graduated, a Phi Beta Kappa, from UVM with a Ph. B. the year the women were first allowed to vote.

#### ARGUMENTATIVE

She was a talkative little girl, brash and argumentative. She learned to read very early, she can't recall just when or how, but at any rate she could spell a few words long before she started to school.

One day she visited the local school with a cousin on the day of a spelling match. Little preschooler Consuelo, to the wretched embarrassment of the cousin, insisted on joining the contestants and shouting out the words she could spell.

"The teacher was very patient with me," smiles Mrs. Bailey, thinking back nearly 70 years. Probably the teacher recognized some of the qualities that were to take Consuelo to national and international fame.

Now working on her autobiography in her luxurious South Burlington home overlooking Lake Champlain she looks much younger than the record shows. That record, telling her steps from one public success to another does not give a clue to her lively sense of humor, her flair for decorating (she loves her Chinese rugs), her interest in art and music, and her passion for collecting charming antiques and family treasures that strike one on entering her house and presence.

#### CAGE OF MICE

A cage of mice in the living room—"I'm keeping them for my minister's daughter"—and her old farm dog named Rover indicate yet another side of her character.

Her life reads like a specialized political history of early to mid twentieth century Vermont.

She likes to tell that she was born, the middle child of three girls, the day that Admiral George Dewey came back to Vermont after the Spanish American War. Ed C. Smith was governor, and he and Dewey captured all the headlines when they visited Shelburne for a well publicized gala.

The men on the cracker barrels at Fairfield's general store talked about the famous Dewey and noted in passing that there was "another girl up to Northrup's", and it was generally agreed that it was a pity that it was not a boy. Now Dewey's and Consuelo's portraits hang not far apart in the State House.

#### DAIRY FARMER

Consuelo (her name came for out of nowhere and was given her by her mother) was close to her father in her childhood. Her father, a prosperous dairy farmer, had studied law at Columbia.

Although he never became a lawyer, he was a member of the Legislature. Her father called her "Bob", and one day when she was nine, and probably arguing, he said to her mother, "Bob really ought to be a lawyer."

The idea stuck with her so that when she finished college she taught a year and saved her monthly for law schooling. She earned \$1000 and saved \$700 of it.

She tells the story of the first day of

her school teaching when the occasion should have been cheerful and positive: the school principal opened the day by having the children sing "When You and I were Young, Maggie", complete with all the verses about being old and gray, Maggie. She had to work hard not to break out laughing as the children dragged on with the dreary song. She thinks schools have improved immeasurably.

#### LAW SCHOOL

She had no trouble being admitted to the Boston University Law School. In fact, she got a \$75 scholarship, quite a boon in those days. It took three years to complete the course, and the 15 women in the school were treated as equals with the men.

Mrs. Bailey has a penchant for dates and details. She drops them off without a moment of hesitation. This must have served her well in her case studies.

After graduation in 1925 she studied in the office of Alfred L. Sherman in Burlington to fulfill the requirements for admission to the Vermont Bar. Almost immediately she was appointed a City Grand Juror, and in 1926 she became the first woman to be States Attorney in Chittenden County and Vermont.

There was some opposition and grumbling about this. One reluctant supporter "Thought she'd be all right. At least she hadn't bobbed her hair." Another complained that she was too young and that was no place for a woman, but she got the job.

#### STATE'S ATTORNEY

During her years as State's Attorney she became the first Vermont woman to prosecute a murder.

Strong, energetic, and determined she went after suspected criminals, especially bootleggers, with a vengeance.

Once she walked miles through a blizzard on Lake Champlain poking sticks in muskrat traps investigating a case while the defense attorney, a young man stuck close to his office stove saying it was unfit weather.

Following her father's footsteps into the Legislature she successfully ran for the Vermont Senate in 1930. Following this term she went to Washington in the early 30's to be Administrative Assistant to E. W. Gibson in the U.S. Senate.

#### REPUBLICAN

From the start she felt a keen interest in Republican Party affairs. In 1936 she became the Vermont Republican National Committee woman and has held the office since that date.

She pulled the astonishing and unparalleled feat of raising \$100,000 for the Republican Party in a series of 13 dinners. In point of service she is the oldest member of the National Committee.

In 1940 Consuelo Northrup married Henry Bailey a Burlington lawyer. They went into practice together but shortly afterward with the beginning of World War II Mr. Bailey, a reserve Captain in the Army JAG Corps, was called into active duty. A physical examination showed that he was ill so he did not serve further. He died in 1961. During his years of illness he was an encouraging and loyal supporter of his wife who continued to move from one honor to another.

In 1952 Mrs. Bailey decided to run for the House of Representatives. How did she campaign?

#### THOUSANDS DOORBELLS

"Why I rang 1000 doorbells in the town of South Burlington. Successful politics means a meeting of minds and facts. To get elected you have to let the people know you, and to be a good representative you have to know the people."

In the House she sat in Seat 46, now at the Vermont Historical Society, used by her father in 1900. In 1953 her sister Fredricka



(Mrs. Winston Sargent) sat in the same seat when Consuelo was Speaker of the House.

In 1953 Vermont led the nation in the number and proportion of women in the Legislature with a delegation of 52 women. Consuelo Bailey ran for the Speaker of the House and won, having the support of most of the women. This was widely noted in the national press including a Life Magazine article on Vermont's stalwart women.

"I think I was elected as a person, not just railroaded through because I was a woman. I never had any feeling of being treated better or worse because I was a woman. There were always flowers for me on the Speaker's table. Somebody, different people, put them there each day, and there was never a day without them. I love flowers. But the first day I brought the gavel down for order I brought it down so hard that there was never a doubt that I meant business," said Mrs. Bailey.

#### GREAT SPEAKER

"She was a great speaker," said veterans of the House at that period. Mrs. Mildred Hayden of Berlin served under her as did Mrs. Gertrude Mallory of Fairlee, both of whom praised her performance. The taste of success was sweet in her mouth. Mrs. Bailey liked that gavel, and she liked firsts. Why not be the first woman lieutenant governor? She could wield the gavel in the Senate. In 1954 she ran for the office.

"I visited 244 towns. I made hundreds of speeches. I met people wherever I could find them," she said.

During this period the late Miss Edna Winslow was Town Representative for Windham. While barnstorming Southern Vermont Consuelo Bailey stopped to spend a night with her friend Edna. A church service was scheduled at the beautiful Congregational Church there on the hill in Windham.

"Connie," said Edna, "you ought to go to Church and shake a few hands. I can't come this time, but you go and make yourself at home."

"So I thought I had better not miss the chance," said Mrs. Bailey. "I slipped in a little late and sat in a back pew. The minister to my surprise recognized me, and he paused to announce that there was a famous visitor in the congregation. Of course this was great for me, and after church I shook all the hands and someone whispered to me that I should go to the service down in Jamaica which would begin in a few minutes."

"So I drove off to Jamaica just in time to slip in the back pew again. And behold, it was the same minister. Once again he introduced the famous visitor and I looked at how many hands there were to shake. About that time the preacher's wife tapped me on the shoulder and whispered. He's going to preach the same sermon. Don't you want to leave?"

#### SAME SERMON

"But no, the good politician has to suffer, even through the same sermon twice, and I wanted to meet those people. When I got back to Edna's house for dinner the thought suddenly hit me: why not stay for the evening service too? Both of us had a good laugh over that but there was no evening service."

As Lt. Gov., Consuelo Bailey reached the highest political office ever held by a woman in Vermont. She conducted the Senate with dignity and brilliance. No other woman in history has been lieutenant governor.

Today she still practices law and is still the National Republican Committeewoman, primed for the trip to Miami in August. She is just back from Paris where she represented President Nixon at the UNESCO conference on the preservation of historic, cultural and national sites in the world. In 1970 she

was the US delegate to the UN Status of Women Conference in Switzerland.

Her telephone rings incessantly, but somehow she is finding time to write her memoirs and to play the organ and enjoy her antiques, especially her splendid collection of Bennington parian ware.

Eleanor Roosevelt paid tribute to Consuelo in her book Ladies of Courage. Her study wall shows autographed pictures of several Presidents. Her honors continue to grow. She ran 22 times for office and was never defeated. She was awarded an honorary degree from UVM.

Consuelo Bailey smiles when asked about Women's Lib.

"Women have to learn to deserve the respect of all people, not just men. You don't need to legislate equality. I never found a door closed to me for being a woman."

Over her study door is a small painted motto: "I'm not denying that women are foolish, but God Almighty made them to match men."

He must have been thinking of Consuelo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

#### QUORUM CALL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### COMMUNICATIONS FROM EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS, ETC.

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

##### REPORT ON VALUE OF PROPERTY, SUPPLIES, AND COMMODITIES PROVIDED BY THE BERLIN MAGISTRAT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, reporting, pursuant to law, on the value of property, supplies, and commodities provided by the Berlin Magistrat, for the quarter ended March 31, 1972; to the Committee on Appropriations.

##### REPORT ON REVISED ESTIMATES OF LAOS EXPENDITURES

A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on revised estimates of Laos Expenditures (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Services.

##### REPORT ON NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of that Board, for the year 1971 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Commerce.

##### REPORT ON EFFORTS BY THE UNITED STATES TO OBTAIN AGREEMENT ON THE VALUE OF IMPROVEMENTS ON PROPERTIES RETURNED TO THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF GERMANY

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report on Efforts by the United States to obtain Agreement on the Value of Improvements on Properties Re-

turned to the Federal Republic of Germany (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

##### PROPOSED COMBINED BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT AND FOREST SERVICE PLAN

A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Rural Development and Conservation, and the Assistant Secretary, Public Land Management, transmitting a proposed combined Bureau of Land Management and Forest Service plan (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

##### REPORT ON SOIL SURVEYS AND LAND CLASSIFICATION OF CERTAIN LANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, certifying, pursuant to law, that an adequate soil survey and land classification has been made of the lands in the East Greenacres Unit, Prairie Division, Rathdrum Prairie Project, Idaho (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

##### PROSPECTUSES FOR CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN FEDERAL BUILDINGS

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, prospectuses for the construction of certain Federal buildings (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

#### PETITIONS

Petitions were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of California; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

##### "ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION No. 16

"Relative to furtherance of family planning research and services

"Whereas, The health and well-being of the residents of the State of California and of the United States are of vital importance to this Legislature; and

"Whereas, The adoption of public policies to voluntarily reduce the birth rate in a manner consistent with human rights, human dignity, and individual conscience is the most moral and democratic way to insure that population stabilization is not forced upon us by higher death rates, social catastrophes, or legislated fertility control; and

"Whereas, The Legislature of the State of California has recognized the need for comprehensive, realistic, confidential and well-publicized birth prevention programs; and

"Whereas, In recognition of the fact that the State of California and the government of the United States should play a leading role in the fight for human rights and population stabilization; now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the Assembly and Senate of the State of California, jointly, That the Legislature of the State of California respectfully memorializes the President and the Congress of the United States to give immediate and favorable attention to the funding, implementation and continuation of U.S. Public Law 91-572 entitled 'The Family Planning Services and Population Research Act of 1970' which is an act 'to promote public health and welfare by expanding, improving, and better coordinating the family planning services and population research activities of the federal government, and for other purposes'; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Chief Clerk of the Assembly transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the President pro Tem of the Senate, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States."

Resolutions of the House of Representa-

tives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

**"RESOLUTIONS MEMORIALIZING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES AND CERTAIN OTHER PUBLIC OFFICIALS TO PUBLICLY CONDEMN AND TO TAKE CERTAIN OTHER ACTIONS RELATIVE TO THE MASSACRE AT LOD AIRPORT, ISRAEL**

"Whereas, The Massachusetts House of Representatives is shocked and saddened by the massacre of at least 26 persons and the wounding of 70 yesterday at Israel's International Airport. Commissioned by one of several Palestinian terrorist groups advocating the mass murder of Israel men, women and children, the Lod Airport Massacre stands as the most deplorable episode in the long series of atrocities perpetrated by these groups; and "Whereas, The complicity of Arab governments in these atrocities is equally reprehensible. They long have supported, both politically and financially, acts of terrorism against the people of Israel. They retreat to a smug silence only when the result of such acts is sufficiently horrible to arouse outrage and sorrow around the world; therefore be it

**"Resolved,** That the Massachusetts House of Representatives calls upon President Richard M. Nixon, U.S. Secretary of State William Rogers and the United Nations Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim to take the following steps:

"(1) To express publicly their shock at the Lod Airport Massacre and their sympathy to the families of the victims.

"(2) To condemn all acts of terrorism.

"(3) To privately and publicly urge each Arab government to abandon its support to Palestinian terrorist groups.

"(4) To demand that Arab leaders denounce the Massacre and all previous incidents of violence directed at the Israel population; and be it further

**"Resolved,** That engrossed copies of these resolutions be forwarded by the Secretary of Commonwealth to President Richard M. Nixon, U.S. Secretary of State William Rogers, Secretary-General of the United Nations Kurt Waldheim, the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to each member thereof from the Commonwealth."

A resolution adopted by the West Allis-West Milwaukee Democratic Unit, West Allis, Wisconsin, inquiring into the facts relating to the Indo-China conflict; to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. INOUE, from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments:

H.R. 15259. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-844).

By Mr. HARTKE, from the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 3338. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of compensation for disabled veterans, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-845).

By Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, for Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce, with an amendment:

S. 473. A bill to amend the Automobile Information Disclosure Act to make its provisions applicable to the possessions of the United States (Rept. No. 92-850).

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

S. 3080. A bill to amend the Lead Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-852).

By Mr. ALLEN, from the Committee on

Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

H.R. 5404. An act to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to release on behalf of the United States a condition in a deed conveying certain lands to the Arkansas Game and Fish Commission, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-849).

By Mr. ALLEN, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with amendments:

S. 3104. A bill to amend existing statutes to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to issue cotton crop reports simultaneously with the general crop reports (Rept. No. 92-848).

By Mr. CHILES, for Mr. MCGOVERN, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

S. Res. 232. Resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the full amount appropriated for the rural electrification program for fiscal 1972 should be made available by the administration to carry out that program (Rept. No. 92-847).

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, without amendment:

S. 3645. A bill to further amend the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (Rept. No. 92-851).

By Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, with an amendment:

S. 3001. A bill to establish a Federal Financing Bank, to provide for coordinated and more efficient financing of Federal and federally assisted borrowings from the public, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 92-853) (together with minority views).

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, I report favorably, with an amendment, the bill (S. 3001) to establish a Federal Financing Bank, to provide for coordinated and more efficient financing of Federal and federally assisted borrowings from the public, and for other purposes, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent that the report be printed, together with minority views.

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

#### ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on June 9, 1972, he presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 1736) to amend the Public Buildings Act of 1959, as amended, to provide for financing the acquisition, construction, alteration, maintenance, operation, and protection of public buildings, and for other purposes.

#### ORDER FOR STAR PRINT OF S. 3688

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. President, on June 8, the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT) stated that he was introducing S. 3688, a bill to donate to certain Indian tribes certain submarginal lands, and to make such lands parts of the reservations involved, on behalf of himself and Senators JORDAN of Idaho, FANNIN, HANSEN, HATFIELD, BELLMON, and BUCKLEY.

Subsequently the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF) requested that he be added as a cosponsor. The printed bill has omitted the names of some of the original sponsors.

On behalf of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT), I ask unanimous consent that there be a star print of S. 3688

in order to show all of the original sponsors who have just been named.

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

#### INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. ALLEN:

S. 3693. A bill for the relief of Ingrid Fernandez O'Campo. Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GURNEY:

S. 3694. A bill for relief of Alfonso Stefano Fiorilli, his wife, Maria Giordana Fiorilli, and their children, Michele Fiorilli and Donatella Fiorilli. Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUSKIE (for himself and Mrs. SMITH):

S. 3695. A bill for the relief of the Passamaquoddy Indian Tribe in the State of Maine. Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

S. 3696. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for nutrition education in schools of medicine. Referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. BROOKE:

S. 3697. A bill to provide for the assignment of unused laboratory space and facilities to unemployed scientists. Referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. PEARSON:

S. 3698. A bill to foster commercial intercourse with foreign nations by promoting the development of an export trade among small businesses not now engaged extensively in exporting. Referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. MUSKIE (for himself and Mrs. SMITH):

S. 3695. A bill for the relief of the Passamaquoddy Indian Tribe in the State of Maine. Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, with Senator SMITH, a private bill to insure that no statute of limitations found in section 2415 of title 28, United States Code, shall prohibit the United States from initiating an action on behalf of the Passamaquoddy Indian Tribe, within 10 years after July 18, 1966.

At the present time, the Departments of Interior and Justice have under consideration a lawsuit on behalf of the Passamaquoddy Tribe against the State of Maine. The Passamaquoddy have made some very serious allegations concerning the mishandling of their lands and funds held in trust for them. These allegations deserve a full hearing by our courts. However, the Departments of Interior and Justice have not yet acted on the Passamaquoddy request that the United States represent them in seeking appropriate relief, and, because the relevant statute of limitations in 28 U.S.C. section 2415 runs out on July 18, 1972, the time left for making such a decision is growing short. I believe that it would be most unfortunate if a negative decision by the Department of Justice and Inte-



rior at the 12th hour would deprive the Passamaquoddy of an opportunity to have their claim, now fully developed, heard in court. Gov. Kenneth M. Curtis of Maine agrees with this position.

I must add that the private bill which Senator SMITH and I introduce today would be unnecessary if Congress were to act promptly on S. 3377, a bill now before the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. This legislation would provide a general extension of the statute of limitations found in 28 U.S.C. 2415 with respect to the commencement of an action by the United States on behalf of an Indian tribe for trespass on trust or restricted Indian lands. As Senator FANNIN pointed out when he introduced this legislation on March 20, 1972, the passage of the statute of limitations legislation in 1966 was accompanied by scant recognition of its impact on Indian claims which the United States would litigate on their behalf. Senator FANNIN noted that the legislation was handled in the Judiciary Committee and escaped notice by those concerned about Indian legal rights, primarily because the titles of the legislation gave no indication that any claims other than those of the United States were involved. It was not until as late as December of 1971 that many Indian tribes recognized that the 6-year statute of limitations found in 28 U.S.C. 2415 applied to the power of the United States to sue on behalf of the Indian tribes as their trustee. As a result, many potentially legitimate claims for the misuse of Indian lands will be barred if the statute of limitations is not extended. The Penobscot Tribe of Maine is one of those tribes that is just beginning to develop its claims, and it would be most unfortunate if their opportunity to pursue this development was barred by the statute of limitations.

I, therefore, hope that this private legislation which Senator SMITH and I introduce today will be rendered unnecessary by passage of S. 3377, extending the statute of limitations generally. However, if this does not happen, I believe it would be particularly unjust if the Passamaquoddy claim, now fully developed and pending before the Department of Interior since February of this year, does not have an opportunity to be fully aired in court. This private bill represents an effort to avoid that injustice.

By Mr. SCHWEIKER:

S. 3696. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for nutrition education in schools of medicine. Referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

#### NUTRITIONAL MEDICAL EDUCATION ACT OF 1972

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide for nutrition education in schools of medicine.

The Nutritional Medical Education Act of 1972 will provide Federal grants from the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to schools of medicine to permit them to plan, develop, and implement programs of nutrition education within their curriculum.

As a member of the Senate Select Com-

mittee on Nutrition and Human Needs, I have become very much aware of the urgent need for more and better practical education in nutrition for our doctors. Although medical schools do have courses in biochemistry, physiology, and pharmacology which deal with various aspects of nutrition, most medical schools do not have courses in nutrition which deal with the basic relationship between good nutrition and good health.

It is important to point out that problems of inadequate nutrition are not confined simply to poor people in our society. Testimony before the Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs on many occasions has indicated that people at the middle- and upper-income levels often also suffer from poor nutrition. The primary reasons appear to be lack of knowledge about proper nutrition, and lack of interest in it. The advice of family doctors carries a great deal of weight with most people, but unfortunately many doctors simply do not receive sufficient training in nutrition while they are at medical school to enable them to give sound advice on nutrition.

It is entirely clear that many diseases are related either directly or indirectly to nutritional factors. In a followup report to the White House Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Health, the panel on Advanced Academic Teaching of Nutrition pointed out that—

Atherosclerosis (including coronary heart disease), obesity, diabetes mellitus, hypertension, and osteoporosis are representative of many disorders in which nutritional factors are either of principal or contributory importance. In addition, new trends in food processing and environmental concerns require a great expansion of research in the area of trace minerals, "secondary vitamins," pollutants, and involuntary and voluntary food additives. Much of the research directed toward these problems must be conducted by individuals who have received (or should receive) advanced academic training in nutrition.

I think it is also important to point out that sound nutritional practices are vital to the maintenance of health and prevention of medical disorders. In other words, it is vitally important that doctors have enough knowledge of the relationship between nutrition and health to prevent medical problems from occurring. As ranking minority member of the Health Subcommittee of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee, I am very conscious of the need for more emphasis on the maintenance of good health, as opposed to the curing of medical problems after they have already become serious.

Beyond that, however, many doctors today have not been given sufficient knowledge of nutrition to deal with the nutritional aspects of diseases patients already have. In that regard, the White House Panel said:

The effectiveness of physicians in providing optimal care for the many patients who have diseases with an important nutritional component is dependent in considerable part on the kind of nutrition teaching offered them at medical school and thereafter. At the present time, nutrition teaching in medical schools and in teaching hospitals is woefully inadequate.

When should nutrition be taught? I believe the fundamentals of nutrition should be taught early in the medical school educational program, with follow-up courses later which are more detailed and sophisticated.

Interestingly, a study by one medical school indicated that in general, the physicians questioned were more knowledgeable of the theoretical aspects of nutrition than of the applied aspects. The study indicated that younger doctors do not know as much about nutrition as they should and that they want to know more. In contrast, many older doctors did not know much about nutrition, but did not particularly feel the need for more education in this area.

Food faddism and "folk medicine" are becoming more and more popular today. Many people are turning away from physicians to obtain information about nutrition. I believe part of the problem is that many doctors simply are not in the position of being able to provide their patients with the kind of nutrition information patients need and desire for the maintenance of good health. We urgently need more scientific information about nutrition and health. We need more and better nutrition research. We will not get it unless our medical schools are able to provide the kind of training needed.

Only a few medical schools have separate divisions or departments of nutrition. Special courses in nutrition are rare, particularly in applied nutrition as opposed to the biochemical aspects of nutrition. There is a significant shortage of trained people in this field, and grants to stimulate the teaching of nutrition education in medical schools will help to develop an adequate supply of competent people.

The White House Conference Panel on Advanced Academic Teaching of Nutrition made the following recommendation:

In each of the professional schools in a university such as medicine, dentistry and dental hygiene, nursing, public health, food science and technology, or applied health sciences, an individual or committee should be assigned responsibility for the surveillance of nutrition teaching in that school.

In some professional schools, it will be desirable to teach nutrition in a designated course dealing with basic scientific principles of nutrition and their application to human health. In many schools, nutrition teaching will be incorporated in courses such as biochemistry, physiology and certain clinical specialties. Regardless of the plan of instruction, basic nutrition should be part of the required or core curriculum.

In schools where trained nutrition personnel are not available because of financial restrictions, grants should be established to support nutrition for teaching in the categories listed above.

The legislation I am introducing will make a significant start toward meeting that goal. The Nutritional Medical Education Act of 1972 will provide \$5 million for each of the next 5 fiscal years for grants by the Secretary of HEW to public or nonprofit private schools of medicine to plan, develop, and implement a program of nutrition education within their curriculum. These grants should be structured by HEW to assure that properly trained staff members are available.

The purpose of this program is to provide a single focus on applied nutrition education in our medical schools.

The Comprehensive Health Manpower Training Act of 1971 provides general authority for grants for training and research in nutrition. My bill, however, would set up a special grant program to fund the teaching of nutrition in medical schools.

Mr. President, I believe this program will save the American public many times what it will cost. This is really a program of preventive medicine. Our people need to know more about nutrition, and they should be able to rely on their doctors to give them sound advice. Most doctors and medical schools recognize the need for more training in applied nutrition. This legislation will help our doctors keep our people healthy, and I hope the Senate will act swiftly on it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the Nutritional Medical Educational Act of 1972 be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

S. 3696

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the Nutritional Medical Education Act of 1972.*

Sec. 2. Section 769B of the Public Health Service Act is amended by redesignating such section as "769C" and by inserting after section 769A the following new section:

**"GRANTS FOR NUTRITION EDUCATION"**

"Sec. 769B. There are authorized to be appropriated \$5,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1973, and each of the next succeeding 4 years, for grants by the Secretary to public or non-profit private schools of medicine to plan, develop, and implement a program of nutrition education within their curriculum."

Sec. 3. (a) Subsection (a) of section 769C, as amended by this Act, is further amended by striking "and" in the first sentence, and inserting after "769A" ", and 769B".

(b) Subsection (c) of such section is amended by striking "or" in the first sentence and inserting after "769A" ", or 769".

By Mr. BROOKE:

S. 3697. A bill to provide for the assignment of unused laboratory space and facilities to unemployed scientists. Referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

**SCIENTIFIC MANPOWER ACT**

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, I have introduced today legislation to provide many unemployed scientists the opportunity to work in unused laboratory facilities.

Under this legislation, an Officer of Scientific Manpower would be established in the Department of Labor. This office would maintain a file of all unfilled and available laboratory space. The Office would also supervise the establishment of listings of each scientist who is unemployed or in involuntary early retirement, and who meets all of the membership requirements for the professional society representing his specialty.

The Director of the Office would be authorized to assign a scientist to a partici-

pating laboratory, subject to acceptance of his research project by the agency in charge of that laboratory. The scientist would be paid a maximum stipend of \$700 per month, determined on the basis of his needs and experience.

The legislation is designed to permit flexibility in research programs, in order to encourage applicants to work on their own projects to the maximum extent possible. The program would also allow scientists participating in the program an adequate opportunity to continue to seek permanent employment.

The unusually high rate of unemployment in the scientific and research communities has created a double problem: Unemployment is one side of the coin; the loss of valuable knowledge is the other. This bill represents a sound approach to continuing important research projects and providing satisfying employment.

I urge the Senate to give this proposal its prompt attention.

By Mr. PEARSON:

S. 3698. A bill to foster commercial intercourse with foreign nations by promoting the development of an export trade among small businesses not now engaged extensively in exporting. Referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, it is most discouraging to note that our balance of payments position continues to deteriorate. Our balance-of-payments deficit in 1971 amounted to over \$9 billion. Last quarter, we registered the single greatest quarterly trade deficit in our history. Last year, Germany surpassed the United States as the leading exporter of manufactures. Even with continued strong agricultural exports, we have had to devalue our dollar in response to balance-of-payments pressures—and still the picture has not improved substantially.

I believe, Mr. President, that we must seek positive solutions to our balance-of-payments problems and seek them promptly. We cannot fall back on the ancient practices of tariffs and protectionism. We must search for programs which will enable American firms to gain a greater share of the world markets so that we can overcome our balance-of-payments difficulties with expanded trade, not tariffs.

The legislation I introduce today provides a way to increase our exports by involving small and medium sized American firms in the competition for overseas markets. It would help such companies in every State of the Union to organize themselves for international trade. And it would do so at little cost to the American taxpayer.

Mr. President, at this time, only 4 percent of American companies export their products. These 4 percent tend to be the corporate giants, the great multinational corporations who often sell primarily to their own foreign subsidiaries. The remaining 96 percent of American firms—large, medium, and small—battle each other and foreign competitors for domestic sales, but continue to operate, for all practical purposes, in total isolation from

potentially lucrative markets in the developed and developing nations.

The objective of the legislation I introduce today is to bring together small and medium sized companies for the purpose of undertaking export operations. To help them help themselves. To identify new products for export, create new jobs, and improve our balance-of-payments position in the bargain.

This bill would provide the incentive for smaller firms to overcome the initial obstacles for entry into international markets. It rests on the principle that a wider distribution of foreign trade among American firms will benefit not only the companies and their employees, but also the communities in which their production facilities are located and the Nation itself.

From statistics provided by the Census Bureau, we can estimate that as many as 230,000 new employment opportunities would be created in this country if new export sales brought only a 5-percent increase in the receipts of existing small and medium sized companies. Because of their size, these firms include minority-owned enterprises located in inner cities and a large number of enterprises in rural America. The new job opportunities created in connection with production for export by these firms would serve directly the cause of achieving balanced economic growth in our Nation.

Small- and medium-sized American companies face a number of problems in seeking foreign markets. They must overcome barriers of language, currency, export regulations, financing, import regulations, shipping requirements, foreign commercial traditions, lack of marketing data, and many others. The list is long. Probably the most formidable barrier arises from their size alone. With small personal resources and limited capital, these companies find it extremely difficult to "go it alone" in the export market.

This bill provides a means for them to assist each other in their efforts to secure a share of foreign sales, and to benefit from Federal tax and other incentives designed to stimulate exports, on an equal basis with the large multinational corporations.

To date, Federal assistance to American exporters has been aimed primarily at large firms whose sales constitute the bulk of American exports. This policy has resulted not only from the presumption that large companies can do the most for export expansion, but also from the simple fact that these major corporations are already equipped to take advantage of this assistance.

At this time, with continuing unfavorable trade balances, it is clear that our efforts have not been adequate. We must expand our export assistance into new areas if we are to close the balance-of-payments deficits, restore the dollar to a position of strength, and create new jobs for American workers.

It is also clear that large numbers of smaller corporations are taking an interest in exports. State economic development agencies, including the one in my own State of Kansas, have begun to explore new export markets for commodities and manufactured items produced by small independent firms in their States.



A recent survey of small company heads showed 70 percent responded "yes" when asked if they are interested in further exploring their export potential.

The same survey—and the staff investigations which went into preparation of this bill—also reveal that small company officials feel their lack of adequate information about exporting is the single most difficult problem inhibiting steps toward foreign markets.

We should understand that the export problems of small businesses do not result primarily from a lack of capital. Rather, they relate to the difficulties of "breaking the ice" of international marketing. As we seek to overcome this problem for smaller American firms, government can play a critical role. We must create a program in which private enterprise is not smothered by a friendly, but unwieldy, Federal bureaucracy. Rather, we must create a program which will draw out the best resources of private enterprise itself.

These requirements suggest the structure of the legislation I introduce today. I offer it in the knowledge that it is only one phase of a multifaceted effort to restore this Nation to its proper position in international trade. But I also offer it with the conviction that it is a highly necessary and useful contribution to building a strong and productive economy for the future.

This bill would establish an independent agency, the U.S. Joint Export Agency. It would be a small agency, for it is only a leader, a catalyst in a task that is essentially a matter for private enterprise.

It is independent so that the officials of small corporations it brings together for export cooperation will not be overwhelmed and tangled up in vast bureaucracies. And it is staffed with a small group of experts experienced in their fields so that businessmen can obtain knowledgeable assistance in solving complex export problems without an endless round of consultations and studies.

The agency has a range of functions, as explained in detail below, but primary among them is that of helping small companies initiate cooperation for export. In this regard, it is useful to take a brief look at the European experience where foreign trade is a way of life. A review of European trade associations shows the importance of overcoming inertia to begin export cooperation. Isolated from overseas commerce—yet faced with rising import competition in many cases—the management of small firms are often reluctant to approach their colleagues in other firms with proposals for joint export cooperation. Independent and proud of their own product, these small businessmen may feel they will suffer loss of prestige if they take the initiative and call for export cooperation.

Here in the United States this problem of inertia is exacerbated by our preoccupation with our own huge domestic market. To overcome it, a catalytic agent is required to bring small and medium sized companies together to begin export cooperation.

The primary task of the USJEA is to foster the formation and development

of private joint export organizations made up of small or medium sized businesses not actively engaged in substantial export sales, but which have a potential for developing export operations. Such an organization would be comprised of at least five but not more than 20 small- to medium-sized American companies whose complementary products and services lend themselves to cooperation in export marketing. The USJEA would contact firms who could benefit from membership in such a cooperative marketing arrangement, and assist each organization to identify products and markets for export.

To limit the size of the firms eligible for membership, a ceiling of \$60 million in average annual sales—based on last 5 years—has been established. This limit was arrived at after a survey of firms with greatest export potential and in the conviction that larger firms have the financial and other capabilities to develop their own export markets.

Each of these joint export groups, as proposed in this bill, would be organized as a Domestic International Sales Corporation under provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. In addition to the export tax advantages accruing to a DISC, the group would hire adequate staff and management personnel to provide its members with international trade services including the identification of products for export, identification of foreign markets, promotion of members' goods and services in foreign markets, and assistance to members in the technical aspects of exporting, including licenses, financing and export guarantees. For its principal source of guidance and information in the early stages—perhaps the first 2 years—the group would rely on the guidance of the USJEA.

A principal function of the joint export group would be to establish broad product lines among companies which offer related goods or services. These product lines would take shape according to the demands of export markets. By joining an export group, member companies could take the first step into overseas markets on a sound basis, without prejudice to their on-going operation in the domestic market. But because the cooperation exists only for export purposes, and would extend only to export operations, it does not conflict with the spirit or the letter of antitrust legislation in this country.

These joint export groups would be funded primarily with private capital. But Federal support would be available in the form of technical assistance matching grants and loans repayable with interest as determined by the USJEA. This Federal financial assistance is provided to assist in overcoming the difficulties of start-up during an expected period of initial losses. It could be used to provide services required to train and orient management in subjects directly related to overseas marketing of their companies' products.

The grant assistance would only be available after those companies desiring to become members of a joint export group have established an escrow account into which each has paid not less than \$500. The amount of a grant could

not exceed the total amount of the common escrow account, or \$25,000, whichever is less.

Loans for any joint export group would not exceed the total amount of capital paid in by its members for the employment of personnel to staff the group's operations and represent member companies abroad. In short, these would be loans on a matching basis not to exceed 50 percent.

In addition, member companies of joint export groups would be allowed under the bill to deduct as a regular business expense their pro rata share of net operating loss incurred by the group itself. This share, of course, could not exceed the member's stock in and indebtedness to the association.

This is a special incentive for small- and medium-sized firms, one which is not available under the DISC to larger corporations. It is intended to assist the small businessman who wants to export but cannot afford the initial losses associated with becoming established in a foreign market. Because the benefits of DISC only accrue after goods or services begin to move through export channels, this added benefit as an incentive to the smaller firm is necessary.

The appropriations for this new Agency, from which loan and grant funds would come, would not in any year exceed 25 percent the amount of the net earnings of the Export Import Bank during the previous year. In fiscal 1971 terms, this upper limit would be \$29 million. In a sense, then, we would be using profit levels from our export credit institution to guide the amount we as a nation can afford to devote to the promotion of exports from the small business sector of our economy. This makes sound business sense.

Mr. President, the time is long past when we can stand by wringing our hands over the mounting balance-of-payments problems in our country. We must make concerted efforts on every front to improve our trade position and to reach our full export potential as a nation. I believe this legislation provides a positive method of promoting exports of American firms which have not reached their full export potential. This is a sound investment for the workers and for their communities and for the country.

I urge prompt consideration of this legislation.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

S. 5

At the request of Mr. MONDALE, the Senator from Vermont (Mr. STAFFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 5, the Full Opportunity and National Goals and Priorities Act.

S. 32

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 32, the Conversion Research, Education, and Assistance Act.

S. 936

At the request of Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HAR-

ris) was added as a cosponsor of S. 936, a bill to provide prescription drugs to the elderly under medicare.

S. 3063

At the request of Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD for Mr. MUSKIE, the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIER), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. STAFFORD) were added as cosponsors of S. 3063, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code to permit tax-exempt organizations to engage in communications with legislative bodies.

S. 3442

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the Senator from Georgia (Mr. GAMBRELL) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) were added as cosponsors of S. 3442, the Communicable Disease Control Amendments of 1972.

S. 3475

At the request of Mr. ERVIN, the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON), the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. JORDAN), were added as cosponsors of S. 3475, a bill to help preserve the separation of powers and to further the constitutional prerogatives of Congress by providing for congressional review of executive agreements.

S. 3495

At the request of Mr. DOLE, the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3495, a bill to provide reimbursement of extraordinary transportation expenses incurred by certain disabled individuals in the production of their income.

S. 3511

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3511, the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 1973.

S. 3528

At the request of Mr. STEVENSON, the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3528, the Federal Handgun Registration and Licensing Act of 1972.

S. 3538 and S. 3539

At the request of Mr. BAYH the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER), was added as a cosponsor of S. 3538, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to require identification by manufacturer of each schedule II dosage unit produced; and, S. 3539, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to move certain barbiturates from schedule III of such act to schedule II.

#### SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 236

At the request of Mr. HRUSKA, the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLOTT) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. BEALL) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 236, a joint resolution to authorize and request the President to proclaim the week beginning October 15, 1972, as "National Drug Abuse Prevention Week."

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 315, SENATE RESOLUTION 316, SENATE RESOLUTION 317—SUBMISSION OF RESOLUTIONS REGARDING THE SITUATION IN BURUNDI

(Referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.)

##### THE TRAGEDY IN BURUNDI

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. President, I have been appalled over the past several weeks by the situation that exists in Burundi. I have noticed that very little public comment has been made in the United States about a very desperate situation which some might equate to genocide that is taking place in that small country. I feel strongly that the facts should be brought to the attention of the Senate.

Mr. President, for the past 6 weeks, the small land-locked country of Burundi, which is relatively hidden in the center of the massive African Continent, has added a new dimension of horror to the short history of independent Africa.

It has been reported that over 100,000 people have been killed in Burundi within the past 60 days; that an entire population of educated people has been ruthlessly slaughtered; that the murder in Burundi has been systematic, pervasive, and terrifying; and that next to Burundi, the terror that once plagued the Congo pales by comparison.

Today's confrontation between the ruling minority tribe, the Tutsis or Watutsis, and the ruled majority tribe, the Hutus or Bahutus, arises out of centuries of conflict between them, conflict which was aggravated by many decades of colonial rule. It is important to set forth some of that history. Burundi, previously a part of German East Africa, became after World War I a portion of trust territory administered by Belgium, and achieved independence 10 years ago, in 1962.

The Tutsis comprise less than 15 percent of the 3.5 million people of Burundi. They have ruled the country and its predominantly Hutu peoples in a feudal manner for hundreds of years. A successful revolt by the Hutus against the Tutsis which occurred in 1962 in Burundi's northern neighbor, Rwanda, resulted in the tragic massacre of the Tutsis and further inflamed the conflict in Burundi. Many Tutsis have feared full revolt by the Hutus against the chance—treat them as viciously in Burundi as they were treated in Rwanda.

Those fears have been aggravated by attempted Hutu coups in 1965 and again in 1969. Neither of the coups attempts even approached a successful seizure of power, but the Tutsis ruthlessly suppressed them both.

On April 29, 1972, another coup was attempted—and this time the Tutsis apparently feared that power might be wrested from their control. Thousands of Hutus appear to have been involved in the latest coup attempt, including some who were living in neighboring countries. Apparently, thousands of Tutsis were murdered.

The Tutsis feared a repeat of the tragedy in Rwanda. Extremist Tutsis struggled with moderate Tutsis in an ef-

fort to determine the appropriate response to the 1972 coup attempt.

The extremists prevailed. Not only did the Tutsis succeed in controlling the attempted coup. They also proceeded to embark upon a vicious, cruel, and bloody reign of terror.

According to independent reports emanating from Central Africa, the Tutsis began systematically "wiping out" the intellectual class of the Hutus. Burundian refugees fleeing to Zaire report that the massacres are continuing in many parts of the country and that "an Hutu who can write his name is considered an intellectual and a threat to the government."

According to authoritative sources in Zaire, some 120,000 people have been killed in the Burundi conflict. This directly contradicts Burundi Government claims that some 50,000 Tutsis and non-Tutsis have been killed by foreign-trained rebels who have launched the massacres in the name of the Hutus.

The ghosts of Biafra have been brought to life again, with the nonsensical killing of tens of thousands of people. It appears that within the past 60 days, the intellectual elite of an entire people has been systematically slaughtered; a generation of leadership has been eliminated in this bloodbath. No longer are the events in Burundi part of an internal political power struggle.

Even if the struggle in Burundi is essentially a "domestic" matter, one which the Burundi Government might claim falls within the protection of the United Nations famous article 2, section 7, the international community cannot escape its moral responsibility to act.

Regardless of the merits of the strife, regardless of the issues raised either by the Tutsis or the Hutus, murder must be condemned and stopped.

Slaughter—of innocent persons by anyone—violates the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, threatens to involve countries beyond the site of the slaughter, and might become a situation "likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security" within chapters I and VII of the U.N. Charter. Slaughter means death, terror, suffering, and refugees. It has no justification. It must be resisted.

The humanitarian spirit in all men must cry out against such wanton disregard for human life. That cry is clearly evidenced by the Pope's denunciation a week ago of this "organized massacre of innocent people" in Burundi.

The United States also must act. Accordingly, I am suggesting today a four part program.

First, because of our desperate need to know the details of the slaughter in Burundi, I propose that the Senate's Subcommittee on Refugees attempt to ascertain: First, the extent of the killing; second, whether it is continuing; third, the number and location of refugees; and, fourth, what assistance the United States can provide, through multilateral or international organizations.

Second, because the problem in Burundi is essentially an African problem, the United States should, first, request a report from the Organization of African



Unity as to the nature and extent of the strife in Burundi; and, second, offer to assist the OAU in meeting the urgent needs of the people in Burundi.

Third, because the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees has already been informed that Burundi refugees are in Zaire, and because refugees might also be in Tanzania and Rwanda, our Government should request the U.N. Secretary-General to instruct the High Commissioner for Refugees to conduct a thorough investigation of problems facing refugees as a result of the Burundi matter.

Fourth, because the suffering is primarily within the country of Burundi itself, the U.S. Government should request the Secretary-General of the United Nations to conduct a separate and thorough inquiry of the tragedy and report back to the United Nations as to how individual nations, such as the United States, might assist the United Nations in providing assistance to the people of Burundi.

I am submitting three resolutions today which would incorporate my final three suggestions, calling upon the OAU, the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees, and the U.N. Secretary-General to act and offering appropriate American assistance.

Mr. President, the U.S. Government and Senate have a moral obligation to do all that it can to resist killing. I do not suggest that we intervene in an African dispute. I do not suggest that we interpose ourselves in this continent, which is fully capable of governing itself. But, regardless of the parties involved or the location of the dispute, murder is murder.

I am pleased that our Government was the first to respond with humanitarian assistance. Even in crisis on other continents, the American response should be generous and immediate. The American Government and the American people can neither be unmoved nor unconcerned about terror and death. The slaughter of an entire generation of the educated part of any population deserves more attention than several columns in our Nation's newspapers.

I fear, Mr. President, that the American people are being conditioned by international events to accept human suffering. I fear that the tragedies which occur daily in Indochina tend to have the effect of dulling our consciences, hardening our sensitivities, and distorting our perspectives. We have the inclination at times to close our eyes or turn our faces when confronted with pain; to wish away misery; to immunize ourselves somehow to death and terror.

Nothing could be more dangerous. Nothing could more directly threaten our values, our spirit, our sense of dignity than this semiconscious denial of human pain. We cannot afford, Mr. President, to allow our national conscience to be dulled or our sensitivities to be muted. Where there is suffering and slaughter—whether in Africa or in Asia, in Washington, or in Watts—the spirit of this Nation demands that we protest and that we respond, to alleviate the tragedy.

We should not intervene unilaterally in the affairs of another nation. But we should make our resources available to

assist any human beings who are confronted with disaster. We should use our moral suasion to bring about an end to the slaughter.

That type of assistance, administered and distributed through international or multilateral institutions, deserves the support and commitment of us all.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support the three resolutions and the four programs I have proposed in an effort to expose the tragedy and to provide some helpful assistance in its wake.

Mr. President, a variety of news stories have mentioned to a greater or lesser degree the crisis in Burundi. None of them describes the tragedy better than yesterday's front page stories in the New York Times and the Washington Post. Accordingly, I would ask the unanimous consent of my colleagues that those stories be inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks. I also ask unanimous consent that the three resolutions I have introduced be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 315

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United States Government should request the Secretary General of the United Nations to instruct the High Commissioner for Refugees to conduct a thorough investigation of the civil strife which has occurred in Burundi since April, 1972.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 316

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United States Government should (1) request an investigation by, and report from, the Organization of African Unity on the nature and extent of the civil strife which has occurred in Burundi since April, 1972, and (2) offer to assist the Organization of African Unity in meeting the urgent needs of the people in Burundi resulting from such civil strife.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 317

*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Senate that the United States Government should request the Secretary General of the United Nations to conduct a thorough investigation of the civil strife which has occurred in Burundi since April, 1972.

[From the Washington Post, June 11, 1972]

**DOUBLE GENOCIDE TEARS BURUNDI APART:  
WITNESSES TELL OF ORGY OF KILLING AFTER  
ABORTIVE HUTU COUP**

(NOTE: The following dispatch, based on reporting inside Burundi, was filed from Kinshasa, capital of neighboring Zaire (formerly the Belgian Congo).)

(By Jonathan C. Randal)

**BUJUMBURA, BURUNDI, June 9.**—Terrified by yet another bloody uprising against their 500-year-old domination, the minority Tutsi rulers of Burundi are systematically killing the elite of their former Hutu serfs in what can only be termed genocide.

Official Burundi government and impartial estimates alike claim that as many as 100,000 people have been killed in the six weeks since Hutu exiles invaded this poor Maryland-sized mountain nation located in Central Africa between Tanzania and Zaire, the former Belgian Congo.

But such are the difficulties in collecting reliable information in Burundi that the death toll may be considerably higher in the combination Hutu uprising and Tutsi repression in reaction.

By all accounts, the orgy of killing was set off by the invaders' determination to murder all the Tutsis who make up 15 per cent of Burundi's estimated 3.5 million inhabitants. Their plan reportedly then called for the establishment of purely Hutu regime.

The continuing repression is seemingly dictated by the Tutsis' equal determination to cow Hutu peasants into submission and wipe out the educated Hutu elite in order to ensure Tutsi domination for the foreseeable future.

What has been called an attempt at "double genocide" has few parallels in the post-independence annals of Africa. Even such African tragedies as the Congo turmoil of the early and mid-60s, the Biafran rebellion and the recently concluded Sudanese civil war do not match what has happened here.

Outwardly impervious to international criticism, including from the Belgian government and Pope Paul VI, Burundi President Michel Micombero shows little inclination or ability to stop the killing.

Western embassies are reluctant to talk for fear of jeopardizing the security of their nationals. (There are some 6,000 foreigners in Burundi, half of them Belgians.) Only occasional passes have been issued to diplomats for travel outside the capital since the violence began.

To date the Organization of African Unity, the continent's regional grouping, has refused to investigate the Burundi situation, apparently on the ground that such action would violate its charter forbidding interference in a member state's internal affairs.

At this point, such a move might prove to be too late anyway. The repression has reached down through the ranks of the educated Hutu elite to such an extent that only a thousand or so secondary school students still survive.

In an informal conversation with visiting reporters, President Micombero alluded to the lasting effects of the civil war by quoting—if only to disagree with—an unidentified missionary who told him "80 years of evangelization has been washed down the drain."

Similarly, a longtime foreign resident lamented that the violence had "cancelled out everything that have been accomplished" since Burundi gained its independence in 1962 after some 80 years of first German and then Belgian colonial tutelage. Now, he added, "We have to start from square one."

Such is the Burundi genius for intrigue that some diplomatic observers are convinced that the government, which has conceded prior knowledge of the Hutu invasion, allowed the rebels to make their move from bases in Tanzania April 29 in the hope that they would be crushed and that the invasion would justify subsequent repression.

#### ATTACK NO SURPRISE

Officials from the 31-year-old president on down have admitted that the approximate date of the attack was known in advance. The president, who sports an elegant mutton-chop beard, dissolved his government just hours before the attack, and his decision to do so has been interpreted less charitably than his own explanation that he was guided by "divine providence."

The morning preceding the invasion, Congolese in Burundi living along the rich plain bordering Lake Tanganyika, between Burundi and Zaire, took to their boats and headed for safety on the Zaire side.

[Burundi ambassador to the United Nations Nsanze Terence, at a press conference in New York June 1, said that an attacking force of some 8,000 crossed Lake Tanganyika and entered Burundi. He said that 3,000 Burundese constituting their "fifth column" joined with the invading force inside the country.]

Once the attack began on the evening of April 29, the rebels surpassed in violence

even the followers of the late Pierre Mulele, the Peking-trained Congolese rebel who led the successful rebellion in Kivu Province in 1964 and whose tactics inspired the Hutu uprising here.

High on Indian hemp, protected by witch doctors' tattoos, anywhere from 3,000 to 25,000 rebels moved out of their bases in the dense forests on the Tanzanian border and went on a rampage. They chanted "Mai, Mai Mulele," the magic Swahili words for the famous Mulele water which was supposed to dissolve the government troops' bullets.

#### REBELS JUMP GUN

The attacks centered on the south north-east and Bujumbura, a city of 70,000. The rebels jumped the gun in the capital by refusing to pay for gasoline for Molotov cocktails at a downtown filling station, chopping off the attendants' fingers and thus raising the alarm two hours before operations were to begin.

In the northeast, the attackers were quickly repulsed. But in the southern province of Bururi, they struck with great effectiveness, seeking out their victims with lists of names and addresses. Tracts found on captured rebels harangued them to kill Tutsi men, women and children and even disembowel pregnant Tutsi women to ensure that no Tutsi fetus would survive.

A French journalist who interviewed the widow of a Tutsi gendarme captain was told that her three children were beheaded by machetes before her eyes, her husband disemboweled and the children's heads stuffed in his stomach while she was repeatedly raped and left for dead.

Micombero recounted that captured documents spoke of plans for a rebel victory parade in Bujumbura on May 19 during which he, as the last surviving Tutsi, was to be killed.

#### SECRET HUTU SOCIETY

Although the government so far has failed to produce the documentary evidence, no responsible observer, Burundi or foreign, seriously doubts the government case linking the invasion to a secret Hutu society said to have been formed in 1970 to provide funds to train the rebels.

Monthly contributions varied between 100 Burundi francs (about \$2) for a poor Hutu to \$400 for a rich businessman. The government contends—once again without producing evidence—that thousands of names were on the society's lists, including many prominent Hutus in government and private life.

Bernard Bududira, Tutsi vicar general of the Roman Catholic diocese of Bururi in the south, quoted an eyewitness who saw Alois Barakikanna, a Hutu graduate of the University of Arizona and vice director of the government's Economics Ministry, at the lakeside mission of Minago exhorting the rebels to continue their devastation.

According to other testimony, other Hutu leaders were in the vanguard of the southern attack, although, unlike their troops, they were not drugged. Some of the rebel military leaders wore blood-daubed enamel dishpans as helmets.

Although Micombero accused Gaston Soumialot and Martin Kasongo of being in Burundi during the attack, no one else has corroborated the presence of these two former leaders of the 1964 Simba uprising in the Eastern Congo. All the rebels captured spoke the Burundi language, Kirundi, indicating that foreign intervention was probably limited to adapting techniques perfected in the Congo.

A major variation on the Simba rebellion, however, was the strict order given to avoid harming whites.

#### DEVASTATION EXTENSIVE

The extent of the devastation wrought by the Hutu rebels was brought home by a helicopter flight low over the rich Lake

Tanganyika plain and through the green hills where most Burundese live.

Starting at Bugarama Lake, 25 miles south of the capital, and extending to Nyanza Lake near the Tanzanian border to the south, there is an almost uninterrupted record of violence: burned-out cars, huts and buildings in the town of Rumonge; some 30 mutilated bodies, bloated and bleached, in the reeds near the lake shore. They are jealously guarded by crocodiles and a hippopotamus family.

But more telling still was the almost total lack of people seen from the helicopter in this, one of Africa's most densely populated countries.

According to a missionary report, 2,782 homes were burned down in the southern attack, which lasted three days before government forces, reinforced by a company of airlifted Zaire troops turned the tide.

Although most of the rebels retreated back across the Tanzanian border, President Micombero disclosed the existence of a rebel "People's Republic" of Martyazo, which held sway in the southern hills for two weeks before it was crushed by the army and gendarmerie.

But if there is little real argument with the government's explanations about the initial attack, the same cannot be said for its claims about casualties, the continuing repression or the mysterious death of former King Ntare V in Kitega in central Burundi.

In his formal chat, Micombero recounted the demise of the king, who rashly returned to Burundi at the end of March after accepting the president's assurance that he would be protected.

Terming the ex-king a "fool" to have thought that his return would provoke an uprising in favor of the monarchy, Micombero explained how he had honored the letter of his promise to protect the king by placing him under house arrest in the royal palace in Kitega.

Micombero spiked rumors that Ntare had been killed in fighting between the army and rebels seeking to free and use him as a symbol of their revolt. "The king was not assassinated," the president said, "but judged and executed immediately on the night of April 29."

Angered by the importance the Western press has given the aftermath of the attack, Micombero said: "You people insist on the repression without insisting on its causes."

In his eyes, the attack, but not the repression, constituted genocide, which "no government which is civilized could caution."

Indeed, "it was worse than genocide," Micombero said, because the Hutu attackers killed not only Tutsi men, women and children but also some Hutus who refused to join their ranks.

#### PURSuing GUILTY

He maintained that only those who are guilty are being punished and compared his relentless pursuit of the Hutus to the continuing hunt for Nazis implicated in exterminating European Jews in World War II.

"They're still tracking down those responsible for the Jewish genocide then, and that's more than 20 years ago," he said.

Evasive about the exact death toll, Micombero nonetheless estimated that between 50,000 and 100,000 Burundese had lost their lives. But he insisted that more Burundese were killed in the initial attack than in the subsequent repression.

Since in the past he has said 50,000 Tutsis alone had died in the first rebel push, his estimation was interpreted as the first official admission that large numbers of Hutu were victims of the repression.

Reliable reports from missionaries, the surest sources of information in this country, conservatively estimate that no more than 1,700 Tutsis—and far fewer loyal Hutus—were killed in the south in the initial

rebel onslaught and that no more than 4,000 lost their lives in the entire country.

In the repression, Hutu casualties in the south alone were said to range from 20,000 to 40,000 dead.

Between 3,000 and 4,000 Hutus have been killed so far in the repression in Bujumbura, an equal number in Kitega and some 15,000 to 20,000 in all the rest of the country, except the north where little information has been available.

#### HUTU CASUALTIES

Other reliable sources put Hutu casualties as high as 10,000 in Bujumbura alone.

In the capital, authorities no longer drive trucks with Hutu cadavers through the center of town in broad daylight. But every night trucks carrying the dead are seen either along the lakeside road or along Patrice Lumumba Avenue on their way to a giant bulldozed burial ground near the airport.

With relatively few exceptions, only adolescent male or adult Hutu men have reportedly been killed in the repression. However, Hutu women with skills in teaching or nursing have been killed.

For example, five Hutu women teachers were bayoneted to death by the army at the Bururi mission.

As one source put it, "The army and gendarmerie haven't wasted many bullets."

In the early weeks of the repression, personal vengeance played a role in the arbitrary denunciation, arrest and death of many Hutus, although the army has shot several soldiers and volunteers who were guilty of such excessive zeal.

#### ARBITRARY ARRESTS

Now, at least in theory, three citizens must denounce a suspect before he is arrested. But this procedure is not always honored.

The other morning in the center of Bujumbura, a foreign journalist watched three gendarmes jump out of a jeep and bundle three well-dressed men off to an undisclosed destination.

In the south, army atrocities have been reported at at least one mission which was being used as a feeding and pacification center for Hutus lured out of the forests by government promises that calm had been restored. A helicopter mounted with machine guns flew over the assembled Hutus at the Hutumba mission in the south and opened fire, killing about 100 of them.

The United Nations has formally protested against the use of requisitioned UNICEF cars in Bujumbura by the police and against the unauthorized use of a United Nations fishery research vessel which has been armed and used to attack suspected rebel strongholds along the lake shore.

The effects of the repression at Bujumbura University are such that 170 of the 360 Burundese students failed to apply for scholarships for the next school year. Since few Burundese are rich enough to attend without a scholarship, the conclusion is that 170 Hutu students have been killed, arrested or forced into hiding.

Much of the killing at the university and in secondary schools has been carried out by the students themselves. Policemen arrived in some schools with lists, summoned the Hutus outside, and pushed them into trucks where they were bayoneted to death.

At the capital's technical secondary school, a professor recounted that on the night of May 19, the Hutu students suddenly put out the lights and tried to escape. Their Tutsi colleagues killed half of them, but strangely enough some of the 100 or so Hutu students are still in school. "And you would never know anything had happened," the professor added.

The great fear of the foreign community is that the remaining Hutu secondary school students in Bujumbura and elsewhere in



the country will "disappear," once the foreign teachers go on their annual summer holidays abroad.

At one point last year, the army numbered some 3,500 men. But it is now reported well below strength, not because of casualties suffered in fighting the rebels but rather because its Hutu officers, noncommissioned officers and men have been either purged or killed.

The Christian churches have also paid their tribute to the violence. Missionary sources report that 12 Hutu Protestant pastors and 14 Hutu Catholic priests have been killed so far in the repression.

What lessons the recent events here will hold for the future are impossible to tell. No one takes seriously the threat of an immediate Hutu revolt.

"All the Hutus who lifted their heads have had them severed," said one foreigner.

Reconciliation seems far off. In the immediate future, foreigners here hope that there will be no prolonged rebel insurgency. But eventually, it is believed the Hutus will rise and try once again to oust the Tutsis, probably in less than 10 years.

#### BURUNDI: LAND OF TRIBAL PASSIONS

Burundi and neighboring Rwanda to the north were both formerly Belgian-administered trust territories. The two countries became independent in July, 1962.

With populations of about 3.5 million each, the two countries are ethnically divided between a Tutsi minority and a Hutu majority. The Tutsi, 15 per cent of the population in Burundi and 9 per cent in Rwanda, are a proud, tall, aristocratic pastoral people who had ruled the poorer, farming Hutus for centuries prior to independence.

In 1959, Belgians and influential Roman Catholic missionaries encouraged a successful if bloody Hutu revolt against the ruling Tutsis in Rwanda. At least 20,000 Tutsis were slaughtered, and some 200,000 others fled the country, many to Burundi.

Following the revolt in Rwanda, the Tutsis in Burundi tightened their control over the Hutus but also sought to establish closer ties. Numerous intermarriages encouraged hopes that a single unified nation would gradually emerge.

Since independence, scarcely a year has passed in Burundi without either an attempted coup, trials followed by hangings or a revolt. But this political turmoil largely involved feuding factions within the Tutsi minority.

In 1966, King Mwambutsa IV of Burundi was forced off his throne by his son, Ntare V, with the help of then Capt. Michel Micombero. Three months later, Micombero in turn deposed Ntare and proclaimed a republic with himself as president.

On April 29 of this year, Hutu rebels, some coming from camps in Tanzania and others apparently from across Lake Tanganyika in Zaïre (the Congo), invaded the country. They were joined by Hutu tribesmen within the country, and together they attempted to oust the Tutsi-dominated Micombero government. The coup failed and the Tutsis began a bloody repression in reaction.

[From the New York Times, June 11, 1972]  
SLAUGHTER IN BURUNDI: HOW ETHNIC CONFLICT ERUPTED  
(By Marvine Howe)

**BUJUMBURA, BURUNDI, June 9.**—This nation is just beginning to realize the extent of the slaughter that has taken place here over the last six weeks in struggles between the country's two major ethnic groups.

The complete story of an attempted coup at the end of April, and the counteroffensive that followed, cannot be told since only official sources can be quoted and they are clearly biased. Other sources, as well as foreigners, are still generally terrorized and re-

luctant to jeopardize lives of friends or risk expulsion. However, a six-day visit to Burundi has produced a plausible account of the catastrophe out of a web of rumors, lies and contradictions.

Clear statistics on the extent of the massacres are hard to come by. Information is limited because movement has been severely curtailed by official barricades and curfews. Foreigners must have travel permits and these are very difficult to obtain. Above all, most people are terrorized and reluctant to talk.

Nevertheless, authoritative sources on the scene estimate that about 2,000 people were killed in the initial rebellion, mostly members of the ruling Tutsi tribe, a numerical minority. The reprisals are said to have cost the lives of 2,000 more Tutsis and about 100,000 members of the Hutu, the majority tribe, mainly in the Bururi Province and the area of Bujumbura.

The President of Burundi, Lieut. Col. Michel Micombero, acknowledges that 50,000 to 100,000 people have been killed in the last six weeks, while many foreign residents estimate the number of victims at closer to 150,000.

The basic struggle involves an attempt by the Hutu majority to overthrow the ruling Tutsi aristocracy, as the Hutus in neighboring Rwanda in 1959. Here the attempted coup has failed, at a terrible price, particularly among the Hutus.

"We have won a reprieve but the final showdown is irreversible," a member of the Tutsi minority said. The dominant Tutsi account for only 15 per cent of the 3.5 million inhabitants of this country, which is about 10,750 square miles in area, roughly equivalent to the state of Maryland.

Colonel Micombero still speaks of his "program of national unity," but most people believe that the progress that had been made toward integration has now largely been erased by the violence.

#### PROVINCE DEVASTATED

Bururi Province in the south, where the main part of the Hutu rebellion took place, is now a scene of devastation. The population has almost disappeared from a once densely inhabited area in a 40-mile stretch along Lake Tanganyika.

Some people, estimated to number 10,000 have fled to neighboring Tanzania, and 15,000 have escaped across the lake to Zaïre, the former Republic of the Congo, leaving 175,000 unaccounted for. Many of these people are known to have taken refuge in the bush and marshes but many more are believed to be dead.

Only recently a small trickle of human life has begun to return to Rumonge, the lake-side fishing center of Bururi, the inland farming center, and some of the hill towns. In the Bururi region alone, 2,000 grassroof huts have been burned. Some 5,000 women and children have taken refuge in the Bururi missions.

The reprisals, on the other hand, have taken a heavy toll not only in the south but in Bujumbura and towns throughout the country. The Hutu elite has been decimated in the government administration, in the commercial world, in the church and in schools down to the secondary school level.

#### LOCAL OFFICIALS CRITICIZED

There have been excesses and atrocities during both the rebellion and the subsequent repression, according to foreign testimony. The burden of private criticism, however, has been directed against the local authorities for neglecting to curb reprisals.

"It is natural to demand greater moral restraint from the established authority than from drugged rebels," a churchman declared.

Foreign diplomats and other residents have generally followed the events in impotent silence, fearing that any intervention

would bring grave repercussions for the foreign community of Burundi. The 6,000 or so missionaries, technicians, school teachers and businessmen and their families are considered hostages.

Until now, foreigners have not been the target of either the rebels or the repressors. The only foreigner to be killed was a Belgian technician who lost his life by accident when he went out to the street to observe the first assault at Bujumbura.

The explosion of ethnic antagonism is regarded by many missionaries as evidence of a failure of the Western church, both Roman Catholic and Protestant.

"The church has been humiliated and must start again from zero," a priest said. "Both those who provoked the rebellion and those who carried out the repression were Christians," he noted.

Representatives of seven missionary institutions broke their silence on May 20, with a strong letter to their superiors, and aimed at the Burundi Government, condemning persons responsible for the rebellion as well as the "systematic repression" of the Hutus.

The letter also protested against arbitrary arrests and the ban on priests' visits to the prisons. The only response to the letter seems to have been increased difficulties for missionaries who seek to obtain travel permits.

At the end of last month, a group of diplomats, led by the papal nuncio, applauded the president for starting his pacification program and pledged support for "all victims" of the violence. Even this action brought no direct response.

#### PROTEST BY PRIESTS

Troubled by the continued repression and the official silence around it, three Italian priests and one Spanish priest in the north spoke severely about arbitrary punishment. They were promptly called to Bujumbura for interrogation by the police. Accused of political activity, the four young priests have been put under surveillance.

These protests, however timid and belated, coupled with strong criticism in the international press, seem to have spurred the authorities to move to halt the repression. "Or maybe it's merely that there are no more Hutus who can lift their heads," a churchman observed.

The Burundi Government has publicly blamed "foreign influences for the ethnic war," but has not specifically attacked any country. Diplomatic speculation about this accusation run from China and North Korea to the Vatican and the United States Central Intelligence Agency.

President Micombero cleared Belgium, which until 1962 exercised a colonial mandate here, of the charges. However, the colonel did accuse Belgian Christian trade unions and former trusteeship administrators "of sowing division among us." There were no Hutus or Tutsis, but a united people, before the colonial period, he said.

Burundi's ethnic troubles are considered to have been inevitable by scholars who have followed the evolution of this area of Central Africa. The problem can be attributed above all to a rapid breaking up of the feudal structures.

More than three centuries ago, the tall handsome Tutsis came with their flocks from the high plateaus in East Africa to settle on the gentle hills of what are now Rwanda and Burundi. The local kings accepted them as colonizers and married the Tutsi women, establishing a royal line of mixed Tutsi and Hutu blood. A feudal hierarchy was established with the Tutsis as lords and the Hutus their serfs.

#### FOREIGNERS BRING CHANGES

This feudal harmony was disturbed by the arrival of European colonizers and by the teachings of the Catholic Church. The area became part of German East Africa in 1899 and after World War I was ruled by the Bel-

glans for 40 years under a League of Nations mandate, followed by United Nations trusteeship. The outside forces brought basic education and new ideas to the Hutus, such as the injustice of slavery.

In neighboring Rwanda, the Hutus carried out their revolution in the presence of the Belgian administration—and probably with some Belgian complicity. The king there was overthrown in 1959 and the Hutus won control of the Government through elections held under sponsorship of the United Nations.

Some 20,000 Tutsis were killed in the revolt and 300,000 were forced into exile—about 100,000 of them to Burundi.

The Belgians, who granted both territories independence in 1962, generally felt that the transition could be smoother in Burundi, where there were many Hutu-Tutsi marriages and a Hutu middle class was gradually emerging.

Two Hutu risings, in 1965 and 1969, however, were evidence of a growing dissatisfaction within the majority and ambition for more than token responsibilities.

The attempted coup of April 29 this year, to all appearances, follows in the same line of rebellions but was organized on a much broader and more violent scale. It was also complicated by the involvement of some monarchist Tutsis as well as opposition elements in Zaire. But independent sources generally agree that essentially this was another attempt by the Hutus to assume what they consider their rightful place as the majority in Burundi.

The fullest account of the initial attack was given this week by President Micombero in an informal interview by a small group of newsmen. The 31-year-old leader, who ousted young King Ntare V in 1965 to proclaim a republic, discussed for the first time the role of the former King in the recent events.

Ntare was duped by the Hutu plotters, according to President Micombero who said the former King's name had been used to get as wide backing as possible for the uprising. Ntare returned to Burundi after "they convinced him that my regime was very unpopular and that it was now or never to make a comeback," Colonel Micombero said.

The President acknowledged that he had given assurances that the former King would be protected on his return. But he stressed that since Ntare was "trying to trap me," he could not be allowed to move about freely and had been put under house arrest.

After the former King's return, preparations for the plot were intensified, the President said. The army was put on alert two weeks before the rising occurred.

Colonel Micombero declined to link the dissolution of his Government on the morning of April 29 with the attack that came that evening. The timing, he said, was a matter of "providence."

Monarchists and rebels acted together on the night of the rebellion, the President said. He disclosed for the first time that the former King was immediately tried and executed on the night of the attack. Earlier, official reports said that Ntare had been killed in the fighting when his supporters tried to free him.

The initial rising, according to the first official account broadcast over the Burundi radio on May 29, took place on the night of April 29 between 7 and 8:30 P.M. Some 10,000 utus and a number of "Muleleists," followers of the late Congolese revolutionary leader Pierre Mulele, carried out nearly simultaneous attacks in four areas of the country. In most of the places, military balls had been organized by Hutu officers involved in the plot.

The rebels were said to have come mainly from a training base in the words of northern Tanzania. They were reportedly armed

with poisoned machetes, clubs, a few automatic weapons and gasoline bombs.

At Bujumbura, fewer than 100 persons took part in the attack, which was aimed principally at the radio station, near the military camp.

An argument at a service station over payment for the fuel for the gasoline bombs is said to have alerted the army camp. Two officers who came out to investigate the incident were killed before the rebels were dispersed. Another group of rebels clashed with troops in front of the cathedral and a third band attacked private vehicles at an intersection near the military camp, burning a dozen cars and killing about a dozen persons.

The main attack took place in the south in an area along the main highway between Rumonge and Nyanza-Lac. It was said that 4,600 rebels took part in a systematic slaughter of Tutsis in the region. Local Hutus were ordered to join in the hunt and shared the Tutsis' fate if they refused.

Another group of 3,000 rebels attacked in the Bururi region, and homeland of the President and most of the present Tutsi rulers. Nearly every army officer is said to have lost some member of his family in the attack. President Micombero said his brother-in-law had been slain.

Forty of the chief administrators were also killed, including the district commissioner, the attorney general and his assistants, doctors and accountants, as well as many of their wives and children.

At the same time, about 100 attackers from Tanzania assaulted the military post of Cankuzo in the east, where a large number of Tutsi refugees from Rwanda had settled. However, this band was rapidly "cut into pieces" by the defending forces, the Bujumbura radio said.

A fourth attack was said to have taken place at Kitega, where the former King was being held. However, although the town was besieged by rebels according to the official report: residents of Kitega said they had heard no fighting.

Eyewitnesses at Bururi confirmed official reports that the assailants were mainly Hutus, using Mulelist tactics. They were said to have smoked hashish, to have worn white saucers stained with blood as helmets, and to have had their bodies tattooed with magic signs as immunity against attack.

The rebels, fired with drugs, were said to have killed all the Tutsis they could find, generally cutting them to pieces with their machetes.

Normally Burundi people are not drug users, but witchdoctors played an important role in this attack, according to Colonel Micombero. He said that the Mulelist trainers would shoot blank bullets at a man to show his immunity and then shoot a dog or cat with real bullets to show that the animal had died because it did not cry out the words that conferred protection.

"We have tangible proof that Mulelists from Zaire participated in the rising," President Micombero said. He charged that the Zairian oppositionists wanted to use Burundi as a base to attack the regime of President Mobutu Sese Seko. He asserted that Martin Kasongo, a well-known Mulelist, had taken part in the Burundi rising, had stolen four million francs at Nyanza-Lac and had disappeared.

"I want his head," said Colonel Micombero, declaring that Mr. Kasongo deserved the death sentence for having organized the massacre.

Asked how long the repression would last, the President snapped: "They're still tracking down the persons responsible for the genocide of Jews in World War II and that's more than 20 years ago. You can easily understand that we are still taking action against criminals six weeks after the genocide here."

The initial slaughter took place in a period of 24 hours, but isolated attacks lasted for

two weeks. At Martyazo, in the Bururi region, the rebels set up a "people's republic" and remained entrenched for nearly two weeks before they were routed out, the President said.

The army, gendarmes and youth brigades rapidly put the rebellion down in most areas of the south, according to available information. However, some 100 rebels are believed to be still hiding in the bush, coming out at night to steal food.

The repression that followed the attack has been extreme, according to all independent sources. The authorities announced that they had uncovered a secret "organization for genocide and coup d'état" and said they had proof that the aggressors not only wanted "to overthrow the republican institutions but also had a highly detailed organized plan for the systematic extermination of the whole Tutsi race."

The President said that "thousands" of Hutu names were on the lists of persons paying dues to the rebel organization.

Large-scale arrests started with the four Hutu members of the Government. Pascal Buhiriza, Minister of Telecommunications, was said to have confessed that the massacre were aimed at the Tutsis.

On May 7, it was announced that "a good number" of Hutus had been found guilty of taking part in the plot and had been executed.

The Revolutionary Youth brigades took the lead in what is widely described as arbitrary arrests and killings. These were aggravated by personal being denounced as plotters because of disputes over land or a cow.

"It was barbaric, unbelievably inhuman," said a foreign resident who had seen a man clubbed to death in front of the Bujumbura post office by a gang of Revolutionary Youths.

"They picked up almost all the Hutu intellectuals above secondary level," a Tutsi professor said.

The university was severely affected. Students were seen assaulting Hutus in the university grounds, beating them to death with rocks and clubs. In the beginning, soldiers came into the lecture halls, called Hutus out by name, threw them into trucks and took them away. Most of the those have never returned.

In the first week of repression at Bujumbura, witnesses said Hutus were piled up in trucks and taken off for burial at a mass grave at the airport. "I used to see the trucks almost every evening at around 9, after the curfew, going down Avenue Lumumba in front of the cathedral and sometimes I could hear people screaming inside," one resident said.

The churches have been particularly hard hit. Twelve Hutu priests are said to have been killed and thousands of Protestant pastors, school directors and teachers. In the Bujumbura hospitals, six doctors, and eight nurses were arrested and are believed to be dead.

In its "truth broadcasts," the Burundi radio has said almost nothing about the repression that has followed the rebellion. The rebels were given "the punishment they deserved" and "only the guilty Hutus" were arrested, it has said. "One cannot even speak of repression but legitimate defense because our country is at war," the state radio emphasized.

Most independent observers are inclined to accept the official position that there was a Hutu plot. However, the origin of the name lists, the evidence of guilt and the severity of the punishment are widely questioned.

It is also increasingly asked why the authorities did not act to prevent the initial outbreak, since there had been reports of unusual movements in the south six weeks before the rising. Some church sources wonder whether the attack was allowed to happen so as to provide justification for broad repression.

The slaughter has been a serious blow to



the economy. In the south, the missions are trying to get refugees out of the bush to harvest the cotton, bananas and coffee, but it seems that much of the crops will be lost.

Foreign observers generally question whether reconciliation can ever be possible after so much killing. In the city areas here where Hutus and Tutsis live side by side, the two tribes are terrified of each other, and word has spread that all Tutsi families should get rid of Hutu houseboys for fear of poison or some other form of retaliation.

#### FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1972—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 1219

(Ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.)

Mr. ALLEN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3390) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 1220

(Ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.)

Mr. SAXBE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 3390), *supra*.

AMENDMENT NO. 1222

(Ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.)

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and the distinguished Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER), I am submitting an amendment to S. 3390, the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, to increase the amount of American assistance to Bangladesh by \$50 million—to bring the total to \$100 million, the amount proposed by the Agency for International Development.

The unprecedented tragedy that swept the land and people of Bangladesh last year has rightly brought an unprecedented humanitarian response from the American people and Congress. Despite the slowness of our Government to react, the American people and the Congress have seen the birth of Bangladesh as a saga of human courage and tragedy rarely witnessed in modern times—a saga deserving of our concern and our help. Last year millions of Bengalis perished in the violence of the Pakistan Army's repression, while millions more sought refuge in India, and countless thousands died of disease and malnutrition in the refugee camps. Today, because of this violence and dislocation, more millions face severe food shortages and homeless nights.

Never has there been so massive a shift in population, in as short a span of time, as the flow of nearly 10 million refugees into India last year, and their spontaneous return this year to a free and independent Bangladesh. It is, and will likely remain, one of the greatest human migrations of the 20th century.

Last year the Congress voted \$200 million to help return and rehabilitate these refugees who fled famine and war, and to help rebuild their lives and lands devastated by both manmade and natural disasters. This year, we must continue this help.

I fully appreciate the Foreign Relations Committee report and why it did not recommend the full \$100 million

authorization for refugee relief assistance in Bangladesh, as requested by the administration. At the time of the report there was no public announcement as to how the administration planned to use the additional funds. In addition, the committee expressed its concern that the United States might get itself into the position of assuming the primary responsibility for the relief program in Bangladesh.

The committee's concerns are legitimate, and I commend its insistence upon proof from the administration of the capacity to program the funds in accordance with sound management standards and consideration for the contribution of other donor nations. However, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Refugees—from my own close observation of this problem, both here and during my visit to Dacca in February of this year—I believe that the full \$100 million is not only justified but is absolutely essential to permit the United States to continue to play the leadership role on which the entire international humanitarian effort depends.

Although the administration refused to recognize Bangladesh and was unconsciously lethargic in providing the emergency assistance which was needed last January and February, nonetheless AID has now signed a \$90 million agreement with the Government of Bangladesh. The agreement brings the total amount obligated out of the \$200 million, to \$168 million. Additional requests from the Bangladesh Government and from American voluntary agencies working in Bangladesh amount to an additional \$65 million and will be programed this month.

Important among these voluntary agency programs are the special efforts of Catholic relief services and church world service, the housing programs of CARE, the special training programs being undertaken by the international rescue committee, and many other outstanding programs of American and other international voluntary organizations. These programs deserve our support because they are effective, and because the people and government of Bangladesh have welcomed the return of voluntary agencies which have a long history of useful work, and who have responded so generously on their own to the humanitarian needs of the Bengali people.

Mr. President, the recent \$90 million bilateral agreement with Bangladesh represents an important achievement for which I commend AID. Members of the Refugee Subcommittee staff who have studied AID's plans, report that this bilateral agreement reflects carefully thought out projects, mutually agreed upon by both Governments. Moreover, as I look down the list of projects that American funds will support—a list of some of them I will introduce at the conclusion of my remarks—I am convinced that we are providing the kind of assistance Bangladesh requires at this time. During my visit to the area, I was impressed by the courage and resilience of the people of Bangladesh. Despite the suffering and disruption to which they

have been subjected over the past year, most are now energetically at work rebuilding their lives and country. In fact, because of their industry and courage, preliminary reports suggest that agricultural production in Bangladesh may be greater than might have been expected.

What the people of Bangladesh need today and over the next few months is the wherewithal to rehabilitate their own country.

They need materials to repair coastal embankments badly damaged during the 1970 cyclone and in the war.

They need engineering services and parts to repair damaged electric powerplants and transmission lines.

They need materials to rebuild roads and bridges.

They need the resources to rebuild schools and to buy textbooks.

And they need assistance to reconstruct houses, water supply and sewage systems.

The people of Bangladesh will provide the most important resource of all—their manpower. But what they ask of us is to help provide the material resources to help them put it to work.

Although, as the committee report suggests, more Public Law 480 commodities will undoubtedly be required in fiscal year 1973, the need for food will be eclipsed by the need for other materials as Bangladesh moves from the relief stage, to the rehabilitation stage. Our relief assistance this year, along with that or other donor nations, will help Bangladesh become a strong member of the family of developing nations rather than an orphan forever dependent on other nations for survival.

Finally, Mr. President, in an authorization bill otherwise devoted almost exclusively to security assistance, I urge the Senate not to cut corners on our humanitarian responsibility—to support this amendment to authorize the full \$100 million request for relief and rehabilitation assistance for Bangladesh.

I ask unanimous consent that a list prepared by AID of some of the uses of American relief funds in Bangladesh, as well as a discussion of current needs, be printed at this point in the Record.

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

#### Proposed uses of the \$90 million AID rehabilitation grant

Commodity imports:	Millions
Cotton (100,000 bales)-----	\$15.6
Tallow (20,000 tons)-----	4.8
Fertilizer—Urea (80,000 tons)-----	10.0
Fertilizer—TSP (35,000 tons)-----	4.0
	34.4

#### PROJECTS

Coastal embankments-----	16.0
--------------------------	------

This activity encompasses the completion of Phase I of the Coastal Embankments project including repair of facilities damaged in the 1970 cyclone and the war. The grant will finance consultant services, equipment and materials (floating craft, vehicles, cement, steel road) and local costs. This project will have a significant relief effect by employing 160,000 laborers.

Groundwater survey-----	.5
-------------------------	----

This high-priority project will finance one full year's cost of USGS staff services, equipment (drill rig, vehicles, scientific equipment, etc.) and local costs required to accelerate tubewell irrigation and rapidly expand agricultural production.

#### Power rehabilitation-----

a. Siddhirganj Thermal Power Section—This AID-financed power plant was damaged during the war and, because of the war, is long overdue for its first annual inspection and overhaul. We will finance engineering services, spare parts, local costs, and additional training in plant maintenance, if required.

b. Two Transmission Lines (Comilla-Noahkali Feni)—Almost all project equipment is on hand and only one construction season is required to complete the lines. The government has assigned a high priority to bring power to the areas involved as a stimulus to development. The project will finance the cost of engineering services, replacement of lost items of equipment and local costs to complete construction of the transmission.

c. Rehabilitation of Transmission and Distribution Systems—Considerable damage was done to the power system during the war and further deterioration because of a lack of maintenance. Under this activity repairs will be made, jerry-rigged arrangements replaced and normal maintenance operations reactivated. At least one major repair job, a large sub-station near Dacca, will be undertaken. We will finance the equipment required for immediate work as well as for the rebuilding of normal stocks, engineering and procurement assistance and local construction costs.

#### Mongla-Ghasiakhal Canal-----

This project, which will shorten inland water routes significantly, can be completed in two years with minimal expatriate supervision. The largest cost item will be for dredging the canal.

#### Education-----

a. Textbooks and reference books will be provided for the six universities in Bangladesh. Local printing costs of primary, secondary and college textbooks will also be underwritten.

b. School Reconstruction—The government is now reviewing the need for and cost of rebuilding of schools damaged in the war.

#### Roads and bridges-----

a. Dacca-Aricha Road—With the exception of two major bridges, all project components can be finished in one to two years. The project will fund the cost of engineering consultants and construction firms for this work. The contractors are also expected to undertake other work on the highway system.

b. Other roads and bridges—Under this activity imported construction materials and the local costs for bridge and road rebuilding being done by local contractors and the roads and highway department's own forces will be financed.

#### OTHER PROGRAMS UNDER REVIEW FOR FUTURE BILATERAL GRANTS

Rural housing (imports of cement and roofing).

Low-lift pumps and spare parts.

Construction of tugs and barges in Bangladesh public and private shipyards.

Rebuilding and resupplying rural health centers.

Construction and equipping repair shops for trucks.

Rehabilitation and expansion of the river dredging fleet.

Repair and emergency extension of town water supply and sewage systems.

Industrial credit through intermediate credit institutions.

17.0 Rehabilitation of natural gas facilities for industrial uses.

Additional short-staple cotton (if available).

Additional fertilizer for CY 1973 crops.

Granular pesticides.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 1223

(Ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.)

Mr. SPARKMAN, for himself, Mr. TOWER, and Mr. MUSKIE, submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them jointly to the bill (S. 3390) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF AN AMENDMENT

##### AMENDMENT NO. 999

At the request of Mr. CHURCH, the Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY) was added as a cosponsor of Amendment No. 999, intended to be proposed to the bill (H.R. 1) to amend the Social Security Act to increase benefits and improve eligibility and computation methods under the OASDI program, to make improvements in the Medicare, Medicaid, and maternal and child health programs with emphasis on improvements in their operating effectiveness, to replace the existing Federal-State Public Assistance programs with a Federal program of adult assistance and a Federal program of benefits to low-income families with children with incentives and requirements for employment and training to improve the capacity for employment of members of such families, and for other purposes.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON LAND-GRANT COLLEGES

Mr. STEVENSON, Mr. President, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Migratory Labor of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I announce hearings on the role of land-grant colleges in meeting the needs of farmworkers and others in rural America. The hearings will be held in Washington on June 19 and 20.

For the past year, the subcommittee has been analyzing the vast change that has taken place in rural America, a change marked by the displacement of farmworkers by new technology, the replacement of the independent farmer by giant corporations and conglomerates, and the continued outmigration from rural to urban America. One of the questions the subcommittee has been considering is whether the U.S. Department of Agriculture is living up to its self-declared "moral and legal responsibility to farmers and farmworkers," or whether its programs have contributed to the impoverishment of farmworkers and their families and the displacement of farmers.

Our hearings in Washington and California have so far shown that public policies—farm subsidies, tax breaks, wage laws, and land reclamation pro-

grams—often work to the special advantage of giant corporate and conglomerate farms.

Many witnesses have charged that the policies and activities of federally assisted land-grant colleges have also served to subsidize big business in its takeover of much of rural America.

Most recently, a report by the agribusiness accountability project, "Hard Tomatoes, Hard Times," made a number of specific charges which the subcommittee will examine during the hearings.

We are especially interested in determining:

First. To what extent has the land-grant college system assumed responsibility and developed programs to assist farmworkers and farmers and others in rural America who have been displaced or affected by the development of new agriculture technology?

Second. What are the land-grant colleges doing to assist the farmworker and family farmer adjust to changing conditions in rural America and maintain their economic viability? Are we satisfied that existing efforts are adequate? If not, what additional steps can be taken to assure that land-grant colleges are responding to all the people of rural America?

Third. What is the appropriate future role of the colleges of 1980, the so-called black land grant colleges?

Fourth. Who are the current beneficiaries of the research and other efforts of the land grant colleges, and is the current allocation of institutional resources and distribution of benefits equitable?

Fifth. What mechanisms are needed, if any, to make the land grant college system accountable to the public interest? Are changes needed in the composition of advisory committees at either the national level or on individual campuses? Is it desirable to have more public disclosure regarding research projects, administrative operations, foundation activities, fiscal policies, patent and licensing practices, industry contributions, and potential faculty conflicts of interest?

Secretary of Agriculture Earl Butz, officials and faculty of land-grant colleges, and representatives of farmworkers, farmers, and consumer interests and others have been invited to testify.

Persons desiring more information about the hearings may call Mr. Boren Chartkov, Counsel to the subcommittee at (202) 225-4538, or write him at room 201-Annex, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510.

#### NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON REFORM OF THE PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY SYSTEM

Mr. BAYH, Mr. President, for some time now the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments has been deeply involved in the study of various proposals to reform the process by which we choose our President and Vice President. The subcommittee is now about to start another series of hearings on this issue; this time we will be dealing with various aspects of the nomination process, with



most of our attention to be devoted to the presidential primaries.

The subcommittee's hearings will focus on three proposed constitutional amendments now pending before the subcommittee—Senate Joint Resolution 97, introduced by Senator HATFIELD, Senate Joint Resolution 214, introduced by Senator SMITH, and Senate Joint Resolution 215, introduced by Senator MANSFIELD. Each of these measures proposes the adoption of a single nationwide primary in place of the present State-by-State system of primaries and conventions.

We expect to have testimony from Senators, Congressmen, political scientists, and other experts in this field. Because we firmly believe that the Constitution should never be amended unless we are sure that the proposed change is absolutely necessary and the best possible remedy, we will also be interested in hearing about other proposals—whether they are other constitutional amendments, Federal legislation, or model statutes for the States to enact—which our witnesses think relevant to this inquiry.

The hearings will be held on June 21, 1972, at 10:30 a.m. in room 1114, New Senate Office Building; on June 22 at 10 a.m. in room 6226, New Senate Office Building; and on June 29 at 10 a.m. in room 318, Old Senate Office Building.

Any person who wishes to submit a written statement for the record, or who has further questions about these hearings, should contact Peter W. Coogan, assistant chief counsel of the subcommittee at 225-3018, or at room 300, Old Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510.

#### ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

##### ESSAYS ON RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, the Nebraska Rural Electric Association has sponsored a youth tour to Washington for a number of years. The group is made up of those boys and girls who have been the winners of essay contests sponsored by their individual Nebraska rural power systems in cooperation with the Nebraska Rural Electric Association.

I ask unanimous consent that four of these winning essays be printed in the RECORD.

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

WHAT RURAL ELECTRIFICATION MEANS TO ME AND MY COMMUNITY

(By Ron Berggren)

A mirage of lights glowing in the night; an irrigation pump pumping at the press of a button; and automatic washer tumbling the clothes while dinner cooks on a shiny range. Here is electricity at work in my rural community. Here too, is a modern miracle at work. Sparked by an endless flow of invisible electrical current, a rural revolution has created a new life of production and convenience.

Electricity is a form of energy. We know what it is by what it does. It gives us light, heat, and power. While the time required for these developments has been short, the effort and investments have been great.

Nebraska has a unique public power arrangement. All electrical facilities—from

giant generators to meters—are owned by the people. Every power user is automatically a stockholder in this vast enterprise, and every voter has a voice in its management. Backing it are elected farmers who serve as directors of the Nebraska Public Power District.

With an increasing use of computers in the system, it enables the District to further broaden its computer programming to cover the District needs. The nuclear reactor and computer add to the complexity of the system, and this leads to higher levels of performance and the upgrading of employees.

The Rural Electrification Administration (REA), as well as much of the public power plan in Nebraska, was due to the work of Senator George Norris from Nebraska. In 1950, about 78% of Nebraska farms had electricity as opposed to only 5.8% in 1929. The whole process of rural electrification in Nebraska started in 1936.

In the home there are numerous uses of electricity. Electric irons, dishwashers, washing machines, driers, vacuum cleaners, and lawn mowers save hours of labor. Mothers prepare meals quickly and easily with electric stoves, ovens, toasters, grills, and blenders. Refrigerators and freezers keep food fresh while fans and air conditioners cool homes in summer. Electric heat, which can provide thermostatic comfort to each room, also helps balance the peak summertime energy load caused by irrigation and air conditioners.

Today's industry could not exist without electricity. The electric motor is the basic source of motion for the many machines on our farms, in our homes and in our businesses. Flip a switch and the smoothly running electric motor goes to work immediately. It can operate for hours, days, and years without the filling of fuel tanks, cleaning of valves, grease jobs, and the usual maintenance problems that gasoline engines require. There is no smoke or smelly exhaust, and it runs so quietly that you are hardly aware of it.

On our farms, electricity lights homes and barns. Electric pumps supply water from wells. Electric milking machines are used by dairy farmers. Livestock farmers use electric fences and heaters. Electric timers are used for grain dryers, fans and automated feeding operations. The use of electricity continues to increase, due to further acceptance of many labor-saving devices.

An increasing population and ever expanding standard of living have produced an industrial growth exceeding all expectations. Industry can be located in this area because we have available a source of low-cost electricity. We are in the midst of an electric "highway" for importing and exporting blocks of electricity due to generator plants and transmission lines.

##### RURAL POWER AND ECOLOGY

(By Debra Miller)

Ecology, which has been described as "the most intelligent use of our natural resources", is an integral part of our rural electric system. Electricity makes it possible to use our resources in a multitude of ways that would be impossible without it.

To illustrate this, let us look at the example of irrigation, which depends heavily upon electricity. Without the miracle of irrigation, our dry Nebraska soil would bear only a fraction of its current harvest. In fact, this constructive use of our natural resources is perhaps the most important to those of us living in rural areas.

Irrigation, bringing vegetation to fields that were once allowed to lie fallow and unprotected because of lack of water, is also helpful in curtailing much erosion of valuable soil. That the erosion of soil is an important ecological problem to be considered, may easily be proved by looking back to the

Dust Bowl years, in the '30s. The isolation and hardships suffered by farmers during that dreadful period in history may have prompted President Roosevelt to create REA in 1935. It is valuable to note that the Rural Electrification Act, continuing the REA, was sponsored by two statesmen from the erosion-stricken Great Plains, Senator George Norris of Nebraska, and Representative Sam Rayburn of Texas.

As an aid to a more healthful atmosphere, electricity has many advantages. Since it is an extremely clean source of power, there is no air pollution, as with the previous wood and coal burning devices. Living in an area as we do, with only a low grade of coal available, and not an excess of trees, the dependence upon these inefficient fuels as sources of power not only caused a polluting influence with its annoying smoke, but was a drain upon our natural resources, as well. Today, living in a world of safe, clean, automatic electric living, it is difficult to imagine rural communities as they must have been before electricity came.

Today the generation of electricity is often in the news. The demand for electricity has become a matter of grave ecological concern. Sometimes the articles are about some of the problems of generating electricity, such as thermal pollution. Yet even now, research is being done to determine ways of leashing the heat produced, using it in a constructive way.

One very interesting idea that seems to have special interest for those in rural areas is the plan which would utilize solid animal wastes by using it as a fuel to generate power. This plan has been used in some European cities, for example, Paris, Rotterdam and Dusseldorf, where it gained approval because it used the disposal of wastes for a useful purpose, and also because it substituted wastes for the high-sulfur coal which polluted the atmosphere. Closer to us, in Chicago solid animal wastes from the stockyards (in themselves an ecological menace), have been used to generate power.

There are many ecological problems concerning the rural need for power—most of these are being carefully researched in an attempt to turn the disadvantages into advantages. Even with these faults, however, the ecological benefits that rural electrification have given us many times outweigh any disadvantages that might occur.

Electric power, in addition to the multitude of everyday uses that we are accustomed to, also aids us in our fight for ecology, in which we endeavor to use our natural resources in the most intelligent way possible.

##### RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND THE VALUE OF ELECTRICITY IN THE HOME AND ON THE FARM

(By Roxanne Wicke)

Who appreciates the value of time more than a farmer and his family? Rural electrification enables this self-employed person to effectively utilize his precious time. From the home and surrounding buildings to the far-flung fields and pastures, rural electrification conserves the energy and time a farmer so desperately needs.

Before 1935, the life of farming was strenuous and depressing. The washboard and plowshare consumed so much time that people were already migrating to cities in search of an easier life. When Franklin Delano Roosevelt signed the Executive Order creating the Rural Electrification Administration (REA) the clock of electrical progress began to tick. Since then cooperatives, the REA, and the National Rural Electrification Cooperative Association (NRECA) have been organized. These provide the farmer with devices and methods which smooth the ruts of his life.

Daily farm life begins in the home. The electric water pump and hot water heater furnish a refreshing shower. The olive green electric stove, refrigerator, freezer and the

varied appliances help the wife prepare a quick, but delicious and nutritious meal. Throughout the day the services of a dishwasher, vacuum cleaner and chromium washer and dryer free her for other family and social duties. Television sets, radios, and phonographs provide instant entertainment. Not to be forgotten are the modified electric heating and air-conditioning system and the elaborate wiring furnishing clean air and bountiful light.

Around and within the surrounding buildings electricity is widely used in many variations in eliminating the darkness, odors and uncleanness of a farm. Barns are equipped with automatic milking machines to accomplish this task sanitarily and quickly. Barn lights are helpful in bringing forth new lambs, calves and piglets. Security lamps provide the welcome sight of instant and continuous light. The brooder house is furnished with heat lamps while the shop and garage have electric drills, saws and other carpentry tools. Also automated by electricity are silos, grain elevators and other methods of feeding.

In the hidden recesses of a verdant pasture, a pump jack, unlike the wind, provides a faithful flow of clear, cool and sparkling water. Surrounding the pasture is a fence invigorated by an electric fence charger, which has a two-fold purpose. The straying of stock is prevented and also the prowling of predatory animals is hindered.

The fields of golden, rustling grain and other crops also benefit from rural electrification. Irrigation wells run by electricity produce doubled, or even tripled, outputs. Irrigation is beneficial not only in eliminating the worry of drought, but also in utilizing formerly barren land which now increases the income for the grower of crops and furnishes mankind with needed food.

These examples of electricity on the farm are only a few of the numerous time-saving aids. Many more are forthcoming from the development room of Willie Wirehand and other corporate researchers.

The benefits of rural electrification not only exist on the farm but also extend to the community, state, nation and world. The community is served by the offering of jobs, opportunities for leadership, and sponsorship of clubs and projects. Money saved from low rates is spent and invested and thus the state's and county's economies are stabilized. Also apparent throughout the United States are the numerous lakes created by dams needed for generation of electricity. These picturesque bodies of water offer fishing, boating, ice skating, swimming, or just sunbathing. Individuals benefit from reading the supply of literature. Thrillingly, the unique formation of the cooperatives preserves the democratic way of life for all mankind.

Thus, since 1935, rural electrification has made possible the innovation of machines and methods which save time for the farmer and his family. This conservation of time is applied in the home and surrounding buildings and in the pastures and fields. The cooperatives, REA, and NRECA also furnish benefits for the farmer and his world. This welcome time and these benefits demonstrate that rural electrification is essential in giving the farmer a life of fruitful work and contentment.

#### RURAL ELECTRIFICATION AND THE VALUE OF ELECTRICITY IN THE HOME AND ON THE FARM

(By Russell Gohl)

"Go Big Red", Nebraskans have cheered their football team on to be No. 1. Electricity has also become No. 1 in rural homes and farms. Each yard gained on the football field, the fumbles, the intercepted passes, and the tireless work of coaches make it possible to win each game to become No. 1 in the nation.

It was largely due to the hard work of

George W. Norris and Sam Rayburn, who introduced the REA bill in the Senate and House of Representatives, that Congress passed the bill which was signed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, May 20, 1936. Since this time the "team" has been making yardage. It has had fumbles, interceptions, and troubles, but has won each game to become first in almost every home and farm.

The many hours of planning and hard work, the cheering on of many people has brought an impact upon rural America far beyond the dreams of its early pioneers. It changed everything it touched from the time the first light was turned on. Those huge poles and miles of wire linked rural America with modern civilization.

Motor, electric tools, fans, welders, coolers, automatic feeders and waterers and the many other automated systems have made production of livestock not only easier but more profitable. Electrically equipped shops have saved many a farmer a trip to town to make a minor repair to machinery which would have normally taken several hours off his day's work. Also crop irrigation with electrically pumped water can make the difference between success and failure for many large-scale farm operations.

While electricity was becoming No. 1 in the farm yard it was also making a big play in the rural home too. With the coming of electricity, the farmer's wife switched to electric equipment and appliances as fast as family finances would permit. Today modern rural homes have every convenience of city homes. Such as, automatic washers and dryers, electric ranges, air conditioning, and electric heat.

For the generation that is growing up today, rural electrification will be an exciting challenge. Unlike their forbears, these young people will not be plodding through the mud to a one-room schoolhouse to learn how to get "lights in their homes." Instead, they will look to scientists in industry, Government and the agricultural colleges to find new and better ways of employing electric power in their homes, on their farms and in their rural businesses.

The rural America is a wonderful way of life, and although each yard gained and each game played takes constant planning, electricity will always be No. 1 for rural America.

#### RETIREE COUPLE BUDGET: FRESH EVIDENCE FOR SOCIAL SECURITY RISE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, recently the Bureau of Labor Statistics updated to autumn 1971 its three budgets for retired couples living in urban areas.

The new budgets range from \$3,319 a year at a lower level to \$7,443 at a higher level. And the intermediate budget amounts to \$4,776.

However, even these relatively modest budgets are well beyond the means of millions of older Americans.

More than 4.7 million fall below the poverty line. If the hidden poor are counted, their numbers swell to 6.3 million.

Equally significant, these updated budgets provide powerful and compelling evidence for major improvements in social security.

Today social security benefits for the typical retired couple amount to about \$2,664, or only about 56 percent of the BLS intermediate budget.

And the proposed 5-percent increase in H.R. 1 is certainly not going to help much. In fact, it will not even keep pace with the rise in the cost-of-living since

the effective date of the last social security boost.

Quite clearly, a more substantial increase is needed if our Nation is really serious about solving the deepening retirement income crisis effecting millions of older Americans.

For these reasons, I am sponsoring a 20-percent boost in social security benefits. A companion measure, H.R. 13320, has been introduced by Representative WILBUR MILLS, the chairman of the House Committee on Ways and Means.

For the typical retired worker, my proposal would increase monthly social security benefits from \$133 to \$162. For the average elderly couple, monthly payments would rise from \$222 to \$269.

On the other hand, H.R. 1 would raise benefits to \$141 for the retired single worker and to \$234 for the aged couple.

In terms of dollars and cents, a 20-percent increase would provide a single retired worker \$250 a year more than under H.R. 1. And for an elderly couple, this would mean an additional \$420 in badly needed income to pay for rising property taxes, food costs, medical care, and other expenditures.

Equally significant—and I want to stress this point—this proposal would in no way jeopardize the soundness of the social security trust funds.

Actuarial assumptions recommended by the prestigious 1971 Social Security Advisory Council indicate that it would be possible to finance this increase with a modest rise in the payroll tax and still maintain the overall integrity of the trust funds. In fact, the proposed tax rates under this measure will be lower over a longer period of time throughout this century than under H.R. 1.

As of this date, I am pleased to report that 60 Members of the Senate have joined me in sponsoring this proposal. Four others have also indicated that they will vote for this measure—making a total of 64 Members of the Senate who support a 20-percent increase.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the names of the cosponsors of my proposal—Amendment No. 999—be listed in the RECORD.

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

#### COSPONSORS OF AMENDMENT NO. 999

Frank Church, Harrison A. Williams, Walter F. Mondale, Vance Hartke, Claiborne Pell, Thomas F. Eagleton, Edward M. Kennedy, John V. Tunney, Philip A. Hart, Harold E. Hughes, Hubert H. Humphrey, Mike Mansfield, George McGovern, Birch Bayh, Henry M. Jackson, Warren G. Magnuson, John Tower, Charles H. Percy, Howard H. Baker, B. Everett Jordan.

Frank E. Moss, Alan Cranston, Robert C. Byrd, Thomas J. McIntyre, Adlai E. Stevenson, Joseph M. Montoya, John O. Pastore, Fred R. Harris, Gale W. McGee, Howard W. Cannon, Mike Gravel, Lee Metcalf, Daniel K. Inouye, Ernest F. Hollings, Alan Bible, Edmund S. Muskie, David H. Gambrell, Quentin N. Burdick, Gordon Allott, James B. Allen.

Mark O. Hatfield, Edward W. Brooke, Gaylord Nelson, Clifford P. Case, Jennings Randolph, Bob Packwood, John Sparkman, John L. McClellan, Margaret Chase Smith, J. Caleb Boggs, Abraham Ribicoff, Jacob K. Javits, James O. Eastland, Richard S. Schweiker, Strom Thurmond, Charles Mathias, James B.



Pearson, William Proxmire, Lawton Chiles, Ted Stevens, Edward Gurney.

### THE ADMINISTRATION'S URBAN GROWTH REPORT

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, the President has recently submitted to Congress its first report on urban growth as mandated by title VII of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970. I do not think it unfair to say that the report has met mostly with unfavorable reviews.

Much of the criticism appears justifiable. I am particularly concerned that the report ignores the clearly expressed will of Congress. Title VII declares that there shall be a national urban growth policy and directs the President to make recommendations in his urban growth report for programs and policies to develop and carry out such a policy. Instead, the report questions the advisability of a comprehensive national urban growth policy and presents recommendations which are no more than a listing of President Nixon's legislative program for the previous year: general and special revenue sharing, Government reorganization, welfare reform, and so forth. Surely this listing does not constitute a coordinated national urban growth policy.

The American Institute of Planners, an organization which has long recognized the importance of structuring a coherent growth policy for our urban areas, has taken a position on the administration's report based on a thoughtful critique. I ask unanimous consent that the critique be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### POSITION STATEMENT

The Board of Governors of the American Institute of Planners endorses the concept mandated by Congress of accountability by the Executive Branch for the continuing formulation and implementation of urban growth policies. Reports issued by the Executive Branch must show evidence of positive leadership in the defining of unified comprehensive policy.

Unfortunately, the President's first official response to the Congressional mandate, his *Report on National Growth 1972*, rejects a concern with the urban dimension in favor of excessive concern for rural growth; rejects a philosophy of planning in favor of an executive approach; and, in the opinion of this Board, fails to be responsive to the Congressional mandate.

*Report on National Growth 1972* is no more than a survey of problems and a commitment to two obvious goals of growth policy: first, to the idea of "balance" between the nation's urban and rural environments; and second, to the idea of "orderly" correction of existing problems. The *Report*, however, fails to examine the implications of the giving up of federal categorical programs in favor of state-local priorities and procedures, fails to explain how affirmative federal policies will be made to work, fails to state what resources will be made available and whether such resources will be adequate for the stated purposes, and fails to establish mechanisms by which the citizens of the United States can become involved in the process.

The *Report* shows the Administration's confusing approach to the process within the Executive Branch. As one example, it

seems to us that land use controls under recent and proposed federal legislation should be included in the group of activities recommended for the proposed Department of Community Development rather than put under a Department of Natural Resources. Moreover, we are concerned that the resources for any federal program be matched with the locus of authority, as is manifestly not the case with the maintenance of the Highway Trust Fund beyond the reach of the proposed Department of Community Development.

The *Report* contains a number of contradictory assertions and assumptions about the federal role vis-a-vis the states and the private sector, an example being the Administration's abandonment of responsibility by advocating revenue sharing without sanctions, combined with its willingness to abandon existing programs addressing themselves to city and urban problems in favor of a vague hope that the states will turn to planning at the metropolitan level. We believe the federal government has a responsibility to implement its policies in a direct rather than an indirect fashion in accordance with the recommendations below.

Lastly, we view with great concern the *Report's* summary of Administration attitudes concerning the process of planning in a democratic society. We criticize especially its claim that not "even a single coordinated set of policies can remedy or even significantly ameliorate all of our ills" and its drastic misuse of the term "planning" as an activity only to be supported within the office of an elected official, as part of the administrative and budgetary process. We do believe that a set of coordinated policies is both feasible and necessary and can be produced with due regard for the democratic process.

In light of the foregoing, and taking into account the considerations presented in the critique of the President's *Report* (also published here) the Board of Governors of the American Institute of Planners:

1. Urges that National Growth Policy (or National Urban Growth Policy as mandated by Congress) address, purposefully and in a coordinated manner, the following basic and interrelated issues:

- (a) settlement patterns, including the quality and efficiency of settlement;
- (b) human opportunity and welfare;
- (c) capacity and fiscal vitality of government;
- (d) quality of environment and management of natural resources.

2. Affirms that equity in the formulation and application of National Growth Policy requires the participation of all segments of society in that effort and the allocation of adequate resources consistent with policy direction and priorities, both of which are necessary to assure access in the definition of policy and effective utilization of resources in the disposition of the issues involved.

3. Reaffirms that planning can and should make an essential contribution to defining appropriate roles for all levels of government and private institutions in the formulation and implementation of unified policies that will reflect and respond to the considerations enumerated above with full respect for diversity and pluralism.

The Board of Governors further recognizes and deplores a condition when no policy becomes the policy and fosters the fragmented deliberations now proceeding, prolonging the long history of unrelated or conflicting programs, projects and actions which have led to the present national condition. Congress has mandated a National Growth Policy to deal with this condition. The expression of the recommendations herewith adopted are vital to the successful fulfillment of that mandate.

Following is a detailed critique of the *Report on Urban Growth 1972* prepared for

the Task Force by its member Alan Rabowitz and submitted to the AIP Board as a support document to the above policy statement. This critique attempts to provide the AIP membership with an evaluation of how the simplistic statements in the *Report* fit into the context of urban growth policy as it might and should be defined. This critique is not adopted Board policy, and additional comments on the report are welcome. Copies of *Report on National Growth 1972* are available from the Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, for 45¢ each. Ask for publication number 1770-0156.

#### NATURE OF THE PRESIDENT'S REPORT

For many years, thoughtful analysts of the nation's urban programs have been documenting the extent to which various federal activities either complemented or vitiated the efforts of other parts of the federal establishment and of public and private agencies involved in planning and implementation at the local level. In recent years, the demand for cohesion in policy-making at the federal level has increased, and both the executive and legislative branches have broadened the scope of their efforts to obtain comprehensive, balanced, policies concerning housing, land use, transportation, economic development, pollution control and other components of urban and rural life. Much of the intellectual leadership for this movement has come from the U.S. Advisory Commission for Intergovernmental Relations and related committees in the Congress.

In the Urban Growth and New Community Act of 1970, Congress declared it in the national interest to: . . . provide for the development of a national urban growth policy and to encourage the rational, orderly, efficient, and economic growth, development, and redevelopment of our States, metropolitan areas, cities, counties, towns and communities in predominantly rural areas which demonstrate a special potential for accelerated growth; to encourage the prudent use or conservation of our natural resources; to encourage and support development which will assure our communities of adequate tax bases, community services, job opportunities of adequate tax bases, community services, job opportunities, and well-balanced neighborhoods in socially, economically, and physically attractive environments.

The President was instructed to use the powers of his office to collect, analyze, and evaluate information about urban problems and programs and make a biennial report, with recommendations, to the Congress, with the first such report due in February 1972.

#### THE ADMINISTRATION'S RESPONSE

Accordingly, The Domestic Council produced for the President for transmission to Congress the *Report on National Growth 1972*, a 74-page pamphlet that is an explicit and systematic avoidance of the Congressional mandate for evaluation of new and existing policies.

The introduction indicates the key sentiments that control the Nixon Administration's thinking. Congress' mandate for a report on national urban growth policy is rejected as "too narrow," and the focus is shifted away from "the urban crisis" to the need for restoring balance between the nation's rural and urban populations, primarily in the context of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. In addition, after finding that "the longstanding issues concerning the growth of our nation are much too complex to be resolved in any dogmatic fashion," the President defines his responsibility to "assist in the development of" rather than "enunciate" a master plan or a single comprehensive national growth policy and declares that—

"No single policy, nor even a single coordinated set of policies, can remedy or even significantly ameliorate all of our ills.

As our problems are many and varied and changing, so our solutions must be multiple and diversified and flexible."

The structure of the *Report* itself then follows the chapter headings provided by Congress. In the next section, these chapters are analyzed in that same order.

#### A CRITIQUE OF THE SUBSTANTIVE IDEAS

##### Chapter 1—Population growth and distribution

To "understand the forces that are shaping the communities in which we live and work," the *Report* devotes its first chapter to a standard description of population trends from 1790 to 1970.

The text covers demographic trends, immigration, the westward movement, the migration of blacks from the South, the impact of technology on agriculture and the migration from rural to urban areas, the growth of metropolitan areas, and the changing racial and economic composition of central city and suburban populations.

No attempt is made to analyze the impact of such forces as the relation between higher personal incomes and changing family characteristics, the impact of the automobile and other technologies on the location of industry and housing, the role of the Federal Housing Administration in suburbanization, or the nature of other national policies that might have shaped these population trends. The Domestic Council, however, does conclude that "for some time our urban areas have been spreading out faster than population growth alone would justify."

##### Chapter 2—The challenge of balanced and orderly growth

To "articulate some of the challenges that must be confronted as the Nation responds to the challenges of growth," the *Report* notes that growth has been characterized by rapid economic expansion and greater mobility for automobile owners but has been accompanied by some problems. The Administration looks for policies to insure that future growth is both "orderly," meaning correction of existing problems, and "balanced" between rural and urban growth.

The problems seen associated with past growth include the depopulation of rural areas and small towns, the hard times befalling central cities, the concentration of the poor and the black in the inner city, environmental damage and traffic congestion, and the rising cost of land in housing.

The challenge specified in the *Report* is limited to a federal responsibility to assure balanced and orderly growth, and the reader is left to supply his own reasons therefor, for the *Report* does not discuss the Administration's objectives in terms of welfare economics, economic efficiency, the distribution of wealth, or social equity.

The Domestic Council does, however, advance some further ideas concerning the obstacles in formulating a single comprehensive strategy to deal with the forces of growth, citing an unpublished study about the difficulty of getting agreement about the causes, externalities, and interdependence of problems. Two aspects of our national culture are basic in their thinking: first, a high value set upon freedom in the private sector and democratic choice in the public; and, second, an appreciation of the sharing of powers with the states in the governing of a country of vast size and diversity. The Domestic Council does not feel it is feasible for the highest level of government to design policies for development that can operate successfully in all parts of the nation. It does believe, however, that a useful distinction can be made between national responsibility for such items as fiscal and monetary policy and the solution of water and pollution problems and local responsibility for such problems as street lighting.

##### Chapter 3—Recent State and local actions to influence growth

To "identify major actions of the federal government undertaken to deal with the problems of growth," the *Report* describes in considerable detail a familiar list of state-level activities: establishing the nature and financing of local governments, creating departments of urban affairs, housing finance agencies and urban development corporations, beginning to be concerned with environmental and land use controls, encouraging new communities and other housing programs, creating planning and development districts, and reviewing the organization and financing of local governments, transportation agencies, and education departments.

The federal role envisaged by the Domestic Council is described in a number of ways. The assertion is made that "the nature of growth in America in the years ahead will depend primarily upon the scope and nature of actions taken by state and local governments and upon the countless decisions made by tens of thousands of individuals and business enterprises, large and small;" and rarely is it suggested that a national growth policy should tell the states what to do. The use of federal grants as both carrots and sticks is barely mentioned, except in reference to the implementation of the requirements of Circular A-95 under the Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968.

While the *Report* sees state policies as "the basic building blocks of national policy," there is no suggestion of how the federal government might deal with a state that did not wish to be a building block and did not address itself to the problems of its local governments. A somewhat more direct federal role is seen in connection with problems involving the cooperation of several states, but such agencies as Appalachian and river basin commissions are seen primarily as "devices for rationalizing federal investments in a region rather than full-scale federal-state cooperative ventures." One may infer that the introduction of revenue sharing would diminish further the federal role deemed appropriate by the present Administration.

##### Chapter 4—Administration actions to deal with the challenges of growth

This chapter is a short review of past involvements, covering the New Deal days, the passage of housing and full-employment legislation, and, under President Eisenhower, the beginnings of the urban renewal and interstate highway programs, and of current initiatives by the Nixon Administration. In the catalogue of recent activities are found the attempts to reorganize and decentralize the federal establishment and to improve interagency cooperation (especially in transportation planning), to develop programs related to rural areas, mass transportation, environmental protection, housing and new communities, to install "planned variation" procedures in the Model Cities program and "annual arrangements" in the housing programs, and to encourage widespread reform of the property tax and systems of school finance.

The *Report* declares that "the need to make federal programs more responsive to the people and their locally elected officials, both in terms of the goals they seek to achieve and the way they deliver federal assistance," is "an extremely important feature of the President's policy toward growth." There is, however, no discussion of how the enumerated activities by the Administration relate to the Administration's decisions in fiscal and monetary policy and to programs in other departments of the federal establishment, nor is there any evaluation as requested by Congress of the effectiveness of federal efforts to carry out the national urban growth policy.

##### Chapter 5—Administration recommendations to the Congress

The *Report* ends with a call for speedy passage of Administration legislative proposals for government reorganization, revenue sharing, expanded rural credits, planning and management assistance, a national land use policy, a powerplant siting act, a tax policy to conserve coastal wetlands and historic buildings and welfare reforms.

The Domestic Council begins this chapter by minimizing the influence that the federal government can have on local governmental and private decisions and by expressing its determination to get rid of "planner's blight," the consequence of a plethora of federal categorical programs. Where the Administration might have concluded that the solution might lie in better formulation and consolidation of categorical programs in wiser administration of them at higher levels of interagency cooperation, and in better planning at the state-local level, it has chosen instead to ask for a limited form of governmental reorganization and for a giving up of responsibility through revenue sharing.

Planners should note that the proposed Department of Community Development will merge the Department of Housing and Urban Development with Agriculture's Farmers Home Administration and Rural Electrification Administration, Commerce's Economic Development Administration, Transportation's Federal Highway Program and Urban Mass Transportation Program, and OEO's Community Action Program. Unfortunately, the proposal for special revenue sharing in the transportation field does not include the monies in the Highway Trust Fund.

Reliance upon passage of federal revenue sharing is a key aspect of the Administration's program, allowing the Domestic Council to pass on to the states the full responsibility of spending the proceeds, to avoid addressing the questions of the adequacy of state tax efforts and the equitable distribution of funds among state and local agencies and to sidestep the issue of the adequacy of budgeted federal funds to compensate for neglect of domestic needs over the past few years of inflation and high military outlays.

The legislative package proposed by the Administration contains some curious inconsistencies. One example is the request for a new categorical program for rural credit to be administered by the Department of Agriculture while urban categorical programs are being phased out. Another example is the intention to employ sanctions on states under the national land use policy (concerning shorelands, scenic and historic districts, airports, highway interchanges, and parks) while specifically refraining from sanctions in the fields of community development, governmental reorganization, and education. Still another is the Administration's willingness to impose a long-range planning requirement on the nation's electric utilities (concerning powerplant sitings) but not on other private corporations instinct with a public interest.

The Administration's concern for the planning and management function at the state and local level extends to information processors and budgeteers for certain types of elected officials but does not seem to extend to the needs of either legislators and their committees or planning agencies working directly with citizens and businessmen on the many forms of community planning.

#### QUESTIONS FOR FUTURE REPORTS

##### Policies for Resource Allocation

One of the major deficiencies of this first report is not only its avoidance of the idea of a national urban growth policy in favor of a more general concept of urban-rural balance, but its omission of an evaluation of those policies now being administered at the federal level. At issue is any Administration's willingness to analyze the nature and



scope of federal allocations of its resources. Certain questions need to be asked in the next report along these lines; a few examples follow:

(a) How does fiscal policy fit into the national urban growth policy? Should tax credits be used instead of revenue sharing? Would a negative income tax be better than housing supplements?

(b) What are the costs and benefits from programs for urban and rural development. How should the federal government (Congress and the executive) decide to spend a dollar in rural areas instead of a dollar in urban areas? Is a dollar for highway building more or less justified than a dollar for housing?

(c) How does monetary policy fit in? Should federal funds for the state-local sector be cut back in times of inflation and increased in times of recession?

(d) Are the nation's resources being properly allocated between the public and private sectors? Should the nation increase the share of the national income going into education, manpower development, social welfare, community development, and environmental programs? Should federal resources be used to compensate for lack of responsibility on the part of private firms, state and local governments, and individual citizens?

(e) What timetables should be built into a national urban growth policy?

#### PUTTING THE FEDERAL HOUSE IN ORDER

Another set of questions need to be framed and answered in future reports. All of them have to do with the way in which the mechanisms for planning, programming, and budgeting are performed within the federal establishment and among federal agencies and other public and private agencies.

(a) To what extent are Congress and the Administration working together in the context of a national urban growth policy?

(b) What are current problems in obtaining cooperation between federal agencies at both departmental and regional levels and in reconciling decisions of regulatory bodies (such as the Interstate Commerce Commission) with the departmental programs affecting national urban growth (including, for example, distribution of contracts by the Department of Defense)?

(c) What are the problems in using the Office of Management and Budget, the Domestic Council, and the other Executive Office bodies (such as the Council on Environmental Quality) as moderators of national comprehensive policies? What are their relations with such useful agencies as the U.S. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations?

(d) What are the current problems in administering federal programs, for example, of assuring that housing funds produce good housing rather than speculative profits and unsound structures?

#### CONFRONTING THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL ISSUES

Given the nature of the partnership between the federal government and the states, who bear the Constitutional responsibility for establishing local governments, a national urban growth policy requires that certain federal funds be disbursed by the States. A wise man will inquire about the stewardship of his partners, and it is incumbent upon the federal government to evaluate each state's progress in supporting the objectives of national policy. The next National Urban Growth Report, therefore, should contain an evaluation, state by state, of the extent to which funds have been made available to local communities, the extent of reorganization of state fiscal and administrative systems, and the extent to which state and local agencies are planning together for the amelioration of social-economic-and-physical problems in both metropolitan and rural areas. An important part of the evaluation should be a consideration of the relative

merit of categorical and revenue-sharing programs.

#### THE ROLE OF PLANNING IN THE REPORT

The words "planning" and "planners" are given a rather special meaning in National Growth Policy 1972, as the examples below indicate:

The Administration will not rely upon "some master plan for directing the multitude of public and private decisions," but "our plans for national growth must rather seek to help individual Americans develop their unique potentials and achieve their personal goals." However, some states provide planning and technical assistance to local units of government; the New York State Urban Development Corporation is authorized to initiate the planning and construction of needed public facilities; California recently adopted the preliminary plan of the Tahoe regional planning agency; the American Law Institute is preparing a model land development code that would involve State agencies in planning and controlling the use of land; California has provided for planning and land assembly by redevelopment agencies in support of new communities; states have been establishing planning and development districts whose principal responsibilities are comprehensive and functional planning, coordination of planning done by units of local government and other organizations within the area, technical assistance to local governments in planning and administration, and review and coordination of certain federally assisted projects; the Appalachian Regional Commission is involved in "a comprehensive developmental planning process rising up from the grassroots," the Metropolitan Council of Minneapolis-St. Paul performs planning and other coordination service functions; the "A-95" review process covers federal grants for highway and airport planning, among other programs, and is designed to assure that major federal programs in a given jurisdiction are consistent with and will not disrupt well-considered development plans for the area; the National Resources Board and its two successors represented a unique attempt at national planning before the effort was terminated in 1943; the "planned variation" approach will broaden the citywide Model Cities program into a truly comprehensive method for the city's chief executive to use in approaching the community development problems of the city; the "annual arrangements" approach seeks to demonstrate that, given a realistic forecast of Federal funding, communities will plan for community development in an effective manner; "planner's blight," often a feature of urban renewal, provides a good example of the kind of unanticipated and undesirable consequences that can result from well-intentioned federal [categorical] programs; Urban Community Development revenue sharing would enable communities to plan and implement longer term programs dealing with growth and development; one important element in the proper planning of new urban development is the protection of natural and historic values; and:

Planning and Management Assistance: Money is not the only resource needed to meet the challenges of growth. Effective governmental institutions staffed with capable officials are needed to put this money to effective use. The President, therefore, has proposed a new planning and management program designed to help state and local elected officials manage their resources to achieve local—as well as certain national—objectives. This program significantly complements all the revenue sharing initiatives of this Administration. Planning and management assistance would strengthen the ability of state and local governments to make decisions and to implement those decisions successfully. It would also provide new opportunities for elected chief execu-

tives at all levels of government to improve management and evaluation techniques. And it would enable states to coordinate all aspects of urban and rural development.

The planning and management proposal would offer financial assistance, without any matching requirement, to governors, mayors, and country executives to aid them in further developing their executive management capabilities. Examples of the activities that would be assisted include the development of better budgetary procedures, administrative reorganization programs, modern information systems, improved personnel recruiting techniques, and other activities that will help state and local officials better handle their executive responsibilities.

While the members of AIP assume that planners are involved with policy determination and direct participation in dealing with the economic, fiscal, political, social, physical, environmental, and administrative issues at all levels of the public and private sectors, the scope of planning in the President's Report is more limited. Planning appears there as a managerial function encouraged by the federal government primarily for state and region agencies, as a method of carrying out projects such as airports, and as an activity that suffers if there are too many variables (as in "planner's blight").

The field of "planning" is sure to suffer from this interpretation, and vigorous efforts by those who prefer a broader context will be required to provide support for contemporary planners. Without such support, how will planners be able to work on problems of community participation and community organization, on problems requiring research and analysis of social, economic, and environmental conditions, on the questions of powers and resources involving decentralization of public functions simultaneously with rationalization of public services on an areawide basis, on the problem of bringing an understanding of local problems into state legislatures and agencies and of state problems into Congress and the federal agencies, and on the problem of improving instruction on urban affairs in colleges and universities?

In short, America's planners must be part of the Administration's planning and management scene, encouraging proper use of information systems and computer models as tools of administration, but diligent in their efforts to make government at all levels (local, state, and federal) and all branches (legislative, judicial, as well as executive) sensitive to the subtle combination of political, psychological and technological forces that make planning an art as well as one of the policy sciences.

#### CANCELED CAREERS FOR OLDER FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, one of our most serious problems today is the unacceptably high level of unemployment.

Approximately 5 million Americans have lost their jobs. Millions more are underemployed. There is also a substantial amount of hidden unemployment, particularly among older workers who have "dropped out" of the work force after prolonged periods of fruitless searching for a job.

Yet, the Federal Government, which ought to be a model employer, may actually be contributing to our painful unemployment problem.

The number of involuntary early retirements has soared during the past 3 years. Early retirements for fiscal 1971 were 2½ times as great as in 1970 and six

times the level in 1969. For the current fiscal year, these revealing statistics are similar to the monthly averages for 1971.

These disturbing findings were recently presented to the Committee on Aging in an exploratory report prepared by Elizabeth M. Heidbreder, an economist for the National Council on the Aging.

This report provides striking evidence of the injustice and harsh economic impact of the present involuntary retirement policies on middle-aged and older Federal employees.

Many now find themselves in impossible situations. They are usually the first to be fired, but the last to be hired. Their Federal pensions are often insufficient to meet their financial responsibilities.

A few days ago the three daily newspapers in the District of Columbia gave extensive coverage to this report and the impact of a canceled career for an older Federal employee and his family.

Mr. President, I commend these articles—by John Cramer of the Washington Daily News, Joseph Young of the Evening Star, and Mike Causey of the Washington Post—to the Members of the Senate, and ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Daily News,  
May 26, 1972]

#### REPORT FLAYS PRESSURE TO RETIRE EARLY (By John Cramer)

A new report to the Senate's Special Committee on Aging charges that government lay-off policies produce large injustices and "cancelled careers" for many older federal employees.

It especially criticizes:

Government policy of encouraging—and pressuring—middle-age workers to retire early.

Questionable administration of reduction-in-force rules, with Civil Service Commission acquiescence, to nullify the protections supposedly provided by veterans preference and seniority—and thereby give agencies freedom to handpick older workers for layoff.

The report, prepared by an economist for the National Council on the Aging, is certain to spur the growing clamor against the way CSC administers the rules.

It prompted Committee Chairman Frank Church, D-Ida. and Sens. Jennings Randolph, D-W. Va., and Walter F. Mondale, D-Minn., to say in a preface:

"Even the early retirement and second careers may often be desirable, employees should be free to decide if they wish to retire early.

"Unfortunately, there is very disturbing evidence to suggest that the federal government—which it seems clear, ought to be a model employer—may be a leading offender in applying pressure tactics to coerce older employees to retire early.

"We are mindful that a system which provides overly protected job tenure can lead to one extreme: bureaucratic entrenchment. This, of course, is not only inefficient but also unresponsive to the needs of its citizens.

"But if management in government is allowed to take arbitrary actions which, in effect, cause 'cancelled careers,' it may pose a serious threat to well-trained and conscientious employees—and to the entire civil service system.

"Such capricious action can only cause our nation to lose some of our most experienced, dedicated and knowledgeable personnel in government. Even more fundamental, it can only serve to undermine the deep and per-

sonal commitment which many career civil servants have towards their jobs."

#### 'SCAPEGOAT CLASS'

Older workers, the Senators said, rapidly are becoming a "scapegoat class" in the federal service.

By law, employees personally caught in lay-offs are entitled to retire on immediate annuities (reduced 2 per cent for each year they're under 55) if they have 20 years of service and are at least 50, or if they have 25 years regardless of age.

By regulation, almost certainly illegal, CSC has given agencies in layoff situations the right to "request"—but not require—the retirement of those who meet these age-service standards.

By widely accepted custom, the "requests" become a form of pressure to retire.

#### RETIREMENTS SOAR

The report said this caused 1971 early retirements to soar 250 per cent over 1970 and 600 per cent over 1969. And for most of the early retirees, it said, annuity income was less than half of salary—as against a maximum of 80 per cent for those permitted to work full careers.

It said:

"The effect on middle-aged employees who must decide before a RIF whether or not to retire early is to present them with an important career decision before knowing what will happen in the impending RIF and often before they have time to seriously consider retirement.

"While some may welcome the opportunity to retire early, others may find it difficult to start a second career or to live on a reduced income."

But even if they resist early retirement, the report said, older workers find themselves vulnerable to layoff because of CSC's interpretation of layoff rules.

#### DUCKING THE LAW

By law, employees doing like work are supposed to be assigned to the same competitive level—and, within any level, veterans and senior non-veterans are supposed to be the last to be laid off.

Agencies get around this by declaring like jobs unlike . . . doing their damndest to put each employee in a level all by himself.

The Space Agency, as reported here before, recently achieved the absolute ultimate: At Kennedy Space Center, it assigned 46 GS-6 secretaries to 46 individual levels, thereby rendering seniority and preference 100 per cent meaningless.

The report recommended:

"The General Accounting Office or a similar independent agency should evaluate the present regulations and practices concerning competitive areas in RIFs in order to determine if employee rights are being infringed upon."

[From the Washington Star, May 26, 1972]

#### THE FEDERAL SPOTLIGHT: INVOLUNTARY RETIREMENT

(By Joseph Young)

The number of "involuntary" early retirements among federal employees has increased sixfold since 1969, according to a report issued by the Senate Special Committee on Aging.

The report declared that not only employees over 60, but many in their fifties and even late forties are being pressured by their agencies to retire as a result of Nixon administration policies to cut jobs and grades. This often results in cutting their income by more than half at a time when their financial responsibilities are the greatest.

It also said that employees in government over age 45 or even 35 are often denied the opportunity of training and thus are placed at a disadvantage with younger employees in competing for better positions.

"Involuntary" retirement in government were 2½ times greater in 1971 than in 1970, and six times that of the total in 1969. So far, figures for 1972 are similar to the 1971 monthly averages.

The increases occurred as a result of Civil Service Commission rules which allow agencies facing a reduction-in-force to request voluntary resignation of eligible employees before the cutbacks take place. Under this type of arrangement, employees may retire at age 50 with 20 years service or at any age with 25 years service.

The report was prepared for the Senate committee by Elizabeth J. Heidbreder, economist and research associate with the Institute of Industrial Gerontology, National Council on the Aging.

The report recommended immediate steps to forestall continued emphasis on early retirement as a primary tool to reduce the federal work force, including having appropriate congressional committees investigate the power given agencies by the CSC to use the "involuntary" retirement provisions to pressure workers to retire.

It also called for a General Accounting Office study to see if employees' rights are being infringed upon in such cases and also a study on the impact of such retirements on the federal service.

In addition, the report proposed that the provision of the Middle-Aged and Older Workers Employment Act which offers special services to persons caught in mass layoffs be extended to federal workers. Also, federally assisted training programs should be extended to training programs within the federal civil service, the report stated.

Accompanying the report was a statement by Sens. Frank Church, D-Idaho, the committee chairman; Jennings Randolph, D-W. Va., chairman of the subcommittee on employment and retirement income; and Walter Mondale, D-Minn., chairman of the subcommittee on retirement and the individual.

Their statement said the committee has sought in the past to encourage the federal government to serve as a model employer. "But now, fundamental questions are being raised about its determination to act as a model employer, especially when pressures to economize continue to intensify. . . . Perhaps even more fundamental, existing federal employment and retirement practices may lead to the creation of a 'scapegoat class' in the civil service."

The senators said "such capricious actions can only cause our nation to lose some of our most experienced, dedicated and knowledgeable personnel in government."

[From the Washington Post, May 26, 1972]

#### THE FEDERAL DIARY: BIAS AGAINST OVER-40 WORKERS NOTED

(By Mike Causey)

The government discriminates against older people in hiring, training, promotion and even firing and the federal definition of "old" people apparently is getting younger all the time.

Those are the conclusions of the Senate's Special Committee on Aging whose members say they are shocked at the adverse impact recent federal economy moves have had on the 40 plus set. The Committee is chaired by Sen. Frank Church (D-Idaho), where youthful appearance is offset only by his dependence on bifocals.

A special report due today, called "Cancelled Careers," discusses the growing trend of federal agencies to depend on older workers to retire before they are ready as a way of reducing average grade levels and save jobs for younger people in the system.

Backbone of the report is a special study on recent federal layoff policies as they apply to middle-aged workers. It was prepared by Elizabeth M. Heidbreder, an economist with the National Council on the Aging.



She says that widespread reports of pressure on older workers indicate that although the government "has a policy of nondiscrimination toward older workers, and enforces the Aging Discrimination Act which covers private industry, it may be guilty of letting the aged factor by itself influence personnel decisions when employee cuts must be made."

What she and the Committee are talking about are letters of encouragement from federal agencies telling employees they should retire for the good of the service, and the stepped up use of involuntary retirements. Under that system, the government can push a worker out before normal age and service time for retirement are met and the worker's pension is then reduced because he or she quit early.

The Senate report mentions practices in a dozen agencies, but singles out the Defense Department for setting "minimum age" requirements for attendance at blue-ribbon training sessions that usually lead to promotions.

It says that the National War College, Army War College and Industrial College of the Armed Forces limit students to age 45; and Princeton's mid-career federal program to age 40, "however, an applicant at GS 15 in his early 40s may be considered, in unusual circumstances."

Some top Defense training programs, the report says, are limited to students with top ages of 37, and it concludes that since Defense represents over half the civilian government, such age discrimination is "probably fairly typical" of other federal training programs.

The Committee proposed that government agencies reexamine their official and unofficial policies toward older workers during layoff and cutback situations, and that Congress and the General Accounting Office make continual reviews of agency practices.

#### CADET COLONEL FREDERICK H. OELSCHIG, SAVANNAH, GA., MOST OUTSTANDING ARMY ROTC CADET IN NATION

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I am pleased to invite the attention of the Senate to the fact that Cadet Colonel Frederick H. Oelschig of Savannah, Ga., has been selected the most outstanding Army ROTC cadet in the Nation.

Selection of the most outstanding cadet is made on the basis of leadership potential, advanced camp performance, ROTC grade and participation in ROTC activities and sports, qualities of discipline, courtesy, personality, and character, and excellence in academic grades.

Mr. Oelschig excels in each of these areas. He is currently cadet colonel and brigade commander at the University of Georgia. A senior agriculture major with a 4.0 average out of a possible 4.0, Cadet Colonel Oelschig is first in his class of 800 students. He has received many honors, including the American Legion Scholastic Excellence Award, Sons of the American Revolution Award, and is a member of Blue Key honorary society. Other activities include the Horticultural Club at the University of Georgia, as well as being president of the Southern Region Branch of the American Society for Horticultural Science. He also has received six different scholarships, which attests to his outstanding scholarship leadership.

I had the privilege of having lunch with this outstanding young man when he was recently in Washington. At that

time, the Department of the Army Commendation was presented to him by General Westmoreland in a special ceremony at the Pentagon.

The State of Georgia is indeed proud of Cadet Colonel Oelschig's achievements, and honored at the credit he has brought to himself, his family, his State, and his country. This is indeed one of the highest honors a young man can receive in this country and we laud him for his spirit and determination.

#### THE IMPERFECT CIRCLE OF NIXON-KISSINGER

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, while Nixon-Kissinger diplomacy toward China and Russia deserves plaudits, the most serious and damaging diplomatic problem facing the United States remains unsolved—ending America's part in the Indochina war.

Anthony Lewis, of the New York Times, recently visited Hanoi to see the war from that angle, and came back to write:

That the North Vietnamese will accept total destruction of the works of man in this country if that is the price of the war.

But the United States appears to believe we can bomb the North Vietnamese into submission. Mr. Lewis warns:

If American bombers turn Hanoi into rubble, as they can, Americans will be the victims as well; their children will have to live with it. And that suggests that the whole Kissinger vision may be wrong: Vietnam is not a bump on an otherwise perfect circle. It is the issue on which the United States will be judged, by the world and by itself.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Anthony Lewis' article of June 5, entitled "The Imperfect Circle," be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### THE IMPERFECT CIRCLE (By Anthony Lewis)

LONDON, June 4.—The success of the Moscow summit is a particular triumph for Henry Kissinger's world view. He has argued that great powers can balance their mutual interests on a planetary scale, transcending local or ideological differences. In Moscow, as in Peking, President Nixon boldly followed that approach.

The question that remains is how the global vision can solve the little local difficulty of Vietnam. Mr. Kissinger would doubtless accept that it is not begrudging the triumph of Moscow for those concerned about Vietnam to ask.

In the Kissinger view, American policy—Presidential policy—should be a circle in which all elements fit together. Bangladesh, the Middle East: Everything must be related to the effort to create a structure of great power accommodation. In those terms Vietnam is an annoyance. It is "one small country," as Mr. Kissinger recently called North Vietnam in evident frustration, that will not fit the pattern. It is a bump on an otherwise perfect circle.

American policy is to squeeze that bump, to make it conform. The evident fear is that to compromise our political objectives in South Vietnam in any meaningful way would weaken our power and credibility everywhere: would threaten the entire circle.

That is the theory underlying the tremendous increase in American firepower applied to Vietnam in the last two months: The intensified bombing of the North, the new

shelling from ships offshore, the approval of new strategic targets, the mining of harbors. And the prospect is for more escalation: more B-52's, more ships, a new air base in Thailand.

One who has just been in North Vietnam would never underestimate the destructive force of those bombs and shells. American bombing has clearly wounded the transportation system and made life more difficult. It has also destroyed many civilian facilities—schools and homes and hospitals—and taken many lives.

The utilitarian question is whether the destruction will work politically: Will it make the North Vietnamese negotiate on American terms in Paris, as Mr. Kissinger has long hoped?

When I tried to explore that question in Hanoi, several persons referred to the testament of Ho Chi Minh, written a few months before his death in 1969. It includes a two-line verse;

Our mountains will always be,  
our rivers will always be,  
our people will always be;  
The American invaders defeated,  
we will rebuild our land ten  
times more beautiful.

The implication is that the North Vietnamese will accept total destruction of the works of man in their country if that is the price of the war. It is a difficult thought to believe in its fanaticism, but there it is.

If in fact the present level of American air and naval activity does not make them come to terms, what follows? In Hanoi, many foreigners thought the logic of American policy was to go on up the path of escalation, hoping that each step would at last bring political results. Some thought the next logical step would be the destruction of Hanoi.

There is no real sign now of any internal check to such a policy. Protest in America is at a low level. People are weary, without hope. Congress is ineffectual. Few seem to care how many Vietnamese are killed in order to make the circle perfect.

But history will care. If American bombers turn Hanoi into rubble, as they can, Americans will be the victims as well; their children will have to live with it. And that suggests that the whole Kissinger vision may be wrong: Vietnam is not a bump on an otherwise perfect circle. It is the issue on which the United States will be judged, by the world and by itself.

To apply some force to preserve an indigenous independence in South Vietnam would be one thing. To use staggering destructive power for the sake of preserving Nguyen Van Thieu in office is another. As André Fontaine said recently in *Le Monde*, it is an obsession, the self-destructing pursuit of a white whale.

In all this Henry Kissinger has a particular responsibility. Not only because of his position—the power remains the President's—but because of his life and ideas.

He saw for himself the terrible results of an ideology of force. He taught hundreds of students the necessity for analysis, for detachment, in weighing values and making political choices. To forget all that now, to provide the intellectual rationale for the obsessive pursuit of an abstraction, would indeed be *la trahison des professeurs*. Henry Kissinger must know better.

#### JOBFARE FOR H.R. 1

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, Pierre Rinfret, the noted economist, recently commented on my Full Employment Act of 1972. Although a bit chatty of public sector employment, Rinfret praises this effort to update the existing Full Employment Act and to eliminate long term unemployment in the United States.

Since I introduced by bill in February of this year, the level of unemployment has refused to recede. This administration has relied on rhetoric rather than hard policy to meet the rising tide of economic disaster. The first ray of light from the administration came last month when Andrew Brimmer, a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve Bank, announced that his economic studies showed that public service employment had a greater impact on the level of unemployment than any other single economic policy.

Nor has the administration shown any imagination in dealing with our national welfare crisis. I have long advocated guaranteed jobs in place of guaranteed welfare. The Committee on Finance has recently taken a hesitant step in this direction. Although definitely a move in the right direction, this workfare scheme provides only for temporary public service employment at a wage rate of \$1.20 an hour. What I want and what this country needs is a job for every able-bodied citizen that wants one, at a wage that will provide a decent living. This is the American dream. It should be the American reality.

To offer the Finance Committee and all Senators an alternative to workfare, I have submitted an amendment to H.R. 1 that incorporates all the provisions of my Full Employment Act.

Because of its bearing on a matter central to the national welfare, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Rinfret's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### THE FULL EMPLOYMENT ACT OF 1972

(By Pierre André Rinfret)

In 1946, the United States passed an economic milestone. It passed a law called the Employment Act of 1946. For the first time in the history of the United States, we dedicated ourselves to creating full employment, maintaining maximum economic prosperity, and achieving economic growth. All, of course, trying to do it without inflation. This law has been a landmark, and it is fair to say that over the 25 years that have occurred since 1946, the American economy basically has had full employment. That law changed the course of the United States.

Senator Vance Hartke from Indiana has now proposed a new law. The new law is called the Full Employment Act of 1972. Senator Vance Hartke says that if the private sector cannot generate employment, then the Government should be the employer of last resort.

I don't happen to agree with that position, but that's not the point I want to make. I think Senator Vance Hartke has done us a public service in reminding us that our Employment Act of 1946 is out-of-date. We need a new Employment Act. We need to realize certain basic facts:

1. That just because there's full employment in the United States doesn't mean that the blacks are at work.
2. Just because we have full employment, it doesn't mean we have full employment in all States.
3. We can have full employment and still have major occupations with substantial unemployment.

Senator Vance Hartke's idea is up-to-date. He wants to modernize the law, he wants to, in fact, create a new version of the Full Employment Act. And I applaud it. I hope that the Congress this year, in an election year,

will see fit not only to consider this law but to have hearings on the need for modernizing our concepts of full employment.

#### COST OF CLEANUP

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, at this moment, the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment is meeting in Stockholm, Sweden. The gathering of representatives of more than 100 nations is itself a welcome portent that there is growing concern about environmental conditions on the spaceship earth.

Not that the battles have been won. Here at home there are unreconstructed holdouts who remain unpersuaded as to the menace of environmental deterioration. In effect, they seem to be saying that there is no hazard, or no substantive one, and, even if there is, we cannot afford to act because of the economic cost. Fortunately, most of us believe we cannot afford not to act.

In this connection, the New York Times correspondent, Gladwin Hill, wrote an interpretative column discussing the cost of environmental cleanup. In it, Mr. Hill undertakes to explode the myth that "current pollution-abatement regulations are crippling substantial segments of American industry." Indeed, Mr. Hill quotes two economists who suggest that actually pollution is unprofitable in the long run.

Mr. President, this is a constructive, informative article. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### COST OF CLEANUP: OR, A MYTH OF FACTORY CLOSINGS IS EXPLODED

(By Gladwin Hill)

LOS ANGELES—A prominent industrialist told a large Western college audience a few weeks ago: "U.S. Department of Commerce figures show that 219 plants last year were forced to shut down primarily because of environmental pressures."

His words, which were untrue, were part of a rising clamor that one Federal official remarked had been taking on the proportions of "a national myth": the idea that current pollution-abatement regulations are crippling substantial segments of American industry.

Another industrialist said recently that environmental controls "need to be placed back in perspective before the country is faced with economic ruin."

Headlines such as "Pollution Laws Closing Plants by the Hundreds" and "A Drive to Find Jobs for Victims of the Pollution War" have appeared in both business and lay periodicals. A Department of Commerce publication said recently, "More plant closings are being reported daily from countless small communities throughout the nation."

However, a nationwide check by The New York Times, corroborated by Government reports, provides little substantiation for such assertions and apprehensions.

To the contrary, the survey yielded indications—supported by a number of officials, economists and other observers—that the costs of pollution control, while they may be causing dislocations in a few specialized situations, could also be a constructive element in terms of plant modernization and increased efficiency.

Highlights of the findings were the following:

Among the more than 10,000 business enterprises in the United States that fall every

year, in only a few cases have pollution-control requirements been a major factor.

Plant closings in which pollution-control costs did figure almost invariably involved marginal facilities, some of them a century or more old.

Repeatedly pollution regulations have been blamed for industrial shutdowns when the basic reasons were otherwise.

Unemployment caused by such shutdowns, according to the latest Federal data, has aggregated fewer than 1,500 jobs.

Recent studies made by independent consulting organizations for Federal agencies indicate that the cost impact of present pollution-control standards in the years immediately ahead will be small on both industry and the economy as a whole.

Nearly all the states now have water-quality regulations approved by the Federal Government. The Federal Environmental Protection Agency has promulgated general air-quality standards relating to the major air pollutants. In addition, the states have just submitted to the Federal Government "implementation plans" for regulating their particular pollution sources.

The Council on Environmental Quality in its last annual report projected the total national outlay to meet existing air, water and solid-waste pollution-control standards at \$105-billion for the period 1970-75. Of this total, industry's share as distinct from governmental and private expenditures, was placed at \$28-billion, an annual average of less than \$4.7-billion.

Annual sales of all American industrial concerns total about \$750-billion, and 127 companies have sales of more than \$1-billion each.

Industry's outlay in 1970 of \$2.5-billion for new pollution-control facilities, the council said, was only 3.1 per cent of its over-all expenditures for new plants and equipment.

"The cumulative expenditures over the six-year period," the council's chairman, Russell E. Train, has said, "are expected to be less than 1 per cent of gross national product (the nation's total output of goods and services in one year). Industry air and water pollution-control expenditures will generally be less than 1 per cent of the value of shipments."

Nevertheless, the thrust of many expressions from industrial and financial quarters has been that existing regulations impose inordinate economic burdens.

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States, a business group, last September said of pollution-control costs: "All existing firms will be adversely affected, but in some cases the economic impact will be severe."

C. Howard Hardesty, vice president of the Continental Oil Company, said the nation's pollution-control bills were going to be "staggering."

Maurice H. Stans, recently Secretary of Commerce and industry's foremost exponent of the "go slow" attitude on pollution control, said abatement costs might "throw thousands of people out of work" and cause "whole communities to be run through the economic wringer."

Lewis F. Foy, president of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, said 18 months ago: "We have just about reached the end of the line as far as spending large sums for pollution control is concerned."

And the National Industrial Pollution Control Council said early in 1971: "Increasing public concern with the pollution consequences of our society has inspired responses at some levels of government which are incompatible with the economic health of our society."

Contradictory views have been equally emphatic.

"The environment pretext," said Ralph Nader, the consumer advocate, "promises to become a convenient scapegoat for some of the 10,000 businesses that go under each



year at the hands of the marketplace or predatory corporate practices."

And I. W. Abel, president of the United Steelworkers of America, said last August: "We are increasingly being confronted by claims from industry that the demands made on it by citizens and government will not control pollution but rather will bring complete stoppage of plant operations."

"This is a throwback to the antiquated escape route of 'smoke means jobs.' It is environmental blackmail of the worst sort. Many obsolete plants use environment control as a convenient public-relations tool to justify a production decision to terminate operation and rationalize facilities."

Leonard Woodcock, president of the United Auto Workers called it "corporate irresponsibility" before a Senate hearing.

The latest Federal survey on the pollution-control impact came out in March under a newly established "early warning" system. In this the Environmental Protection Agency advises the Department of Labor every three months of situations where pollution requirements may have adverse economic effects. The survey deals only with operations with more than 25 workers.

This initial report, which went back to 1970, said that throughout the country only eight plant closings had been observed "where environmental regulations were a factor."

(A spokesman for the Department of Commerce said it had never issued any such figures as the "219 forced shutdowns" cited by the anonymous industrialist. A departmental inquiry indicated the speaker had gotten the number from a Washington business-news syndicate that had misconstrued figures from a Federal study that did not relate to actual plant closings.)

The eight closed establishments listed in the Federal survey were a woolen mill in South Grafton, Mass.; a chemical plant at Saltville, Va.; a vegetable oil concern in Durant, Okla.; smelters in Superior, Ariz.; a pulp mill at Coos Bay, Oreg., and lumber mill at Philomath, Oreg.

Thirty-eight more "threatened" closings or production curtailments were reported, but in only 18 cases did Federal investigators assess these eventualities as "highly probable."

Of the 38 plants, 13 were in the pulp and paper industry, seven were in the metals industry, six were sugar mills and the rest scattered among various fields. The plants were in 16 states.

A canvass by The New York Times of 20 states, from Maine to Hawaii, produced a scattering of additional cases of actual or threatened plant closings. But generally there was no evidence of any great impact.

In each state, officials and industrial associations were asked to specify any plant shutdowns in which pollution-control costs were a major factor. Few such instances could be cited and, in most of these, pollution abatement proved on inquiry to be a second factor.

The New York Department of Environmental Conservation, for instance, noted four plants that had closed with pollution-control costs cited but said that in each case other economic factors appeared to be the real determinant.

In New Jersey, the State Department of Environmental Protection reported that three small chemical plants had shut down in 1970 after receiving orders to stop polluting the Raritan River, but officials said the abatement cost was not a clear-cut determinant.

In Montana, where there has been much controversy over smelter fume-emission standards, the chairman of the State Board of Health, Mrs. John C. Sheehy, said, "Pollution controls have not cost a single job."

These and many similar reports conformed with the findings of a detailed study of the

prospective impact of pollution controls on 14 major industries between 1972 and 1976 recently made for the Council on Environmental Quality, the Environmental Protection Agency and the Department of Commerce by 11 independent consulting firms.

Of 12,000 plants in the 14 industries, the study report said, about 800 would close "in the normal course of business" between 1972 and 1976 anyway. Pollution abatement requirements, it was estimated, might cause an additional 200 to 300 to close, but many of these would be economically weak units that would probably close anyway in a few more years.

These possible environmental closings, it was said, might involve a theoretical loss of 50,000 to 125,000 jobs—1 to 4 per cent of the employment in the industries involved.

Mr. Train and others have also noted that national pollution-abatement cost projections are seldom balanced against the existing costs of pollution itself—at least \$16-billion a year for air pollution, by Federal estimate, and \$13-billion a year for water pollution.

Other factors that tend to make industrial pollution-control cost figures larger are:

Such outlays are not an all-at-once expense, but can be spread over 20 years or more—the lifetime of the facilities—even though their depreciation can be compressed for income-tax advantages to as little as five years.

In many cases pollution-control-equipment expenditures are accorded other Federal and state tax advantages. Facilities can often be financed through tax-exempt bond issues sponsored by public agencies, affording industries lower financing rates than on ordinary construction.

Joseph Kivel, an officer of the E.P.A.'s planning and evaluation division, said: "I think almost all the plants affected by pollution-control regulations so far are marginal. They're not making much money or they aren't making any. I don't think any industry that is healthy will be closed down as a result of pollution legislation."

The idea that pollution control is unduly costly to industry was challenged recently by two economists—Joseph H. Bragdon, Jr. of H. C. Wainwright & Co. and John A. Marlin of the City University of New York—who studied the financial records from 1965 to 1970 of 17 pulp and paper companies covered in a recent pollution analysis by the Council on Economic Priorities.

"The evidence," they said, "suggests not only that this hypothesis [of undue expense] is entirely untenable but also that the reverse—pollution is unprofitable—is the case in the long run. The earnings performers during the 1965-70 period seem to include a disproportionate number of companies with strong records in the areas of pollution control." They suggested these concerns had good management that was conducive to both low pollution and high profits.

"In some cases," William D. Ruckelshaus, head of the Environmental Protection Agency, said recently, "it happens that by prodding industry to clean up we're encouraging modernization and development of more efficient plant facilities, which is a net benefit to our general economy."

#### HYPOCRISY OF FORCED SCHOOL BUSING TO ACHIEVE RACIAL BALANCE

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I have spoken many times on the floor of the Senate about the hypocrisy which surrounds the issue of forced school busing to achieve a racial balance. To some, it might seem to be an unnecessary repetition to do so again. But a strange story appeared Sunday, on the front page of

no less liberal a newspaper than the Washington Post, and I invite the attention of Senators to it.

Some 3 weeks ago, David J. Armor, an associate professor of sociology at Harvard University, made public a 64-page study which showed that desegregation by busing does not benefit black children.

These results fly in the face of what our liberal probusing friends have been telling us for years. But I do not want to discuss the study today, although its importance in this area is clear. What I do want to discuss is the reaction to the study in liberal circles.

We all know that the liberal is a tolerant man. His hallmark is the fact that he willingly listens to all sides of an issue and, after carefully weighing the merits of the arguments, he comes to a decision in a rational, unemotional way. Above all, the true liberal will absolutely not tolerate the suppression of an idea.

But strange things are happening, as reflected by this story in the Post. The article says:

Several professors have praised the report privately, but refuse to be quoted by name. "Only a damn fool would talk," one said; "I don't want to pay the price."

Mr. President, this sounds like a line spoken out of "The Godfather," and not words heard in a free country. When we consider the sorry respect of a college professor who refuses to be named in a newsmagazine, because of possible repercussions, we could hardly be talking about Harvard University—the shrine of all liberal thought. Such things happen only in totalitarian countries.

But let us read on. Armor's office was broken into over Memorial Day weekend, and all the research records used in the study were stolen. I was always led to believe that the liberal way to resolve issues is through the enlightened exchange of ideas. But here is a plain, unvarnished case of destroying an idea which does not happen to agree with your own. The liberal thinkers who walked Harvard's lawns in past years must be turning over in their graves.

An unidentified leader of a busing project in Boston accused the Boston Globe of an act of, "pure racism" for even publishing the story. A colleague of Armor's Thomas Pettigrew, said that Armor had done "incomparable harm by making the report public."

Mr. President, what has happened to the right of the public to know, which was much discussed during the Daniel Ellsberg case?

There, Pulitzer Prizes were awarded, and ringing speeches were made applauding the vindication of this right, which is so sacred to all Americans.

But apparently, the public's right to know extends only to matters like military secrets. The public, apparently, is not ready to be told the truth about forced busing. These truths must be reserved for those who know, better than the public, what is good for the public.

Well, I have news for these hypocrites. The public is learning the truth about forced school busing. The large votes rolled up by Gov. George C. Wallace show that. And the politicians are getting the message. Compare the campaign speeches

given on this issue 4 years ago with those being given today.

The only people who cannot see the truth are these ivory tower sociologists who are so far from reality that they just float along in a dream world. They have created the remedy of forced busing, and they simply cannot bear the thought that it might be wrong. So when contradictory facts are published, they cry out like hysterical children, saying that these facts should be suppressed.

If these people were truly interested in helping black Americans, they would welcome any information which might shed some light on what would be the best way to attain equality of educational opportunity for every American. But here we have information which threatens the moral superiority which has always been theirs, because they were "right." So they cry out against its publication.

Mr. President, I hope that these are the last walls we will hear from these people who have used the southern school children for so long as laboratory specimens. In their shrill outburst against the publication of this study, they have revealed their true colors, and I dismiss them with contempt.

We do have a problem, Mr. President. We are working on it, and we are making progress. Rational men, who are seeking a workable solution, are the answer. Ivory tower social planners, who are obsessed only with being proved right, are not.

In closing, I might say that the conduct I have described is typical of militant liberalism that has taken hold in our country in recent years.

We have seen it in mobs and demonstrations in the Nation's Capital and all across the country. We have seen it on college campuses. We have seen it result in violence and destruction, and even in the tragic loss of life.

According to this doctrine, if there is an idea with which one does not agree, he sets out to destroy it. If there is a speaker who says something you do not like, you shout him down or shut him up. But if you subscribe to militant liberalism, you never admit that there might be some merit to ideas other than your own.

Militant liberals are quick to pin a label of prejudice on people who disagree with them.

I submit that any attempt to stifle the free flow of ideas and opinions is the worst kind of prejudice. It is an evil that Americans can do without in these most difficult times.

#### LAIRD'S ARMS OFFENSIVE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, Secretary Laird has sprung his spring offensive to counter any moves in Congress to lower military spending. According to Mr. Laird, we need more armament, not less, after the Moscow arms accords to limit nuclear weaponry; more armament, not less, as the President withdraws more of our troops from Vietnam.

Columnist Joseph Kraft sees the Secretary's offensive for new funds as the Pentagon's price for granting "President Nixon's keen desire to win military back-

ing for the arms control treaty, and right wing backing for his reelection."

Mr. Kraft writes that the President believes he lost his bid for the governorship of California in 1962 "because the right wing of the Republican Party sat on its hands." Therefore, Nixon "is now going all out on military spending, even when it is made less necessary by the arms accord, in order to assure that the right wing stays with him in the election this fall."

I ask unanimous consent that Joseph Kraft's column of June 11 be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### LAIRD'S ARMS OFFENSIVE

(By Joseph Kraft)

Simpletons figured the new arms control treaty with Russia would permit a decrease in military spending. But of course that's not the way it works at all.

Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird has indicated there will have to be a considerable increase in defense appropriations for this year. And despite a certain effort by the White House to divorce itself, it is clear that the secretary is only acting on President Nixon's keen desire to win military backing for the arms control treaty, and right-wing backing for his reelection.

Laird made known his intention to seek an increase in military spending at a press conference held after an appearance before the House Armed Services Committee. In his press statement, Laird said the Pentagon would need an additional \$3 billion to \$5 billion to cover expenses of the Vietnam war.

He also said that in the aftermath of the arms control treaty there was more urgent pressure to go ahead with the new Trident submarine, budgeted at about \$1 billion for fiscal 1973, and the new B-1 bomber, for which he is asking \$445 million this year. On top of that he talked about getting additional funds to develop a new long-range missile to be fired from submarines, and to speed up a program for making B-52 bombers less vulnerable to enemy attack.

Some officials at the White House gave the clear impression that Laird was acting on his own. They even expressed some wonder about what he was up to.

Well, the facts are about like this: The Pentagon now has up for consideration by the armed services committees of the Congress a budget request for \$83.2 billion. There has been a good deal of sentiment in the Congress for trimming that figure. Part of the sentiment comes from disgust with the Vietnam war and part from the feeling that the recent treaty with the Russians should mean the end of the arms race.

Laird's move last week was a counteroffensive on the military spending issue. He picked a moment when the war was going relatively well. He claimed the extra \$3 billion to \$5 billion is necessary to pay for gas and bombs connected with the new air and naval operations the President has had in effect for the past month.

He rolled the programs for new submarines and bombers and missiles into the same package. That makes it very hard for the Congress to do any serious cutting. It will look as though arms are being denied to American soldiers in the midst of a military mission that is going pretty well.

But why is the administration so keen on advertising extra military spending at this point? Why not wait, as the Johnson administration used to, until the end of the year and smuggle the additional appropriations through as a supplemental request?

The answer has to do with winning the support of the Joint Chiefs for the arms con-

trol treaty. It is now clear that the President and Laird have virtually promised the Chiefs that in exchange for their support of the Moscow agreement, the military can have carte blanche on the offensive weapons not covered in the agreement—namely, the new submarine and the new bomber.

In keeping with that accord, Laird is now visibly knocking himself out to get full funding of the submarines and the bombers. As a gauge of his super support for the military, he is even asking for a little more in the way of a new missile.

The desire for support from the military chiefs is understandable. President Kennedy made concessions to win their backing for the 1963 agreement limiting bomb testing.

But Mr. Nixon clearly did not have to pay nearly so high a price. He surely could have had the support of some of the Chiefs without going so hard on the submarines and the bombers. Indeed, given his own strong anti-Communist record, and the truly good quality of the treaty, he could have won a very substantial majority in the Senate even without the backing of the military chiefs.

What Mr. Nixon has in mind is his defeat in the race for governor of California back in 1962. He believes he lost that race because the right wing of the Republican Party sat on its hands. He is now going all out on military spending, even when it is made clearly unnecessary by a supreme arms accord, in order to assure that the right wing stays with him in the election this fall.

#### JOHN PAUL VANN

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the news this weekend that John Paul Vann had been killed in a helicopter crash in Vietnam came as a shock to those of us who were fortunate to know him and to gain an appreciation of his many valuable capabilities.

Yesterday's—Sunday, June 11—Washington Post contains an editorial which succinctly portrays John Vann's significant contributions in a war none of us wanted, but were nevertheless forced to accept.

John Paul Vann's death is a great loss to this country.

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:

#### JOHN PAUL VANN

John Paul Vann believed passionately in the Vietnam war long after others—who had once shared his passion—had given up on it. He believed it could be won for, and ultimately by, the Vietnamese in the sense that they could have acquired, some years and many thousands of casualties ago, a capacity to defend themselves if properly led and wisely trained and advised and inspired. And he may well have been right. We will never know for sure because his particular concepts, which always sounded so sensible and logical when he expounded them, were never adopted at the time that he was putting them forth. The military establishment, which he loved because it was his career, and which first feared him and mistrusted him and eventually drove him to resign his commission, was so slow to listen and even slower to learn.

That is the tragedy of his life, which ended—some would say predictably—in a helicopter crash last week. The triumph was that he never stopped trying and that he lived long enough to see a large part of his program, his tactics and his sense of the proper American role in the war actually put into effect, however, late in the day. When John Vann was a lieutenant colonel,



before his resignation in 1963, they were not listening, and they still weren't listening in late 1967 when General Westmoreland had his forces lunging around the countryside searching and destroying, taking the war to the enemy, taking the play away from the South Vietnamese and absorbing heavy casualties in an effort to "attrit" the enemy, to kill North Vietnamese and Vietcong in such numbers that they would quit. John Vann believed profoundly that this could not work, that the enemy should be forced to attack our side rather than the other way around, that Hanoi would never run out of manpower, that the South Vietnamese would never learn to defend themselves if we did it for them, that firepower by itself was not enough, that killing civilians was almost indefensible, that air power wouldn't be decisive either, that carrying the war to the sanctuaries outside Vietnam would only invite the enemy to find new sanctuaries. Then came Tet and a new administration and slowly, painfully, a considerable part of what John Paul Vann believed in was adopted, not so much by choice as by necessity because the American public would not continue with the war effort the way it was.

John Vann died believing that we are now on the right track, not in every respect but in the important respects and whether he was right about that is less important than the fact that he had the courage and the determination, against the most forbidding odds, to risk his life on a daily basis for his beliefs. There are many who believe he was the ablest and most effective American ever to serve in Vietnam, and while that may be an extravagant statement, he was a great soldier who, ironically, may have rendered his greatest service to the Army he loved after leaving it.

It was not necessary always to have agreed with John Vann's belief in the Vietnam struggle to know that he was in Indo China doing what he could to bring rationality to our war effort and to minimize the awful cost of the war to the Vietnamese themselves, and to know, too, that his loss is a heavy blow.

#### FOREIGN TRADE AND INVESTMENT ACT

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the continuing failures of our foreign trade and investment policies are all around us. Unemployment remains at a disturbingly high rate of 5.9 percent; inflation continues unabated; and our trade is now running at an annual rate of around \$6 billion. What was once the greatest trading nation in the world is now caught in a quagmire of muddled thinking and foolish policies. But the reality principle may finally be coming home to the administration. I was much encouraged by some recent remarks of Mr. William D. Eberle, the President's Special Representative for Trade Negotiations.

For the first time in several years, an administration figure in the area of foreign trade has spoken of the importance of achieving full employment in the United States; of drastic labor market entry problems posed for millions of young Americans; and of the devastating loss of pensions that comes with closing factories and a faltering economy. Mr. Eberle went on to speak of the trade impact of the heavy defense burden this Nation carries and the need for a way to keep environmental costs from being a burden on world trade.

Mr. President, because Mr. Eberle's speech before the Steuben-Schurz-Gesellschaft in Dusseldorf, Germany, may portend a new awakening of thought in the current administration, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### INFLATION, SOCIAL POLICIES, AND THE COMING TRADE NEGOTIATIONS

I strongly suspect that the questions uppermost in your minds today are questions I cannot answer. You probably want to know what the role of the dollar will be as a reserve currency in the future. You probably want to know if and when some sort of convertibility between the dollar and other reserve assets will be restored.

Now that the Bretton Woods system is part of history, you want to know when a suitable substitute will be devised to lessen the uncertainty you now face in concluding an export contract today at a price that will be paid a year or more from now.

I cannot answer those questions. There is no simple answer. Secretary Connally, in his characteristically straight-forward manner, stated the position of the United States last month in New York when he said:

"We have not yet put forward an 'American Plan' for the future shape of the international monetary structure. We shall not do so until we have fully wrestled with the complexities of this most complicated subject. Nor do we intend to make our decisions until such time as our internal discussions and debates are fully complete and our thinking can be tested against the thinking of others . . .

"Reform of the world's trade and payments structure," Secretary Connally went on to say, "will not be achieved quickly or easily. Behind the facade of technicalities, basic issues of national policy must be faced and basic differences must be reconciled. We need to fit the reform in a longer vision of a world economic and trading order."

Because the international monetary system provides the lubricant necessary to permit the engine of world trade to run smoothly and to carry an even bigger load, I am as anxious for progress as you are. But what Secretary Connally says should be plain to all by now: we are not faced with the need for a series of patchwork remedies, each one of which can be taken up by itself. We are confronted with the need to fashion a new world economic and trading order to replace one that was passing into history even before the famous Nixon shocks of last August 15.

Bretton Woods created what one American economist has called a "stability of expectations". The system served the world very well for more than a decade. Resting as it did on the assumption that the parity of the dollar would never change and that the exchange rates of other currencies would remain fixed, despite occasional changes, the system provided the world with the liquidity to support a vast expansion in trade and investment. The major source of liquidity was the U.S. economy, where the money supply could be allowed to grow without undue concern for balance of payments constraints.

It is possible that to be a bit nostalgic about the Bretton Woods world, now that it has passed. But it is useful to recall that some of the most bitter criticisms came from Europe. They called the American deficit "the deficit without tears," or, as General de Gaulle put it, "an exorbitant privilege" that allegedly permitted the United States to buy up large tracts of the European industrial countryside with cheap dollars, printed to cover its deficits.

Thus not everybody was happy with some of the underlying incentives that the Bretton Woods system created. But I'll wager most would like that stability of expectations back now that there is uncertainty about what will be created to take the place of the old.

I am happy to say that the need for negotiating new arrangements has been mutually recognized. This past winter the European Community governments, the United States and Japan agreed to launch in 1973 a sustained, multilateral negotiating program to create the new world economic and trading order of which Secretary Connally spoke. This year, 1972, is to be the year of preparation. It is my privilege to represent President Nixon in this period of preparation insofar as trade matters are concerned. It is a difficult job, for there is as yet no agreed, clear-cut goal, nor even an agreed procedure of consultations for concerting our efforts and designing a common goal. The government trade representatives, who have been meeting together off-and-on bilaterally at OECD, GATT, and elsewhere, are like a mountain-climbing party at the foot of a very steep mountain whose summit is still shrouded in clouds. We are at the stage of asking ourselves if we really have the will to climb together.

There is even an uncomfortable discrepancy in the perception that each of us has of the other's role. Since the EEC is now the world's largest trading entity and soon to become even larger, we Americans expect the EEC to act as a bloc with a high degree of political cohesion. We tend to mistake the Treaty of Rome for a European constitution, rather than simply a preliminary to what may become some day articles of confederation. (In our own history, of course, the process was reversed; the American states started out with articles of confederation and only later adopted a constitution.)

Our perception of Japan's role is similarly flawed. We impute a new political role suitable to Japan's impressive economic power, failing to appreciate sometimes that Japan is going through a painful period of political adjustment as the politicians who came to power in the years of defeat and occupation are replaced with a post-war generation, brought up in rapidly increasing prosperity, but also in rapidly changing domestic and international priorities.

But if we have to learn, so do our European and Japanese colleagues, I think. Japan and the EEC together still perceive themselves in much weaker terms, both economically and politically, than is the reality. They tend to feel they are still locked in uncomfortable intimacy with an American elephant. They have accepted much too long the post-war image of American economic predominance—and they have relied too long—on the post-war political consensus that dominated American foreign policy until the beginning of the 1960's when that consensus broke down in a divisive war and a decade of troubles at home.

The way to correct our flawed perceptions, I think, is not to rake over the coals of the past nor to protest self-righteously our separate resolves to serve the common good and world peace, but rather to talk frankly about some of the problems we share in common. The problems that divide us are, in fact, nothing in comparison to the problems we share in common. I will mention three today: first, the problem of managing inflation; second, the problem of accommodating the new social demands of our peoples; and finally, the problem of getting a mandate from our peoples that will permit us to start the hard climb together towards a new world economic and trading order.

If we can agree that we share these three problems in common, then maybe our per-

ceptions of each other's role will be less flawed, and we will be able to devise a common strategy and a common set of tactics. It will not surprise you, I'm sure, that I have chosen three problems, all of which would be less difficult if trade among us, and the rest of the world, is allowed to grow with as few obstacles in the way as possible.

When it comes to managing inflation, I say Europe, Japan and the United States are all in the same boat. We all recognize inflation as the major domestic economic malady we face, but none of the classical patent medicines for treating it is fully effective any more. The frequency with which modern economies are said to be afflicted with "stagflation" attests to the inadequacy of conventional remedies. On this we can all agree. The inflationary pressures in our societies reflect the expectations our people have about the future. I am struck by the fact that in all our countries those expectations are more or less alike.

In all our countries today prolonged periods of historically high rates of economic growth have led to a very palpable "revolution of rising expectations" among our peoples. In every country the price system is signalling impatience, not only for the better material life for individuals that growth has come to promise, almost as a basic human right, but also for a more just and satisfactory distribution of the fruits of economic growth, whether to lift up the poorest families in society or to improve the quality of our environment. Finally, and often overlooked, the "revolution of rising expectations" also contains the expectation of prompt and adequate compensation for those in society who are forced to change their habits and attitudes towards life and work as a result of technological obsolescence or of the increasing specialization and subdivision of labor that growth brings with it.

If inflation is not managed, it breeds not just doubt, but cynicism about the ability of duly-elected authorities to make good on some of the many promises of growth. And as doubt and cynicism grow with inflation, more and more groups in society organize to take the law into their own hands to make sure they get what they want whatever the cost to the others. I say this is the major domestic political problem in all of our countries, and who knows better than you here in Germany?

In Europe you have been experimenting with various forms of incomes policies for many years, primarily in a search for better ways to manage inflation. We are doing the same thing in the United States now, though the debate in public is perhaps less sophisticated than it is here. What you have learned, and what we are learning, is that there is no one simple anti-inflationary mechanism or incomes policy that will ever work for very long. Just as our economies are dynamic, so our political approaches to managing inflation must be dynamic too.

Our separate approaches to the common problem of managing inflation will shift and change with the times. I do suggest, however, that there is one common element we all can and should accept: that is that the flow of imports provides us with one of the few, continuing checks on inflation. As a check on our own costs and price systems, there simply is no substitute for the continuing discipline of competition through trade.

Can we not agree, then, for a start, that in our common concern with managing inflation in our separate ways, we must accept the discipline of imports as a necessity? If we could do that, we might be breaking some new ground.

Could we perhaps expand this area of agreement a bit by bringing into it recognition of the fact that men and women dis-

placed in the process of growth are bound in these times of inflationary pressures to demand prompt and adequate compensation? And is this not a cost each nation should bear for itself, not ask others to bear for it?

Could we go one step further and apply the principle of each nation bearing the costs of all its social policies itself, rather than trying to export the costs of those policies through various restrictions and subsidies involving foreign trade? I have in mind here policies designed to alter the relative economic position of an industry or region to improve the quality of the environment and agricultural policies, as well as other policy for assisting adjustment.

Again, I don't want to get embroiled in technical debates. I recognize the vast array of technical difficulties on the terrain of negotiations before us, but before we can start to climb our mountain together we have to have an agreed set of goals. I have suggested the goal of accepting the flow of imports as necessary accomplices to any anti-inflation policy. I now suggest we accept the general principle that the costs of our separate social policies should be borne by the governments instituting those policies, except perhaps where international agreements can be framed to permit some sharing of costs.

A glaring example of where this principle is not being honored now is, I think the EEC's Common Agricultural policy. That Europeans should tax their consumers to subsidize their farmers is something no American could object to on principle. But that Europeans should create a common mechanism to tax and regulate agricultural imports and to subsidize and manipulate agricultural exports as a means of exporting some of the costs of their social policies in this field is something else again.

You are today exporting the costs of your domestic agricultural policies, on to all the other nations of the world, so that farmers in other countries have to bear costs of aiding your farmers. This is something we in the United States must continually oppose.

It is true that there will be no useful international cooperation if one nation seeks to impose its ideas of proper social policies on another, and agricultural policy in Europe as in the United States is deeply rooted in social, as well as economic, considerations. But it is futile, if not dangerous, in my opinion to envision a new world economic and trading order where countries are expected to agree to take in the costs of each other's social policies, the way my wife might take in the neighbor's laundry. Certainly there will be exceptions where small countries have special problems. Certainly there will be many exceptions for the poor countries of the world who somehow must be integrated into the world economy if half the human race is to have any expectation of engineering an escape from their poverty. But nations with the economic power of Japan or the United States or the countries of the EEC should be willing to absorb themselves the cost of their social policies. It is a principle on which we all should be able to agree, for like managing inflation, it is a problem—or rather a set of problems—we all share in common.

How can we make out of these two principles material for a mandate to negotiate, agreed to by our respective governments and parliaments? This is, perhaps, the most difficult question of all.

Many Europeans tend to think that it is only in America, where there is a formal division of powers between the executive and legislature, that there is a problem of getting a mandate to negotiate. There certainly is a problem. I, for one, believe that in the United States we must find a way to mount

negotiating efforts which involve both the Congress and the Executive for the coming period of negotiation.

But may I ask you who is to speak for Europe and what authority will they have? Will they be politically competent representatives or will they be technicians? Will the technicians be supported, or disowned by the national governments?

If we are going to work in concert, effectively the negotiations will have to be made up of politically competent teams from Europe, Japan and the United States—men and women capable of negotiating the difficult political as well as economic issues we must cope with. It is time we started to think out loud about this problem. Can we, for instance, fashion a single mandate or comparable mandate, with broad authority so that each of our political bodies is permitted to move in a common direction?

Is not now the time for our governments to start talking about the basis for such a common Congressional authority and a European Community Council mandate. Such a mandate could serve as the diplomatic equivalent of a jet-assisted take-off.

The Kennedy Round of tariff negotiations was much simpler to deal with in this regard. It is not just that tariffs may not be the all-important subject in the coming negotiations that they were in the past.

It is not just that discussions of non-tariff barriers and agricultural policy inevitably involve domestic social and economic policies as much as, if not more than, external economic policies. We need a more politically responsive negotiating team and a more politically responsive negotiating mandate now, both because we will be talking about a much greater volume of trade than was discussed in the Kennedy Round, and because the whole exercise depends for its success on fashioning in advance a set of agreed, political goals.

And those goals will not, as they have in the past, rest primarily on a perception of a common external threat, but rather on a perception of some common domestic problems and of the stability of expectations in the world economic and trading system that is needed to live constructively with those problems. How new it is to envision an international negotiation based primarily on a sense of common domestic purpose, rather than on a sense of common defense against an external threat! Yet this is in large measure the task before us. The cloud will only disappear from the summit of that mountain we face and reveal to us a common objective if we can agree in advance that the problems we share in common at home are really more important than the problems that divide us in our foreign policies.

I have only suggested two problems: the problem of managing inflation and the problem of implementing the social policies our people are demanding without begging our international neighbors in the process. I have suggested two principles: that we all accept the flow of imports as necessary accomplices to any anti-inflation policy and that we agree to absorb the costs ourselves of our social policies and not try to export those costs on to others. These are some personal ideas that have come to me in my first six months in this job. There are no doubt more and better ones that can be used to get from our peoples the mandate to negotiate that we must have by next year.

But the time has come, I think in Europe, in Japan and in the United States, to take discussion of our preparations out of the closets where our respective technicians are at work and invite business, labor and consumers in our countries to participate in formulating the new principles on which any new mandate to negotiate must rest.



I started this talk on a note of uncertainty, the uncertainty I know you all feel as a result of the end of the Bretton Woods system. We are going to have to live with much more uncertainty in the years ahead, just as we are going to have to live with a degree of impatience, reflected in inflationary pressure, as a result of the expectations of our peoples.

But uncertainty needn't lead to anxiety. That will only happen if we fail to work together and try to achieve our national end without regard to the implications for the international system. In fact, uncertainty can be a powerful incentive to develop a collective political imagination—one which makes out of the problems we share in common an adventure that puts into the shadow the problems that divide us. We can, if we want, begin the kind of constructive dialogue that will keep our peoples so busy realizing some of their expectations that they won't have time to get cynical about our ability to make that kind of busy-ness possible.

I leave these questions and these thoughts with you in the earnest hope that you will debate them among yourselves, and come up with some better ideas, so that we may develop through international exchange of ideas the outlines of a better world economic system. Remember: you have an assignment in the coming negotiations just as surely as I do, because if we are to have a mandate to negotiate, it must have broad-based and enthusiastic support.

#### CHINA'S DIPLOMATIC THRUST INTO AFRICA

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, the Washington Post of Sunday, June 11, contains an article devoted to an analysis of China's new diplomatic thrust into Africa.

The article, written by Jim Hoagland, comes at a particularly critical moment in our relations with black African nations. It comes at a moment when the U.S. Senate has once again refused to reverse action taken last fall which allowed this country to violate United Nations sanctions against Rhodesia. It comes at a moment when our image among the black African nations is suffering, because of our seemingly insensitivity to the aspirations of these nations.

Africa represents the world's third largest continent; yet, this Nation has chosen to relegate Africa to a low priority status. This is evidenced by our apparent attitude that our interests in black Africa go no further than the commercial exploitation of that continent.

Sooner or later the United States is going to have to pay for the attitude of indifference which marks our relations with black African nations. When that time comes, we will be in for a rude awakening.

I believe Jim Hoagland's article to be highly informative as to the Chinese role in Africa. It would behoove all of us in this body, and in the White House, as well, to give close scrutiny to the article.

We can no longer afford to be double-dealing in our relations with black Africa. Should a drastic change occur in our relations on that continent, the United States will have only herself to blame should the events go against us.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Hoagland's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### THE CHINESE THRUST INTO AFRICA

(By Jim Hoagland)

**ADDIS ABABA.**—China's new diplomatic thrust into Africa, which has intensified since its admission to the United Nations, is being interpreted by many on this continent as the first important step in Peking's predicted drive for the leadership of the Third World.

What Peking intends to do with such leadership is the subject of sharp debate among the governments of the region, which now appears to be China's primary diplomatic target area. The rapidly increasing economic and military aid flowing from Peking to tropical Africa provokes both strong suspicion and grateful enthusiasm from Africa.

The suspicion is seen in Mozambique, where African guerrillas trained and armed by the Chinese are fighting to end Portuguese colonial rule.

Portugal's psychological warfare department has plastered the country with posters that show a Chinese figure in pointed red hat greedily encircling Africa with its arms. Bloodstained fingers grasp for the colonies of Mozambique and Angola. Other posters play on the idea that China wants to control Africa and dump its surplus population there.

North of Mozambique, the 13,000 Chinese engineers and laborers who give rise to that Portuguese propaganda theme are busily building bridges and laying rails for 1,100-mile railway that will link Tanzania and Zambia.

Julius K. Nyerere, Tanzania's president, expresses Africa's enthusiasm for the Chinese, who are advancing more than \$400 million for the railway's construction. The project will help transform his poverty-stricken country and will help black Africa in the economic struggle against the white powers of the south, Nyerere says.

Nyerere evidently feels that Chinese aid for Africa comes with few if any strings attached, in contrast to similar Western help. He has replaced British and Canadian military advisers with Chinese, who now total about 250. Economically, Tanzania's total annual trade with Peking has climbed from \$1,400 in 1960 to \$55 million today.

But African reaction to the new Chinese diplomatic offensive does not fall along completely predictable political lines. Here in Ethiopia, long considered one of America's two or three most reliable allies in Africa, officials are frantically seeking projects to absorb \$80 million of interest-free loans offered by China last year.

"Some countries would be happy to pay twice as much money for half the influence the United States has obtained here," an Ethiopian official pointedly boasted. He has recently hung a large portrait of Mao Tse-tung in his office to replace one of John F. Kennedy.

The United States has spent more than \$400 million on military and economic aid for Ethiopia over the past two decades.

Other pro-Western African governments continue to refuse Chinese aid and diplomatic contacts. President Felix Houphouet-Boigny of the Ivory Coast calls Chinese penetration the greater danger facing Africa.

This sentiment is echoed by South Africa's prime minister, John Vorster, who says the Chinese may someday ride down the Tanzam Railway to attack white rule in the south.

#### A LONGER VIEW

These varied reactions reflect a central theme of China's post-Cultural Revolution approach to Africa: It has become more diverse and sophisticated, as Peking seems to be taking a longer view of the prospects for revolutionary change in Africa.

Throughout Africa, China is showing a new willingness to work with conservative governments that a few years ago were accusing Peking of supporting moves to overthrow them.

The biggest portion of Chinese aid commitments to Africa, which are believed to have totaled more than \$700 million since 1960, is tied to one massive project, the Tanzam Railway. But recent Chinese offers to Africa are spread across a wide spectrum. In addition to the large Ethiopian loan, they include:

Building a 1,000-mile-long road across Somalia, where Soviet influence has been paramount since a 1969 coup.

Providing \$20 million worth of new port facilities for Mauritania. This and other projects may boost the total of Chinese technicians in that sparsely populated West African country to more than 1,000.

A pair of \$40 million loans to the Sudan despite last July's bloody anti-Communist purge there. The Sudan had also been a major Soviet aid client. One Chinese-aided project there is to be exploration for minerals.

Sending through the Chinese Red Cross large relief donations for cholera victims in Chad, although China had no formal relations with the pro-French government in Fort Lamy, and for drought victims in Kenya, with which Peking has had strained relations since 1966.

In all, China is thought to have 18,000 to 20,000 technicians, laborers, soldiers and diplomats stationed in sub-Sahara Africa.

#### "THE EASIEST COURSE"

The United States, Japan and India have all recently paid implicit tribute to the developing Chinese drive in Africa by assigning senior diplomats who have made their careers in China-watching to embassies in Dar-es-Salaam, the Tanzanian capital and focal point of China's presence in Africa.

The Soviet Union—which China apparently considers its most dangerous rival in long-term competition for influence in Africa—is assumed to have also assigned China specialists to African posts, Western diplomats say.

Some diplomats in East Africa interpret the Chinese quest for influence there as a logical product of Peking's revolutionary theory.

"In Maoist thought, Africa is a key area for the struggle of the 'world countryside,'" said a British diplomat, referring to the doctrine that the poor countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America will eventually subdue the industrialized nations of Europe and North America.

A senior American analyst, partly in agreement with that view, said: "The Chinese are concentrating on Africa first because it represents the easiest course for them. Their aid can come in the form of semi-skilled and skilled labor, rather than large capital investment. They can usefully transfer simple technology into Africa's small economies. And militarily, the guerrilla tactics they can teach are probably more valuable now to the Africans than donations of highly sophisticated weapons."

The help of African votes in gaining a United Nations seat for Peking on its own terms has also undoubtedly been an attraction. The African continent provided 26 votes for Peking's admission. China now has diplomatic links with 21 African countries, a figure that may rise now that Taiwan has little to gain by continuing the small

but effective technical aid programs that helped hold countries like Senegal and Sierra Leone in its camp.

Unlike Taiwan, which sought until the end to maintain its legitimacy within the United Nations by playing its role as a member of the big-power club, Peking is seeking to identify itself with the have-not nations, a posture that is likely in the long run to have more appeal to Africa.

#### THE RACIAL ISSUE

A still uncertain factor in China's campaign is its identification as a nonwhite power in the racial struggle in southern Africa. It is still far from clear that China is calculating its interests in terms of race war against the white South Africans, Portuguese and Rhodesians. Some China-watchers dispute the idea that the Chinese would identify racially with Africa. Peking is, however, the only power to have clearly established itself in recent years as a reliable patron of black forces in southern Africa.

This may stem at least partly from the parallel that Chinese theoreticians have drawn between their own revolutionary experience and conditions in Africa. Those parallels have contributed not only to Chinese interest in Africa, but also to the early miscalculations that marked Peking's often-clumsy diplomacy in Africa in the past decade.

At the beginning of the 1960s, Chinese statements on Africa's march to independence stressed the common background of poor peasant masses, the colonial past and what was seen as the inevitable fall of foreign-supported local governments put in place by colonial powers.

In his 1964 visit, one of three he has made to Africa, Premier Chou En-lai echoed this analysis by proclaiming that revolutionary prospects were excellent in Africa—a view that was immediately and intensely resented by many African governments, which felt that Chou was calling for their overthrow.

The turmoil of the Cultural Revolution may have offered Peking a convenient moment to overhaul its faltering diplomatic campaign in Africa, some analysts feel. After concentrating most of its activity in that period on Tanzania and Congo-Brazzaville, two states committed to building socialist societies, Peking openly began to widen its circle of influence in sub-Saharan Africa in 1969.

"Perhaps as we did the Chinese discovered that Africa is more complex than it looked at the beginning of the last decade," an American diplomat in central Africa said. "The national African governments proved to be much sturdier than expected. Now the Chinese are trying to build a real third bloc by working with governments rather than overthrowing them, at least right away."

Chinese economic aid is attractive because the loans routinely carry little or no interest and 20-to-30-year repayment periods, with lengthy delays granted in beginning repayment. American and Soviet loans carry interest ranging from 2.5 to 6 percent with shorter repayment periods.

Ethiopia has used only about \$25 million of \$100 million the Soviet Union offered in economic credits in 1960, partly because of Russian refusal to lower the interest rates.

#### THE SIMPLE LIFE

The Chinese have won praise from other African countries for their ability to live simply while completing aid projects, and for leaving promptly when they have finished.

"Local workers comment that as far as they know they have never seen a Chinese who leaves work immediately after the end of his shift," Tanzania's government press

service reported recently in describing work on the Tanzam rail line. "They are said to continue into 'the second man's job' until they are sent away!"

"The Chinese technicians do not need big cars, air conditioners and huge salaries to come to our country and help us," a Tanzanian official said even more pointedly. "They set a good example for our own workers with their dedication and simple living."

According to a number of reports from different sources in Dar-es-Salaam, the 13,000 Chinese workers of the rail line keep pretty much to themselves in their own separate camps after the workday is finished.

Most are thought to be either members or veterans of the Chinese People's Liberation Army railway corps and engineering corps. Each camp has men assigned to conduct political training, but there have been no reports of significant attempts to indoctrinate the 35,000 Tanzanians working with the Chinese on the railway.

Tanzanian officials often say that the Chinese surprised them by completing their first important aid project, the \$10 million Friendship Textile Mill in Dar-es-Salaam, and "packing up to leave right away. We had to beg them to stay around and show us how to run it. They were very eager not to give the impression of staying a minute longer than necessary," one official said.

The Chinese do make some of the same kinds of mistakes in aid projects as their Western counterparts. The first Chinese manager of the Friendship Textile Mill ran off 5 million yards of "light cotton patterns" that would have sold well in Burma, I guess," said a government official. "But we couldn't do anything with them here. It was an economic disaster." The mill lost \$500,000 that year.

Textile mills, match factories and other plants that turn out low-cost goods that African countries have been forced to import in the past are favorite aid projects for the Chinese.

#### ARMS AND TRADE

Military aid has been channeled to three countries that support guerrilla movements opposing the white governments, and to the Indian Ocean island of Zanzibar.

Guinea, which supports anti-Portuguese guerrillas, also receives Chinese help. And Sudanese officials have recently disclosed to Arab newspapers that China has given the Sudan eight Mig-17s and a brigade of tanks. A senior Sudanese defense official quoted by the Beirut newspaper Al Hawadith said the Chinese had immediately supplied complete sets of spare parts for the weapons, in contrast to the Russians, who had used spare parts as "a pressuring tool" against the government.

China's increased activity has brought rising trade with Africa. Tanzania and Zambia have agreed to a complex scheme for repaying the local costs on the Tanzam Railway, which is not only China's largest single foreign aid project, but also the largest such effort in modern African history.

Chinese goods are being imported by Tanzania and Zambia, which have traditionally been British markets, and sold for a profit, which is used to reimburse the Chinese for local costs. This is a major factor in the large jump in trade among the three countries, and it may be a forerunner of Chinese agreements with other nations.

But a leading Western expert on Chinese foreign policy says that China's economic interest in Africa is comparatively minor.

"What can China sell to Africa? Textiles, ballpoint pens, tires? In short, just the things the Africans are beginning to produce themselves. And Peking's own industries are not particularly geared to use the minerals tropical Africa produces."

"China's interest in Africa is overwhelmingly political, not economic or strategic in any conventional sense. Africa will add to the rising force of the poor as the world is increasingly polarized, in the Chinese view. Their goals remain the same, they have just projected them over a longer period of time."

#### THE COMPREHENSIVE ALCOHOL ABUSE AND ALCOHOLISM PREVENTION, TREATMENT, AND REHABILITATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1972

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I am much pleased to cosponsor S. 3644, the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act Amendments of 1972, which the distinguished Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES) recently introduced.

Since its creation in the spring of 1969, it has been my honor and privilege to serve side by side with Senator HUGHES on the Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Narcotics, which he chairs.

Senator HUGHES has a unique and lifetime concern with the problem of alcoholism in our society. He brought to his job as chairman of the subcommittee the unwavering energy, dedication, persistence, imagination and initiative which, combined with his great knowledge and experience in the field of alcoholism, awakened the conscience not only of the U.S. Congress, but of the entire Nation.

I participated with Senator HUGHES in his 2 years of intensive investigation and hearings on the problems of alcoholism. Those hearings resulted in the introduction of the Comprehensive Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism Prevention, Treatment, and Rehabilitation Act of 1970, which I also cosponsored. Its passage gave the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, for the first time, the tools and resources needed to begin an attack on this major health problem.

In its recent report to the Congress entitled "Alcohol and Health"—a report mandated by the act—the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare reported that—

Alcohol is the most abused drug in the United States . . .

An estimated 7 percent of the adult population in the United States manifest the behaviors of alcohol abuse and alcoholism . . . about 9 million men and women are alcohol abusers and alcoholic individuals . . .

Alcohol plays a major role in half the highway fatalities in the United States and cost 28,000 lives in one recent year.

Alcohol abuse and alcoholism drain the economy of an estimated \$15 billion a year. Alcoholism is not a crime. It is an illness or disease which requires rehabilitation through a broad range of health and social services tailored to persons at different stages of alcohol abuse and alcoholism.

While the landmark legislation in 1970 provided new hope to the millions of Americans who suffer from this disease, it was only a beginning. The programs and moneys authorized by the 1970 act extended for only 3 years. The authorizations for those years were purposefully kept low, and the appropriations have been even lower, so that the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism



could start slowly and prepare itself to wisely administer the amounts necessary to control this disease.

The time has come to extend and increase the authorities under this act. That is what the amendments contained in S. 3644 are designed to do.

The amendments would:

First. Extend the authority of the Act for an additional 3 years and authorize \$480 million in formula grants and \$420 million in project grants over the 3-year period.

Second. Provide for additional personnel for the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism.

Third. Require that all hospitals receiving Federal funds treat alcoholics on a nonprejudicial basis.

Fourth. Transfer the alcoholism project grant authorities administered by the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism from the Community Mental Health Centers Act to Public Law 91-616—the Alcoholism Act.

Fifth. Identify the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism as "in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare" rather than "in the National Institute of Mental Health" in order to give the Secretary the flexibility needed to give the Institute more visibility should that become desirable.

Mr. President, it is with great satisfaction that I once more join with the distinguished Senator from Iowa in his effort to bring necessary Federal attention to this long-neglected disease.

#### GARY CITY COUNCIL VOTES FOR PEACE

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, the American people's demand for an end to the war in Indochina can sometimes be temporarily deflected, but it cannot be stilled. While the administration moves from one public relations extravaganza to another, hoping against hope that it can buy enough time to get through November without being called to account for its failure to bring peace, the public's impatience is translated increasingly into despair over the lack of responsiveness of our institutions.

President Nixon continues to talk as if what is most deeply at issue in Indochina is America's honor. But the people have long since seen through that subterfuge. They recognize that what is really at stake for the Nixon administration is political profit, and what is really at stake for the Nation is an end to a nightmare.

Nowhere has this understanding been put more clearly or more forcefully than in a resolution passed by the council of the city of Gary, Ind., shortly before the latest Nixon escalation. Recent events have only added greater urgency to the resolution's demand.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution and a letter of commendation from the very distinguished mayor of Gary, the Honorable Richard Gordon Hatcher, be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### RESOLUTION No. 1201

Resolution of the Council of the City of Gary, Indiana to the Congress of the United States asking for an immediate end to American military involvement in Southeast Asia

Whereas: Two years ago, on April 7, 1970, the Council of the City of Gary, deeply concerned about what was happening to this country and its people by the prolongation of the war in Indo-China, in a petition to the President of the United States, called for an immediate withdrawal of all United States forces and material from Southeast Asia, and was thereby the first such elective body in a major American city to take such action; and

Whereas: As a result of the national protest of which that action was a part, a withdrawal of American ground troops is proceeding, but regrettably no pledge has yet been made that all are to be withdrawn—on the contrary young Americans are still being drafted as replacements; and regrettably, under a policy of "Let Asians Fight Asians" or "Yellow the Bodies," American air support is being given for new and terrible onslaughts, in computerized warfare; and

Whereas: The war is not only being carried on in South Vietnam, but since 1970, has been extended to Laos and Cambodia, with Thailand being used as a base for American bombing missions; and in recent weeks, the bombing of North Vietnam, halted in response to worldwide protest, has been resumed at unprecedented levels; and

Whereas: No proposals have yet been put forward by the United States government that we would end our backing for those forces that are standing in the way of the freedom and independence of the Indo-Chinese people; and

Whereas: American intervention has brought, and is still bringing great suffering to the people of those stricken countries;<sup>1</sup>

In South Vietnam, a million young soldiers killed, injured or maimed; a million civilians dead; and a third of the population homeless; and

In Cambodia, a million people driven from their homes; and

In Laos, as is only now becoming known to the American people, bombing on a scale never before experienced, with casualties the highest per capita ever suffered; and

Whereas: To that terrible toll must be added our own casualties—53,000 young men dead; a quarter of a million wounded or maimed; and uncountable numbers broken in health, mind, and spirit; and

Whereas: In pursuit of an ever more elusive military victory there, the American people (not without protest) funded and accepted as instruments of national policy:

(1) Waiver of a declaration of war by Congress.

(2) The calculated and planned use of political assassination.

(3) The use of bombing to destroy civilian populations.

(4) The establishment of "free fire zones" in which any living creature can be exterminated without restriction, resulting in massacres such as took place at My Lai.

(5) The use of defoliation and starvation as instruments of war.

(6) The forced emigration of rural peasants to cities by means of saturation bombing and evacuation at gunpoint.<sup>2</sup>

The price being paid for acquiescence in these crimes against humanity is everywhere evident in the dissension that is tearing this

<sup>1</sup> These statistics are from Indo-China: 1971, a White Paper published by the American Friends Service Committee.

<sup>2</sup> Likewise from the American Friends Service Committee's White Paper.

country apart, and nowhere is the revulsion more evident than in the refusal of so many young men to serve in the armed forces, at the price of their imprisonment or exile; and

Whereas: Prolongation of this immoral and illegal war has brought the country to near bankruptcy: It has cost the nation \$123 billion since 1965, and that figure does not include the indirect costs, such as war-generated inflation: Vietnam veteran's benefits; rehabilitation of drug-addicted troops; nor does it include the further cost that must be paid as interest on the burgeoning national debt, which is about 80 per cent war-created<sup>3</sup> and

Whereas: Continuance of this costly intervention is placing an intolerable tax burden on the people, at the same time money is not available in adequate amounts for the most elementary of public services, as we in Gary well know—schools, health and welfare programs; housing; mass transportation, etc.; nor will money be available as long as "64 cents out of every Federal tax dollar (not including Social Security and other trust funds) goes for military and military-related spending, leaving only 16 cents for health and welfare,"<sup>4</sup> and

Whereas: The Congress of the United States alone, under the Constitution, has the power to declare and wage war, and therefore must accept responsibility for its continuance,

Be it therefore resolved: That the Council of the City of Gary, fully cognizant of the seriousness of this action at this time, nevertheless implores the Congress, through its members from this area, to demand an immediate end to the bombing of North Vietnam, and an immediate end to American air and other logistic support for carrying on the war in South Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos, and

Be it further resolved: That Congress demand an immediate end to all other United States military intervention anywhere in Southeast Asia, and that a definite date for such a complete withdrawal be proclaimed; and

Be it further resolved: That copies of this Resolution be sent immediately not only to the appropriate members of Congress, but also to the President, the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Defense; and likewise to the Governor of Indiana and to the State Legislature; and

Be it further resolved: That copies of this Resolution be sent to the Conference of Mayors, with the expressed hope that similar action by other municipal bodies will be encouraged as the most direct means now available to bring the people's demand for an immediate end to the war to the Congress; and finally

Be it still further resolved: That the Council of the City of Gary calls upon all citizens, as individuals and through their organizations, to join this protest.

Adopted by the Common Council of the City of Gary, Indiana, this 18th day of April, 1972.

CLEO WESSON,  
Presiding Officer.

#### STATEMENT OF MAYOR RICHARD GORDON HATCHER

I commend the efforts of councilman Allison and the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom for bringing the issue of the war in Southeast Asia to our council for deliberation. I think it is of the utmost importance that we keep up an unrelenting barrage of letters, resolutions and peace actions so that the President and the Congress will have no doubt as to our commitment to a speedy peace.

<sup>3</sup> These figures are from a study of the costs of the war by Senator Mark Hatfield (R.-Ore.), 1971.

<sup>4</sup> Senator Hatfield's study.

It is especially urgent that we register opposition to our Government's murderous foreign policy now when, contrary to recent assertions that "the war is winding down," it is very obviously doing just the opposite. The cost of this war in human life is appalling. The cost in human suffering is immeasurable.

Some of the costs, however, can be measured. They show how the war effort is impoverishing our society. They indicate the insanity of our priorities when we choose to spend our national treasure for arms and then claim we are too poor to spend for the health, housing and education of our people.

Today, 61% of your tax dollar goes to cover the costs of war, and only 17 percent for human resources. Seventeen army machine guns cost \$9,000—the same \$9,000 which we could spend for an elementary teacher's annual salary—if we get out of Southeast Asia. One B-1 bomber costs \$25 million—we could spend that \$25 million to construct 15 hospitals with 50 beds each—if we get out of Southeast Asia. One aircraft carrier costs one billion dollars. That one billion would build 67,000 low cost housing units—if we get out of Southeast Asia.

This resolution, if it is passed here tonight, cannot help but have positive impact on those congressional and national forces striving to end our involvement in Southeast Asia. Perhaps its greatest significance, however, will be the impetus it gives members of the U.S. Conference of Mayors to initiate similar measures in their cities.

We must end this bitter chapter in our country's history. There can no longer be any doubt that every day we delay carries us further into the morass. I fully support your resolution, and urge all the citizens of Gary to likewise support it by letters, calls and telegrams to President Nixon, our Senators and Congressmen, expressing their anger at the current escalation and their urgent wish for peace.

#### RAIL COMMUTER SERVICE FOR THE WASHINGTON AREA

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, a recent statement by Jeffrey G. Mora, transportation projects manager of Urban Mass Transportation Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation, touches on some very excellent points regarding rail commuter service for the Washington area.

I have long felt that while the core subway system in Washington is definitely needed, there is a definite need for rail commuter service to and from certain Washington suburbs.

The Washington Metropolitan Area Transportation Authority—WMATA—has long registered suggestions that existing rail lines be used as a part of an overall transportation method. As Mr. Mora concludes however, "the subject has been studied enough; it is time for action." I support his call for the activation of a National Capital Commuter Rail Authority and I note with interest that my 2 colleagues from Maryland, Senators MATHIAS and BEALL, are taking an active interest in commuter rail service for Washington.

The distinguished junior Senator from Nebraska, Mr. CURTIS, and I have been urging that this kind of approach be taken for the past 5 years.

Mr. President, Mr. Mora is one of the most respected and studious transportation technicians in the Office of Research Development and Demonstrations at

UMTA; because his paper deserves the thoughtful attention of all Senators I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### THE IMPACT OF A COMMUTER RAIL SYSTEM ON DOWNTOWN WASHINGTON, D.C.

(By Jeffrey G. Mora)

Ladies and Gentlemen: An adequate discussion of the impact of commuter rail service on downtown Washington would take far more time than we can spend at a session like this. Therefore, I can only talk briefly about several important areas. These areas include: First, a brief review of several studies on commuter rail service in the Washington area; second, the existing commuter service, and finally the future and how the existing service might be restructured and expanded. Let me also add that the views I am expressing are mine and not those of the Department of Transportation. I would like to emphasize that unless something is done soon, the limited existing commuter rail service will disappear and we won't have to worry about its impact on downtown D.C.!

Let me review some earlier reports on the subject of commuter rail in Washington. A series of reports was prepared by Louis T. Klauder and Associates in 1962 for the National Capital Transportation Agency, predecessor to the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, WMATA. These reports set forth five alternative plans for establishing commuter rail service between Rockville, Laurel and Washington on the Baltimore and Ohio; Bowie and Washington on the Penn-Central; Franconia and Washington on the Richmond, Fredericksburg and Potomac Railroad, and Fairfax and Washington on the Southern Railroad. A second Klauder Report in 1962 reduced alternatives to two: one, a revised commuter rail plan, and the other a combination commuter rail-rapid transit plan.

Late in 1962 NCTA submitted the two option plan to the President. In relation to commuter rail service NCTA would have contracted with the railroads involved and the Washington Terminal Company. Public subsidy would have supported expected deficits. This proposal resembles similar commuter rail operations in Boston, Philadelphia and New York.

In 1963 NCTA submitted its transportation plans to Congress, but the commuter rail alternatives slipped to minor importance with only a Penn-Central service between Washington and Bowie recommended.

The Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, WMATA, which by 1967 had replaced NCTA, presented its final plan to Congress in 1967 with but one alternative to utilize rail commuter service. However, revenue/cost figures strongly favored automated rapid transit trains rather than the previously proposed contracts-with-the-railroads approach. WMATA then quietly shelved any real interest in commuter rail service as part of its involvement in solving Washington's transportation problems.

Once again, in 1969 WMATA took a brief look at commuter rail service in a staff study. The study concluded that the most advantageous commuter rail system from WMATA's viewpoint would be one which complemented the rapid transit system, then in the planning stages. The four proposed routes included first, Quantico to Alexandria, Virginia on the RF&P with a transfer to the Metro system at King Street; second, Manassas, to King Street via the Southern RR; third, Brunswick, Maryland to Silver Spring on the B&O, and fourth, Baltimore to Washington on the Penn-Central. The plan recommended terminating B&O and RF&P railroad service

at the outer ends of METRO where transfer would be made to the rapid transit system. As METRO expanded outward, the commuter rail service would be cut back. For example, B&O service would be cut back from Silver Spring to Rockville. Service duplicating METRO would be strictly avoided. The study took no position on who should fund or operate the service.

There were two rationales for not providing through service via Union Station linking Virginia with Maryland: (1) Avoidance of terminal charges for each car entering the station, and (2) ensuring that ridership within the DC boundaries be served by METRO and not by a commuter rail system.

WMATA takes a somewhat similar position today in that it would probably oppose any plan that appears competitive in terms of service area or would jeopardize its funding from suburban Washington jurisdictions.

The Senate Public Works Committee contracted with the joint venture consultants of Day and Zimmerman and Louis C. King-scott and Associates to prepare a comprehensive plan for commuter rail service in the Washington area. An abridged version of the full study was published in 1968 titled *Metropolitan Area Pilot Transportation Study*. The study focused on better utilization of existing railroad rights-of-way as a viable alternative to additional road and highway construction. The study recommended that commuter rail service be instituted on a through-routing basis between Germantown, Maryland and Manassas, Virginia and between Baltimore and Quantico, Virginia. The trains would provide access to downtown D.C. through stops at Union Station and one or two new stations between the 14th Street Bridge and South Capitol Street to serve the rapidly growing Southwest Mall area. A feeder bus network utilizing a combination of existing and new bus service would be established to interface with rail service at the stations. The system would be financed through a combination of Federal and local government funds and farebox revenues on the basis of—

(a) Federal moneys provided for all capital investment except station facilities which would be the responsibility of the appropriate local jurisdiction (or jurisdictions) serviced.

(b) The net of operating expenses over passenger revenues to be subsidized in participation shares of one-third from the Federal Government, the balance to be shared by local governments in Maryland and Virginia proportionate to the seatmiles of service provided.

Operating and administrative control would be placed in a special commuter rail division of WMATA. The consultants estimated an annual operating deficit of between \$3.5 million and \$4.0 million dollars with 8,000 daily round trips on weekdays only.

Finally, we have the *Washington Metropolitan Area Rail Commuter Feasibility Study* prepared by Carl R. Englund, Jr. for the Department of Transportation's Urban Mass Transportation Administration. The Englund Study released in 1971, was designed to update the 1968 Senate Public Works Committee report in which Mr. Englund was a participant. It is important to review the salient points in the Englund Report. The Englund Study modified the Senate document in several ways. The basic element of through-routing trains between Northern Virginia and Maryland was maintained. However, service on the Southern Railroad was found not feasible for economic and operational reasons. For example, Southern's service would compete with the Shirley Highway Express buses which tap a similar market area, and railroad station locations are not well suited for ease of road access or parking potential. The basic system out-



lined by Englund includes the existing Penn-Central Baltimore-Washington service supplemented by future electrification of the tunnel under First Street so that trains could operate through Southwest Washington to the Crystal City area. The B&O service would be interlined or through-routed from Gaithersburg, Maryland to Quantico, Virginia on the Richmond, Fredericksburg and Potomac Railroad. He also recommended that one round trip be operated West of Gaithersburg to Martinsburg, West Virginia approximately 73 miles from D.C. Englund estimates, quite conservatively, that 12-14,000 weekday trips would be handled on the whole system during the first year. The first year operational deficit is estimated to be \$500,000, decreasing to approximately \$300,000 over a three year period as ridership increased. Recommendations for management of the commuter service included, Metropolitan Washington Council of Government (COG), a special authority created by Congress or WMATA.

Englund specifically stated that the rail commuter operation should not attempt to handle transit-type ridership from close-in areas to the CBD. The service would be designed to expedite trips to and from communities outside the current bus dominated zones. The rail service is designed to act as a long-haul feeder to the METRO for local distribution. How can this system succeed? Success is predicated on high equipment and crew utilization, elimination of some currently little-used stops, and renegotiated Washington Union Terminal charges. In comparison with the Senate Public Works Committee Report the deficit for the Englund proposal is 75% less and the ridership 100% greater than the 1968 report estimated. It should be noted that the rail mileage recommended by Englund is less because service is not provided on the Southern Railroad or B&O Baltimore Branch. I have only highlighted the Englund report and recommend that you read it, if you have not already done so.

Now, let's talk about the existing commuter service, its impact on D.C. and what might happen in the future. Not many persons in the Washington Metropolitan area know about the existing commuter rail service except the approximately 1300 persons who use it daily, but the Penn-Central and Baltimore and Ohio Railroads operate limited weekday only commuter service into Washington Union Station. Penn-Central operates 2 round trips daily that make local stops between Baltimore and Washington. The stations, for the most part, are unmarked except for a crude ground level slab or gravel serving as a platform. The cars used were built as steam locomotive hauled coaches between 1910 and 1920. They were electrified in the 1930's, and are not air-conditioned.

The B&O operates services on two lines into Washington. Three round-trips operate on the Baltimore-Washington line via Laurel. Not included is one reverse commutation train that runs to Baltimore in the morning and in to D.C. in the evening. There are two round trips operated on the line from Brunswick, Maryland to D.C. via Germantown, Gaithersburg, Rockville and Silver Spring. An additional round trip operates from Martinsburg, West Virginia to D.C. and back.

The combined ridership of approximately 1300 one-way riders amounts to about 1/2% of the total journey-to-work movement to the District, and some 1.3% of mass transit patronage. Approximately 60% of rush hour travel is accomplished by private automobile with public transportation providing the balance. There are several deterrents to expanding or even maximizing the limited existing commuter rail service. First, the less than desirable location of Washington Union Station coupled with a poor

distribution system to work locations; second, lack of rail service to many large or growing suburban residential areas; third, lack of additional rail equipment that could be added to existing trains, and finally a "Catch 22" situation—The railroads are not eager to add more cars even if they were available to accommodate present extreme overcrowding on certain trains because of an approximately \$40 per car charge levied on each car entering and leaving Washington Union Station. This charge is assessed to pay the high station operating expenses. Thus, adding one car at \$80 a day adds 45c to the cost of each seat sold, without the addition of increased railroad crew costs. Adding more cars, assuming they were available, would possibly solve the standee problem, but would drive the current deficits even higher, an untenable position for the railroads.

Lack of a comprehensive rail commuter system has contributed to a highly dispersed pattern of land use, particularly residential, in the Metropolitan area. This dispersed pattern is sharply contrasted to the development corridors that have grown along railroad rights-of-way in Chicago, New York and Philadelphia where extensive commuter service has been provided for many years. The typical Washington scatter pattern inhibits somewhat the requirement for a sizable volume of riders having relatively common origins and destinations. Nevertheless, I believe that a commuter rail system providing for a minimum of 12-14,000 trips daily at a modest deficit with potential for expansion at minimal capital investment would more than justify its existence.

The major capital investment has already been made in the railroad rights-of-way and fixed facilities. The Englund plan requires \$15 to \$20 million to provide 142 route miles of commuter rail service. This \$15-\$20 million would buy 1800 additional parking spaces, minimal new station facilities consisting principally of modern protected shelters with infra-red lights for winter heating, minor changes necessary to the railroad's physical plant, 7 new diesel locomotives and 48 air-conditioned coaches some equipped with cabs for push-pull operation. The same \$15 to \$20 million would build perhaps one mile of rapid transit subway or urban highway!

Now, the most obvious question is why isn't anything happening? Why don't we have an expanded commuter rail system in the Washington area? The problems or the reasons are not technological, but are institutional in nature. Washington is a particularly difficult area to accomplish projects encompassing more than one political jurisdiction. In the case of commuter rail there are several public agencies that could conceivably take-over and operate such a service. WMATA is the first that comes to mind. However, WMATA is not particularly interested in any projects which might detract from building a subway. Moreover, its jurisdiction does not extend as far as Baltimore, Gaithersburg, or Quantico. Nor does WMATA have the legal authority to operate anything, even the subway system. It was chartered only to build the system. WMATA's enabling legislation would have to be amended to include operating a commuter rail system beyond its present boundaries. WMATA probably would be eligible to receive a two-thirds capital assistance grant from the Urban Mass Transportation Administration to help fund costs of new commuter cars, and other physical changes necessary to implement service. The Washington Metropolitan Area Council of Governments is also an eligible public body to receive Federal assistance. However, COG is primarily a planning agency, and would have to augment its staff considerably in order to acquire capability to operate a transit system.

Another approach to an operating agency with regional jurisdiction is for Congress to create one. Activation of a National Capital Commuter Rail Authority would go a long way toward solving the major barrier toward implementing the Englund plan. This new agency would probably be eligible to receive Federal capital assistance, would administer and operate or contract with the railroads to operate the service, and would receive subsidy payments from Virginia, Maryland and D.C. offset deficits. However, before legislation could be brought to the floor of Congress an interstate compact between Maryland, Virginia, and the District of Columbia would have to be worked out, a rather unlikely or at least time-consuming prospect. I should also add that creation of this agency is merely a first step. Other major obstacles remain to be overcome, specifically negotiations regarding Union Station terminal charges, railroad work rules, etc.

Probably the most feasible method of taking the first step is for the states involved to takeover, contract for, or subsidize the existing service. Maryland is the logical state to make the first move in view of the fact that 90% of the existing service is between Maryland points and the District. Perhaps after Maryland has assumed responsibility for service North of the District, agreement can be reached with the State of Virginia in order to implement through service South of D.C. into the Northern Virginia suburbs. The first step is of course the hardest to take. Unquestionably it is only a matter of time if nothing is done before the Railroads apply to the ICC to discontinue the existing service.

I will conclude with a brief discussion on the specific topic of today's meeting: the impact of commuter rail service on downtown Washington. What are the origin zones of suburban commuters? The majority of existing and potential rail commuters from outside the District borders live within 7 to 15 miles radius of their place of employment. Prior studies made in Boston, Philadelphia and Chicago determined that for distances of approximately 15 miles from the CBD, the commuter rail market is confined to relatively narrow corridors. Within these corridors, the envelope of attraction is limited to approximately two miles distance from the rail line. However, it was also found that rail prone commuters will drive relatively long distances to reach a rail line than will deliver them close to place of work. Rail use for commutation tapered off almost completely for trips destined to points more than ten minutes away from the terminal point, either by walking or by transit.

There are four deterrents to maximizing current rail commutation: (1) the poor location of Union Station relative to major employment centers, (2) lack of adequate feeder bus service to and from Union Station, (3) lack of additional railroad commuter cars, and (4) the long amount of time it takes for existing buses serving Union Station to reach downtown Washington. However, assuming a revitalized and restructured commuter system is established the latter problems can be resolved in order to correct the deficient Union Station location. The Washington Metro's first revenue service line will serve Union Station downtown Washington and the growing Connecticut Avenue area via Judiciary Square, Gallery Place (7th and G Streets), 12th and G Streets, Farragut Square and DuPont Circle.

Therefore, a perfect distributor system to Washington's CBD and adjacent employment centers will exist in 1974 if all goes according to schedule. One of the most significant work population centers located in a relatively small area, Southwest Mall, is not now directly served by bus service in the peak rush hours. Southwest workers arriving at Union Station must use taxis or two buses.

This situation is all the more ludicrous because the D.C. Transit M-1 Union Station/State Department bus which links Southwest with the Station currently operates in non-rush hours only! It is also one of D.C. Transit's best kept secrets since it has not been publicized for a considerable period of time. Should commuter rail service be extended through the First Street tunnel into Southwest, shuttle bus service could operate from the Southwest Station to various buildings in that area. Assuming the Englund commuter plan is implemented, or even a modified version of it, there is no reason why a large and growing ridership won't be attracted to modern, efficient, virtually pollution-free mass transportation. Ease of access to downtown D.C. at reasonable cost will immeasurably benefit that area.

In summary, commuter rail service is complementary to Metro, not competitive to it; many rail commuters will undoubtedly use Metro for short distances as a distributor to place of work. Commuter rail service is consistent with the metropolitan goal of reducing the increasingly burdensome fraction factor in the journey-to-work. It makes sense because the capital investment needed to serve 15,000 to 20,000 person trips daily is infinitesimal in relation to the cost of more highways. Commuter rail service will make downtown Washington an even more pleasant place in which to work and shop. Implementation of commuter rail service may stimulate the development and redevelopment of the area surrounding Union Station. It could possibly assist in reshaping current suburban land-use patterns on a more rational basis. In short, the subject has been studied enough; it is time for action.

#### MISS ANN S. RAMSEY CHOSEN AS ONE OF WHITE HOUSE FELLOWS

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, as one of the original members of the Commission on White House Fellows, I am very grateful that Miss Ann S. Ramsay, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Donald A. Ramsay, Portland, Maine, has been chosen as one of the 17 1972-73 White House Fellows.

She was chosen from a field of 1,509 candidates.

I am proud of her for more than one reason. As I am the only woman in the Senate, she is the only woman in the 1972-73 group. As I am a nondegree holder—earned degree—she is the first nondegree holder to receive the fellowship.

However, Miss Ramsay was graduated from Deering High School in Portland, Maine in 1961 and attended Skidmore College, the University of Vermont, and Hunter College for a total period of 5 years. Her field of specialty is mental health in which she is an outstanding leader.

I salute Ann Ramsay of whom Maine is very proud in this great achievement of hers.

#### THE VALUE OF A HIGH SCHOOL EDUCATION

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, this month, as commencement ceremonies are conducted throughout the Nation, it is especially appropriate to reflect on the value of an American high school education to those who receive it.

We should reflect as well on the very

great cost of failure to graduate—both to those who fail and to society as a whole. And more than a million students will fail to graduate with their class this spring.

I invite the attention of Senators to a recent editorial entitled "High School Days Golden for Many," published in the Duluth, Minn., Herald of May 16. The editorial's thoughtful comments concerning the report "The Costs to the Nation of Inadequate Education," recently issued by the Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, on which I serve as chairman, should be of interest to all those concerned with public education in this country. 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:

#### HIGH SCHOOL DAYS GOLDEN FOR MANY

Sen. Mondale, D-Minn., chairman of a Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity, performs a timely service. He calls attention to a report, released by his committee, on the money lost to Americans and their government through noncompletion of high school.

Prof. Henry Levin of Stanford University has made calculations on the basis of 3.18 million American men who did not graduate from high school. They are in the 25-34 age group. This lack of education will cost them \$237 billion in lost income. That means a \$75 billion tax loss for our various layers of government.

Like other shocking sums, these statistics seem like conservative estimates. Accompanying estimates of added welfare costs and costs for crimes committed by the undereducated seem more "iffy." A conjecture at the cost of providing high school opportunity is also hard to follow. We all know some who would have cost the community almost nothing if they had used existing facilities and space which was there.

But the main point is beyond dispute: Time in high school will bring good returns for almost everyone, even though these must be shared with the alert and hungry governments which surround us.

It might be worth while to commission Prof. Levin to add a hypothetical supplement. What have we lost, in earnings and tax-paying power alone, by the decline of many high school standards in this century? In some departments those early high schools compared with many college departments of today. A dilution of requirements and a more genial atmosphere probably kept a higher proportion of students in school, but it surely alienated some and turned others away from habits of serious study.

Educational inflation can affect courses and grades and erode a diploma's value. The parallel with money inflation does not end there. If people were better taught, and remembered their lessons, there would be more resistance to both kinds of inflation. Also, there was a kind of sturdiness in surviving the grim examinations of an old-time high school that few Americans now alive ever had the chance to acquire.

#### BILL BOWERMAN: 1972 OLYMPIC TRACK AND FIELD COACH

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I have commented before in the Senate about the choice by the U.S. Olympic Committee of a good friend of mine, Mr. Bill

Bowerman, to serve as the coach of the U.S. track and field team next fall in Munich. I doubt whether one could find an Oregonian with anything but lavish praise for the choice of a coach. Bill Bowerman's fans throughout our State are legion, and his successes over the years in developing fine young men, who happen to be track athletes, stands by itself. I have known many of the world-class athletes who have attended the University of Oregon and have fallen under the "Bowerman spell," and they are outstanding young men in all facets of their lives, as well as being superior athletes.

Recently, the Portland Oregonian, on June 4, 1972, published a long story on Bill Bowerman, written by Leo Davis, who I believe covers track and field for the Oregonian.

The article touches on facets of Bill's personality that I am well aware of. If there ever was a redtape hater, it is Bill Bowerman. If there ever was a coach to ignore a potential athlete's past press clippings and look instead at his character, it is Bill Bowerman.

I ask unanimous consent that the article, written by Leo Davis, be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### HE'S NOT JUST PLAIN BILL

(By Leo Davis)

Examined in context, William J. Bowerman was the only logical choice to shepherd our Olympians in Munich.

Long before the brass hats came to terms with conscience and voted accordingly, the University of Oregon coach had won his colleagues' respect and admiration for 30 years of service that produced NCAA champions, Olympic medalists and world record holders. Election was inevitable. So was his reaction.

"To be named head of an Olympic track and field team is the greatest honor a coach can receive," pronounced Bowerman. And permitted himself to be dragged, figuratively, to his date with destiny.

Since Bill subscribes without reservation to the sentiment expressed in that acceptance, it is natural to assume his appointment was a calculated reward for a job well done. A consummation of the marriage between talent and goal-pace philosophy.

Not so, he protested. "It was never my intention to become an Olympic coach. I've already accomplished a good deal more than I ever thought I would. I like to work with athletes but I hate red tape and I didn't give a damn about the position."

Bill was persuaded to campaign for the job by a "couple of guys who said I owed it to the people of Oregon."

Record supports his nomination but not his reluctance. To come to grips with that un-Bowermanlike falling, look beyond the record.

The Oregon coach needs Munich like Munich needs another brewery, he has left little undone. But in the doing he created a complex character difficult to portray, harder to predict.

He has been damned as a tyrant and applauded as a genius. He might be neither, he could be both.

Bowerman has coached more sub-four milers than any man in history. Detractors insist his proteges run from not for him.



He pioneered better shoes, lighter uniforms, faster tracks and been accused of gimmickry.

He has written books, lectured abroad, fought bitterly at home against power monopolies. And been censured for ego trips.

Which Bowerman is Munich bent? The one who planted a charge of low grade dynamite at his mailbox to discourage a bullying truck driver? Major Bowerman of the 10th Mountain Ski Troops who cut through Army red tape with a bullet? Or Bill Bowerman who shops through the valley for a used house trailer so his asthmatic miller can stay a step ahead of the pollen count?

When a capricious truck driver persisted in knocking down his mailbox, Bill planted explosives to protest the invasion of privacy. And when his mules got away in Italy and the platoon brought back one too many, Bill balanced the Army's books as befits a man who hates anything in triplicate except four-minute millers.

Name droppers get short shrift from William J., but he has unlimited time and energy for worthwhile causes. It has Bowerman, in 1968 at South Lake Tahoe, who gave the fight against sickle cell anemia some early impetus. It is Bowerman who takes time from his 26-hour days to help wage war against asthma.

At the pinnacle now, after 30 years, he says, "don't ever call me coach." Yet that's all he ever really wanted to be.

After graduation (Oregon, class of 1935), Bill moved to Portland and accepted a teaching job at Franklin High. It was, he said, said, intended as a stopgap. Medicine was his goal and he meant to finance the study by teaching a couple of years. "I was too dumb and too proud to accept help from my Dad."

He wasn't too proud to serve without pay as assistant track coach, though, nor too dumb to recognize opportunity when Medford made him an offer. He accepted and the world lost a fine doctor.

In nine seasons at Medford Bowerman's football teams had a 64-8-3 record and won three state championships. "I think I was a good football coach. In fact Oregon asked me to apply when it hired Jim Alken but I never had any intention of making that my profession."

Track and field caught his fancy. Under him, Medford won three state titles and Colonel Bill Hayward, then at Oregon, loaned a persuasive voice to influence the final decision.

The Bowerman philosophy is now 30 years in the making and still undergoing constant change. Track and field men spend most of their competitive lives alone. They are thinkers as well as doers; they know themselves. And Bill Bowerman has borrowed freely of that knowledge.

Pete Mundle taught him an early lesson. "Pete wasn't much of a runner," Bill said. "In fact I told him that since he was a pretty good golfer he should concentrate there."

"But Pete was determined to run the mile for Oregon. He took a bunch of material I'd collected on running, condensed it into a paper and in the process made himself a miller. He set the Oregon record (since broken) and learned a lesson."

Bowerman, on a state department tour in 1956, borrowed from an indigent but industrious Pakistani and brought back a technique which he implemented to improve his hurdlers.

Tired of waiting for somebody to produce a better track shoe, he attacked the problem himself. "What I wanted was better fit, lightness and durability" At that time the American shoe weighed eight to ten ounces—figure out how much poundage that is in a mile race.

"So I went to a shoemaker and asked how do I make a shoe? He said 'you can't.' But if I could how would I start? He told me to get a last and I did."

Buck Knight wore the first Bowerman shoes. "Otis Davis borrowed them one day and liked them so much he wouldn't give them back. Otis wore my shoes when he won the gold medal and set a world record for 400 meters in the 1960 Olympics in Rome."

Bill Dellinger, now Bowerman's assistant at Oregon, was wearing them in Tokyo when he won a bronze in the 5,000 meters and Bill's proteges, Jim Grelle and Dave Edstrom, were similarly shod in their Olympic bids.

Ducks still wear them. Current models weigh maybe four ounces, still short of Bill's ideal, but serviceable. He's working on a spikeless shoe at the moment and it shows promise. "They're fine for long races but have a tendency to slip in the sprints."

Also in the works is a football shoe for use on artificial surfaces. Bowerman is reluctant to talk, says only he ran into a snag when "I ruined my wife's waffle iron and had to move the laboratory to the garage."

It was Bowerman who recycled old tires to experiment with rubber runways and it was Bowerman who tried his hand at tailoring because track and field uniforms didn't suit him.

Past Olympians, in his words, have "looked good but the uniform isn't worth a damn for competition." This year the United States Olympic Committee may follow a trail Bill blazed years ago and put the team in something serviceable as well as spectacular.

For lay purposes Bowerman outlines his coaching theories in terms of goal pace. "If I want a man to reach the moon he must shoot for it." With goal in mind he charts a pace, based on potential. "I don't tell him to run this fast or win that race, I just ask him to deliver on his promise."

Once the trials in Eugene are concluded and the United States team chosen, everybody will share a common goal pace and for all practical purposes William J. Bowerman will cease to coach. The team he takes to Munich will have proven itself in the toughest kind of competition imaginable and his role will be more a counselor.

He harbors no illusions about his part. "When a man is this far along in his development there is no reason to force coaching on him. We aren't about to change something someone has found successful."

Nor does Bowerman entertain any illusions about his responsibility. "Our job is to expedite. Our position will be to look after the athletes."

At that point he begins to have reservations about the "greatest honor a coach can receive." At South Lake Tahoe in 1968 where he supervised high altitude testing and training, Bill ran the full gamut of red tape. He wound up a keeper of the peace, a trouble shooter, a buffer. He has as much patience with that role as he had with the truck driver and the extra mule.

Some observers foresee an American disaster in Munich, citing the results of the 1971 European championships as evidence the world has caught and maybe overtaken the United States. Bowerman would be last to deny the challenge. He says "it will be a dog fight." Says the United States will send its best team ever and faces its toughest fight ever.

He does not, however, anticipate disaster. "I've coached for 30 years and regardless of the team, if the spirit is there and the communication good there's almost no way this team can fail."

Communication will be good, depend on it. Bill weathered boycott threats and minor mutinies at Tahoe. He has a way of making himself understood.

Gone is Bowerman's reluctance. He complains about red tape, resents the intrusion of countless details, is pressed for time to do his jogging. But the XXth Olympiad is a worthy challenge and his commitment is without reservation.

Depending on their knowledge, people will interpret his appointment as a triumph of talent, or honesty is the best policy, or of where there's a will there's a way. Or occasionally as dumb luck.

But it's best said by paraphrasing an English statesman.

"A man has no permanent friends and no permanent enemies, just permanent interests."

Reluctance was no match for Bill's permanent interests.

#### SALT TREATY SHOULD BE OPPOSED UNLESS IT REDUCES MILITARY SPENDING

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, the Strategic Arms Limitation Treaty entered into between the United States and the Soviet Union is obviously of great significance. I welcome this agreement as a harbinger of better relations between the Russians and ourselves. More importantly, the treaty can have far-reaching effects and, if it is ratified by the Senate and implemented on both sides, could be a real step toward world peace.

But there are many questions to be answered about this agreement and the recent statements by the Secretary of Defense with regard to the Pentagon's plans for new weapons systems and qualitative improvements on existing weapons have caused me great concern.

I am not prepared to support the Moscow treaty until I know how much it will cost the taxpayer.

I will withhold my support of the arms limitation agreement until the administration discloses the full impact it will have on future defense spending.

For SALT to be worth its salt, it should produce the results that proponents have always claimed for mutual arms limitation agreements.

The Nixon administration ought to be able to demonstrate that the Moscow agreement will slow down the arms race and reduce the heavy burden of defense spending.

Statements by Defense Secretary Laird and other Pentagon spokesmen have so far shown that there will be little, if any, immediate savings from SALT and that defense spending might go up while the agreement is in effect.

The Pentagon's estimates of the impact of SALT on defense needs are illogical and unreasonable.

The Moscow treaty should not be seen as an excuse to abandon rational defense planning or as a club to force congressional approval for new and accelerated weapons programs.

Since the treaty was signed, we have been told that the two ABM sites agreed upon in the summit talks will cost more than the 12-site program originally planned, that large sums will be requested to develop a successor to the current ABM program, that the acceleration of the Trident submarine and the B-1

bomber will go forward, that part of the money saved by cutting back on the ABM will be used to work on a new submarine-based missile, and that the costs of the Vietnam war may rise by \$5 billion because of the increased activities there.

The funds for the new requests, on top of an already swollen defense budget, can only be obtained by cutting back on vital domestic programs, increasing taxes, or running up a larger deficit.

The administration may be guilty of a major miscalculation if it believes Congress and the public will buy SALT "at any price."

The President cannot have it both ways. He cannot present himself as a "peace" man from the White House while his Defense Secretary pushes war spending on Capitol Hill.

Defense spending ought to be reduced as a result of the Moscow treaty and the savings passed on to the taxpayer.

One of the best analyses I have seen so far of the effects that SALT can have on future defense spending is contained in an article by Alton H. Quanbeck and Barry M. Blechman that appeared in the Washington Post June 4, 1972.

In addition to showing the projected strategic balance in mid-1977, at the expiration of the new 5-year agreement on offensive weapons, the authors have constructed a most useful table showing the potential savings that could result if the spirit of the Moscow treaty is lived up to. The article suggests a net potential annual savings of \$4.3 billion as a result of SALT. These savings could occur if we do not deploy an ABM system for Washington, D.C., if the development of Trident is slowed down, and if we limit our air defense system to a surveillance role.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article entitled "The Arms Accords: Everyone Gains" be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE ARMS ACCORDS: EVERYONE GAINS  
(By Alton H. Quanbeck and Barry M. Blechman)

The strategic arms limitation agreements signed in Moscow a week ago are landmark accords, symbolizing a marked reduction of U.S.-Soviet rivalry in strategic armaments and formalizing the mutual acceptance of overall nuclear parity. While the specific limits on weapons systems incorporated in the agreements are important in their own right and will result in greater security and substantial economies for both nations, the significance of the agreements, as stated by Henry Kissinger, "transcends the importance of individual restrictions." Most importantly, by explicitly agreeing to forego nationwide population defenses, the signatories have removed the greatest threat to each other's deterrent. In themselves, therefore, these accords are major steps toward stabilizing the strategic relationship.

Two agreements have been concluded: One, a formal treaty of unlimited duration, limits the development of anti-ballistic missile systems (ABM); the second, a five-year executive agreement, limits offensive missiles.

It is unfortunate that in the domestic de-

bate over the advisability of these agreements, the overall sufficiency of U.S. strategic forces and our technological superiority will be largely ignored. The fact is that we have sufficient forces to deter potential enemies, singly or in combination. The large number of U.S. nuclear weapons carried by diverse delivery systems assures that even in retaliation to a preemptive first strike, enough weapons would survive to destroy the attacker's population and industrial base. Our technology lead insures that this will be the case for the indefinite future.

Critics of the agreement will argue, based on simple comparisons of numbers of launchers, that the United States is frozen into a position of inferiority. In fact, however, the United States is better off, by any measure, with the agreements than without them.

The table appearing on page B4 projects the strategic balance for mid-1977, both with and without an agreement. If the momentum of the Soviet missile building program had not been stopped, the U.S.S.R. by that time would have almost twice as many missiles as would the United States. To counter this buildup, the United States could have chosen to launch a new building program of its own, at great expense and with no assurance of greater security. The Moscow accords offer a much more favorable outcome.

Although the Soviets will still have 2,300 launchers compared to 1,700 for the United States, the ongoing U.S. MIRV program will ensure a substantial margin of missile-deliverable warheads in favor of the United States. Number of warheads together with equivalent megatons (EMT, an index of nuclear weapon destructive potential) provide much better measures of deterrent capability than number of missiles alone. The restraints provided by the agreements on projected Soviet capabilities are particularly apparent in the projected EMT index.

There is no possibility that the Soviets can reverse the U.S. advantage in number of warheads over the course of this decade. Although the Moscow agreements do not prevent the Soviets from replacing their present warheads with MIRVs, both their submarine-launched missiles and SS-11 land-based missiles are too small for effective conversions. Any Soviet MIRV program is likely to be restricted to the approximately 300 large SS-9 missiles, the unidentified missile for some new silos under construction, or a follow-on to current sea-based systems. In any case, U.S. defense officials indicate the U.S.S.R. is unlikely to achieve the requisite technology before 1980, long after the duration of the present agreements.

Furthermore, the United States has a larger more modern and more survivable bomber force than do the Soviets. These forces are not limited by the Moscow agreements. Soviet strategic bombers, which entered service in 1956, are comparable to aircraft that were phased out by the United States many years ago. In addition, the late model U.S. B-52 strategic bombers are now being equipped with up to 20 short-range attack missiles (SRAM). The Soviets have not demonstrated any comparable capability.

#### MOSCOW'S TRADEOFF

In a more general context, the agreements provide substantial benefits for both countries.

From the Soviet perspective, the accords establish the U.S.S.R. as a great power second to none, and the strategic equal of the United States. The agreements and other documents issued during the summit represent formal recognition of this status by the United States, and our acceptance of nuclear

parity. Such recognition has long been an important objective in Soviet foreign policy.

Second, the agreement terminates the U.S. deployment of the Safeguard ABM, a system which the Soviets may see as potentially negating the advantages of their offensive missile buildup. Third, the agreements give the Soviets numerical superiority in both land and sea-based offensive missile launchers, an advantage which they may believe will yield political dividends.

To obtain these advantages the U.S.S.R. has made considerable concessions. The Soviets had to accept the United States technological lead; our advantage in warheads, for example, will continue to grow. It has not been able to restrict our great advantage in strategic bombers, nor limit our deployment of forward-based systems (land- and sea-based tactical aircraft capable of carrying nuclear weapons to the Soviet Union due to their deployment in Europe and elsewhere). The latter, especially, provided considerable delay in the negotiations, reflecting its importance to the U.S.S.R.

The advantages of the agreements from the United States' perspective stem from two sources. First, they will result in considerable dollar savings. Much more importantly, however, the agreements effectively constrain the momentum of the strategic arms buildup which has been underway in the Soviet Union since 1965. Since that year, the U.S.S.R. has deployed more than 1,200 ICBMs and 25 modern strategic submarines (Yankee class). An additional 17-18 Yankee subs are under construction.

The buildup had reached such alarming proportions that some were beginning to fear the Soviets' quantitative superiority would overwhelm the United States' technological advantages and gain for Moscow substantial political, if not military, advantages. Even though the agreements permit the Soviets to deploy up to 62 missile-firing submarines, they terminate this buildup below potential uncontrolled levels, and are a more effective counter than similar deployments by this nation. This is particularly true since new U.S. strategic systems such as Trident and B-1 would not be deployed before the late 1970s, even under the accelerated schedules announced by the administration this past winter.

More importantly, both nations benefit by the change in attitudes reflected in the agreement. The superpowers have clearly indicated their determination to reduce the risk of nuclear war and, as stated in the joint communique issued at the end of the President's visit, "to contribute to the relaxation of international tension and the strengthening of confidence between states."

#### NEW OPTIONS FOR U.S.

The Moscow accords directly curtail the Safeguard system to two sites, one at a Minuteman site (now under construction at Grand Forks AFB, N.D.), the other around Washington. Beyond that, the achievement of these agreements should cause reconsideration of some of the major strategic programs presently planned.

On the one hand, we will want to continue certain programs in order to hedge against the unexpected and to modernize or replace existing systems. The Minuteman II and Poseidon MIRV programs are likely to fall into this group. Additionally, there probably will be increased spending on basic research for strategic systems as well as for increased strategic reconnaissance.

On the other hand, because of new explicit constraints on Soviet deployments and because of our improved understanding of Soviet intentions, it may be desirable to modify or redirect other major programs. Some possibilities are:



Since it is no longer necessary to accelerate the development of Trident (a new submarine system incorporating a long-range missile) as a bargaining chip, or to match the Soviets in seabased missiles, should the program revert to its earlier slower schedule? Furthermore, should we reconsider the characteristics of the new submarines?

Is it necessary or desirable to plan to defend Washington with ABMs, even though it is permitted under the agreement? The survivability of our national leadership now depends on airborne command posts together with an extensive and redundant communications net.

Since both sides now have agreed to forego nationwide defenses of their population against missiles, there is little point in trying to protect cities against Soviet bombers. Should we reduce our objectives for air defenses to a surveillance role against unauthorized penetration of U.S. air space and defense against light attack?

While answers to these questions are only partly dependent upon the agreements, a new element has been introduced into the strategic calculation which requires careful evaluation. Potential savings realizable from these measures are estimated in the table below, expressed in terms of average annual savings from fiscal 1973 to fiscal 1979, in billions of fiscal 1973 dollars:

Direct result:	
Limit ABM deployment to two sites.....	Savings \$1.4
Other possible actions:	
Do not deploy ABM defense for D.C.....	.2
Slow down Trident development.....	1.0
Limit air defense to surveillance role.....	2.2
Gross potential annual savings.....	4.8
Incremental Spending for Additional Surveillance and Research.....	.5
Net potential annual savings.....	4.3

#### AGENDA FOR SALT II

Negotiations on further arms limitations are likely to be prolonged and difficult. The prominent issues remaining are complicated and involve forces and concepts that are hard to define and isolate.

Topics likely to be discussed at future SALT meetings include possible limits on forward-based systems, bombers, land-mobile ICBMs, air defenses, anti-submarine warfare forces, and intermediate range missiles. Additionally, one would expect that the two sides will eventually discuss mutual force reductions in strategic systems already limited.

One of the problems most likely to be resolved in the follow-on negotiations concerns the mutual vulnerability of both sides' land-based missiles. Conceivably, improvements in missile accuracy and warhead proliferation could still lead to the attainment of a counterforce capability against the land-based component in either the U.S. or Soviet strategic force. Such a development could be destabilizing.

Two forms of limitations would ameliorate these problems: reductions in the number of deployed warheads, and mutual agreement to shift land-based missiles to sea, or simply to phase them out altogether. In this sense, the provision in the present agreement permitting the shift of older land-based missiles to sea is an important precedent.

While these subjects are made difficult by problems of definition, verification and the interrelationship of strategic and general purpose forces the atmosphere of cooperation engendered by the Moscow agreements and the summit in general should help ease these difficulties. In any case, independent of any future agreements, the measures

agreed upon in Moscow are major steps in assuring the security of this nation.

The following table estimates the projected strategic balance in mid-1977, at the expiration of the new 5-year agreement on offensive weapons, based on administration statements about present U.S. planning and on observed deployment rates for Soviet systems:

	Without Moscow agreement		Under Moscow agreement	
	U.S.S.R.	U.S.	U.S.S.R.	U.S.
Land-based missiles.....	1,900	1,054	1,330	1,000
Sea-based missiles.....	1,200	656	950	710
Heavy bombers.....	140	500	140	500
Deployed strategic warheads.....	3,400	11,000	2,600	11,000
Equivalent megatonnage.....	5,500	4,550	4,000	4,450

Note: Weapons characteristics based on the International Institute for Strategic Studies' "The Military Balance, 1971-72."

### THE DECLINING SUPPLY OF U.S. MINERAL RESOURCES

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, at the recent meeting of the American Iron & Steel Institute, a presentation was made which vividly illustrates our declining supply of mineral resources. In this speech, Mr. E. F. Andrews, vice president of Allegheny Ludlum Industries emphasizes the need for a comprehensive national mineral resources policy, stressing Government cooperation with mining and basic production industries. His views deserve the consideration of the Senate. For that reason I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Andrews' presentation be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### AMERICA—FROM HAVE TO HAVE NOT

(By E. F. Andrews, Chairman, Committee on Critical Materials Supply, Vice President, Purchases, Allegheny Ludlum Industries, Inc.)

When our forefathers established this Republic 200 years ago, the word undoubtedly went throughout the world that the "land of plenty" had been found. For many years, this, in fact, was true. We took a land where one million Indians were virtually starving to death and created a situation where 200 million people have as a major problem the storing of their surpluses. It is the first nation in history with more people dying from obesity than from starvation, the first nation with more school teachers than farmers, the nation with the largest percentage of the world's goods, with an economy three times larger than all the countries of South America added together. And, except for a brief period during World War I, we were a net exporter of minerals. America—the land of plenty.

However, during World War II and the Korean conflict, this country began to get its first taste of material shortages. As we entered the decade of the '60's, this industry could foresee developing material problems and established the Critical Materials Supply Committee of the Institute, with the express purpose of forecasting raw material supply problems and, insofar as possible, avoiding them.

Historically, the manufacture of iron and steel has required the mining, transporting, storing, and consuming of raw materials in

volumes triple that of the molten metals derived. Since steel is not a single homogeneous substance, the long-term supply of needed raw materials and the problems relating to their availability are matters of considerable importance to this industry.

During the 1960's, in spite of the fact that we were not prosecuting a war of the magnitude of World War II, a very large number of the items essential to the making of our products were, at some time or another during the decade, in short supply. Among these were molybdenum, vanadium fluorspar, nickel, chrome, copper, coal, tin, zinc. The causes of these shortages stem from defense needs, labor problems, international actions, changes in technology, and environmental quality control programs (use of metallurgical coal by utilities).

As we enter the '70's, a period of relative ease is being enjoyed. Unfortunately, this period of ease is primarily caused by a general world-wide economic slowdown. However, a very quick review of the immediate situation is in order.

Your Critical Materials Supply Committee members report that, except for three items, there is no immediate problem insofar as availability is concerned. Three items are worthy of note.

The first is nickel. This item remained a critical material throughout a very large part of the last decade. Due primarily to an economic slowdown in our industry, producer and consumer inventories are as large as they have ever been in history and a substantial share of established productive capacity is shut down. However, a large share of the world's productive capacity will have labor contracts expiring at midyear. Thus, while no problem is anticipated, protective inventory policy is advised.

The second item worth note is zinc. In the past three years, the domestic zinc industry has closed productive capacities for slab zinc amounting to 400,000 tons/year. When and if the Great Falls, Montana, facility closes in July of this year, domestic capacities will be reduced to 730,000 N.T./year. Production cost increases, cost of pollution control equipment, and labor problems are blamed. The domestic demand for slab zinc is estimated to be about 1,300,000 N.T. Thus, a shortage of about 570,000 N.T./year is possible.

During the period from late February through March, a nearby shortage developed because of the confusion created among the domestic producers by the Canadian producers raising the price of prime western zinc by 1 cent per pound to 18 cents per pound. The domestic producers were under Phase II of the President's Economic Program. One producer filed its request with the Commission late in January and received permission to raise prices by 1 cent per pound March 15, 1972. In the meantime, domestic producers were requesting that the Price Commission declare zinc as an international commodity which action would have exempted zinc from Price Commission control. The Cost of Living Council ruled against this request which then meant the other major producer had to file for Price Commission approval.

Until approvals to raise prices were received, zinc was held off of the market by several domestic producers because they could not legally sell their product at the Metals Week average, which is standard practice. This action developed a nearby shortage of zinc. Hopefully, this manufactured shortage will be small when taken into consideration with total 1972 activities.

Although the domestic shortage on a yearly basis will be 570,000 N.T., it is expected that it will be made up in part by metal from

Japan, Canada, and the balance of the Free World, wherein production collectively is estimated to exceed consumption by 462,000 N.T./year. In addition, Congress has just recently freed an additional 515,000 N.T. of zinc from the stockpile. Although much of this metal will have to be upgraded, the stockpile metal, together with the available foreign metal should be sufficient to meet our needs through 1974 based on the following assumptions:

1. 4% yearly increase in demand.
  2. No further deterioration in domestic capacity from July, 1972.
  3. The estimated Free World excess metal can continue to come into the United States.
- Obviously, the above forecast sounds reasonably good; but it is based on the best of everything happening, including the building of new foreign smelters which, reports indicate, are being currently planned. At this moment, zinc is a semi-critical metal and could easily move into the critical stage. Therefore, it will bear constant watching by all concerned.

Also, we would be remiss if we did not take a moment to mention the general critical problem of energy.

There has been no shortage of speeches, testimony, opinions, statements and debate about the energy crisis. But there remains a very real shortage of energy supplies and a lack of concerted effort to provide direction for avoiding crisis. There is doubt the American public is really aware of the problem, and we still have not formulated a national energy policy which is aimed toward workable solutions. There are many government departments and agencies involved with energy policy, often working at cross purposes in the interests of consumers, industry groups or conservationists.

The problem of inadequate energy supplies will be with us for many years. Nuclear power probably cannot make a significant contribution until the 1980's when breeder reactors are expected to come into use. It appears that, during the next ten years, the traditional fossil fuels—oil, natural gas, and coal will carry the burden of providing our energy needs.

A serious shortage of natural gas already exists with widespread curtailments in service to industrial consumers in the immediate future. The utilization of coal is being limited by ecological considerations. Commercial coal gasification operation is probably ten years away; is expensive; and can make only a modest contribution to demand. Large additional supplies of oil will be required to fill the expanding needs.

To obtain these increased supplies of fuels, it will be necessary to go offshore. It is anticipated that one-half of our oil requirements will be imported by the mid-1980's and will be supplemented by high-cost, imported liquid natural gas. This solution raises obvious problems, such as dependence on possibly unreliable foreign sources, shortages in ocean transportation, and balance of payments.

Continuing pressures to protect the environment have delayed many proposed programs. For example, Alaskan gas and oil cannot be expected to reach the lower 48 states before 1975, and this may be optimistic. The nation is faced with possible brown outs this summer, in part due to conservationist groups and government regulations delaying nuclear plants from coming on stream as well as holding up construction permits on proposed new plants.

It is to be regretted that environmental overreacting has resulted in the establishment by various government agencies of regulations that, in many instances, cannot be met based on present technical knowledge. This is resulting in the massive shifting of utility fuel from coal, of which we

have abundant reserves, to foreign oil and gas at higher cost.

It is urgent in the energy crisis that we start making decisions. It is imperative that our government establish a national energy policy that will incorporate, but not be limited to, the following:

- (a) Provide additional financing for research and development of a liquid metal fast breeder reactor.
- (b) Provide expanded programs to convert coal into a clean gaseous fuel and provide financial support for projects to develop an economical means, if possible, of recovering sulphur oxide from stack gases.
- (c) Accelerate oil and gas lease sales on the outer continental shelf.
- (d) Set up a leasing program and financial support for the recovery of oil from our vast oil shale resources.
- (e) Develop long-range planning of electric power plant sites and establish acceptable locations for transmission of gas and oil line routes.

As you can see, with the exception of energy, our immediate situation is relatively good; and it is during times of relative ease that it is wise to address ourselves to the long-term problems. Here, the picture is not nearly as rosy.

For the recent White House Conference on the Future of Business, the Industrial Conference Board was asked to provide an economic forecast for the next eighteen years. If we can assume that this forecast is reasonably accurate, insofar as the growth in the economy is concerned, it presents to this industry some major supply problems. The uncertainties are influenced by such things as new resource discoveries; new technology; changes in the costs and prices of things people buy; shifts in needs, in tastes, in life styles. In spite of this, the requirements of a growing economy for raw materials can be portrayed in their overall dimension with tolerable limits of accuracy.

Metals present the greatest problems of future adequacy, for domestic ore reserves of the major metals are much smaller in relation to growth and anticipated domestic demand than is the case for fuels. The Department of Commerce notes that the demand for imported mineral raw materials will continue at an increasing rate. These rising imports and their impact on the balance of trade and the balance of payments is evident.

But our growing dependency upon imported raw materials is of immediate and primary concern to this industry. The United States is 100% dependent upon foreign sources for its chromite, columbium, mica, rutile, and tin—all essential, strategic materials. We are dependent upon foreign nations for 99% of our manganese; 98% of our platinum; 94% of our antimony; 93% of our cobalt; 91% of our bauxite; 87% of our nickel; 83% of our asbestos; 78% of our fluorspar; 58% of our zinc; 53% of our cadmium; 51% of our beryllium; 38% of our lead; 38% of our mercury; and 35% of our iron ore.

All of the above are essential items. According to the Department of Commerce, the United States may be dependent on foreign sources for up to 50% of its total mineral requirements. In 1970, we imported \$9 billion in minerals and exported \$5 billion. If the trend of the past 20 years continues, we will require mineral imports of \$60 billion by the year 2000. The trend toward our future dependence upon foreign sources is certainly cause for immediate concern.

Thus, the primary objective of this paper is to emphasize that the United States is no longer a surplus nation with regard to critical material supplies. This calls for a reordering of our priorities in this industry and in our

government. In general, we believe that the material policies of the government in the past have been too heavily influenced by political and social considerations and should be altered in order to give equal recognition to economic factors.

The cold facts are that the resource base of the United States has been, and is, declining. There are only a few ways to improve it. New resources could possibly be discovered; or new processes and techniques could be developed, permitting reduction in the need for primary materials. Presently under heavy study is an increase in the recycling of materials. Finally, there could be development of substitute materials. As you can see, all of these offer rather limited "sure fire" total answers to our problem. Let us examine five basic areas of concern.

#### INTERNATIONAL

It is recommended that an in-depth review of our national posture should be made to make certain that, as mentioned before, the economic considerations are weighted at least equally with political and social considerations when dealing with the developing nations, which contain great stores of raw materials. Certainly, the recent events involving chrome from Rhodesia, nickel from Cuba, tungsten from China, tin from Bolivia, cobalt from the Congo, and iron ore and copper from Chile are causes for re-examination.

International law lacks effective application in many such instances. The Court of International Justice does not take jurisdiction over disputes between governments and business corporations. Must the operation of American multinational enterprises continue to be restricted by the conflicts of national laws and the absence of international laws, or can we introduce parallel legislation into the national laws of groups of countries supporting the creation of a common code?

In other words, can the growing needs for multinationalism, so necessary for the private enterprise system and its material supply problems, be reconciled with the forces of nationalism in newly developing nations? The seriousness of our problem of future supply is compounded by the fact that demand for minerals is rising at a faster rate in many of these countries than in the United States. As a result, nations of the world are beginning to compete seriously for a rising share of a lessening world supply; and less developed countries are more aggressively promoting their own industrialization and are, therefore, increasingly more sensitive to "exploitation." It is true that many of these countries lack the technology to discover, extract, and market their resources; but they also mistrust and fear the business corporations that have such capital and management skills. Business and government must join hands immediately to solve this problem.

A review and study should be made with respect to our national posture on international cartels or agreements, such as the international tin agreement which impinges on world supplies. In this connection, it should be noted that the United States has lent considerable support to the Tin Agreement, even though not a participating member of the Agreement. Through its policy of withholding sales of surplus stockpile tin to domestic consumers, our Government has indirectly, but effectively, made us a virtual participant in the Agreement. Once a decision has been made, based on sound economic reasons, that it is to our best national interest not to join in an agreement, no agency of Government should have the unilateral power to impose that agreement on industry by such indirect methods, particularly on an item for which we are totally dependent on offshore sources.

Further on the international front, we feel that a complete review should be made to



examine the degree of our growing dependency for our raw materials on "unfriendly" nations. The Russians have been gaining an increasing share of our market in chrome and nickel. Now that the bamboo curtain has been penetrated, we are reminded that China is the large supplier of tungsten. Even though these materials may enter our markets in increasing quantities, one cannot help but be apprehensive about the increasing dependency upon these sources and its effect should some future international crises develop. And yet, Government actions in the last few years seem to be almost designed to push us in the direction of unfriendly sources.

#### GOVERNMENT AND BUSINESS RELATIONS

It seems to us that a foremost question that arises within most nations has to be the matter of relationship between government and business. The affiliation appears in various forms, ranging from nationally owned corporations in many European countries to the intertwined system in Japan, sometimes referred to as Japan, Inc. Whether it is necessary to move toward more formal arrangements, or whether merely holding hands at arms length is sufficient, needs serious restudy.

Recognition by government of industry's resource problems is essential. The Japanese Ministry of International Trade and Industry has just issued a white paper entitled, "The Outlook on Japan's Resource Problems." This paper states that their problem of obtaining a stable and adequate supply of raw materials of desirable quality, competitive with world conditions, is one of the most important issues facing Japan's economic development in the next decade and, thus becomes of the highest priority to the Japanese government. At a time when conditions cry out for more and more government concern about the health of business, we seem to be getting less and less. We do look forward with great hope to the National Materials Policy Commission's report, but are mindful that a report and action on a report are two different things. (We should note here that subsequent to the filing of this paper, this Commission's interim report has been released. It is a good start at setting forth the shortages that fact us and adds weight and urgency to what is said here.)

The Federal government has supported certain research and development programs in extractive metallurgy, use of secondary materials, etc., but Federal efforts must expand in scope. Consideration must be given to joint or cooperative programs to develop processes for utilizing off-grade or poor-grade minerals. This country does have some low-grade, unused chrome, vanadium, tungsten, manganese, and fluorspar. Making these economically feasible is an expensive but perhaps necessary venture. We should not confine such programs to our own country, but we should review the possibility of government and industry supporting each other throughout the world—as our international competitors are doing so successfully.

Should not the American government and industry move together as the Japanese government and industry recently did with regard to Turkish chromium? Here is a case where government and industry, acting in unison, developed a special assistance agreement, including financial and technical assistance to Turkey for establishing a ferrochrome alloy plant. In return, Japan will receive, among other things, one million tons of chrome ore. The United States has been for many years Turkey's principal customer for this product. We have been assured that we will continue to receive some material. Perhaps, in this instance, we have been protected. We may not fare so well the next time,

particularly if it becomes necessary to deal with less sophisticated governments.

Closer communication between industry and government is needed on legislative measures which may adversely affect the production of raw materials so urgently needed. Recent legislation on safety laws, ecology requirements, depletion allowance and beautification, some though highly desirable, has had, and is having, a serious impact and is retarding our efforts to improve our resource base. Too rapid or improper application of these measures will be counterproductive to our long-range interest. It is essential that our national goals on ecology, for example, be properly balanced against our national economic well-being.

We certainly agree with the recent statement by Assistant Secretary of Commerce, Harold Scott, when he said, "The economic cost to the minerals industry of maintaining and expanding production while giving full attention to environmental protection will, of course, affect our efforts to assure adequate supplies of minerals and energy. Some substantial mineral resources will remain unexploited unless we find environmental solutions at reasonable economic cost. In like manner, on the currently operating mineral processing operations, the impact will be huge if companies attempt to meet every stringent standard quickly; but given a proper length of time to install appropriate controls and given emission standards consistent with regional standards, the cost can be cut sharply and the efficiency improved. In the environmental area, in most cases we would do well to act only after we understand the economic impact of costs and alternatives of the proposed actions, appropriate the time needed to carry out such actions, and develop feasible long-range plans. We should determine how necessary actions are best financed and see that similar situations are treated similarly."

Also, it may become necessary to revise the whole body of legislation governing American business so as to enable private enterprise to operate more effectively while assuring pursuit of economic matters in the public interest. It is particularly obvious that American business is at considerable disadvantage with foreign corporations that do not labor under the same types of restrictive policies and laws.

The laws, regulations, antitrust restrictions, and other governmental practices that choke off our resource base and render American firms uncompetitive cry out for review.

#### STOCKPILE POLICY

Any paper dealing with critical materials supply would be remiss if it did not speak of our national stockpile policies. Very honest questions as to the rate of disposal and who is eligible to receive stockpile materials immediately come to mind. As long as domestic production run behind domestic consumption in the material under consideration, it is our feeling that the rate of disposal should be no greater than the shortfall between domestic production and domestic consumption and that sales should be limited to domestic firms that are customarily involved in the distribution and consumption of such material. To be in the position of selling to traders for international markets those items that we must reach to foreign lands to replace cannot be in the best interest of this country.

In like manner, pricing policies of stockpile materials deserve comment. Should the stockpile be used to bring economic gain to the government by running a bidding match, substantially increasing the costs to domestic industries, or should pricing policy take into consideration stabilizing prices and curtailing inflation?

The law provides that the stockpile is essentially for the purpose of security and/or defense. Have we not reached the point where, as other industrial nations, we must now admit the fact that the government's stockpile does have a place and can serve economic purposes as well as strategic and defense? Examine the activities in and out of the stockpile over the past decade. Economic and political considerations were, in fact, served, although done so in the guise of defense needs. Has not the time come for us to acknowledge this fact, work with the Government to establish appropriate policies, and fix guidelines so that we can take some of the economic whiplash out of material shortages when necessary, as our competitor nations now do?

#### IMPORT-EXPORT POLICIES

Since a large share of the critical materials are imported, a word about tariffs is appropriate. Through the Trade Agreements Program, or by specific Congressional action, our tariffs on raw materials have become progressively lower, and a long list of items now enters this country virtually unimpeded. At the same time, certain other raw materials which are produced in this country continue to have tariff protections so as to preserve the industrial capability of this country and for national security reasons.

We are fully aware that, here again, choosing between two desirable alternatives is necessary. We feel that duties should be removed on items for which this country depends upon foreign sources and for which there is little or no hope of increasing domestic supply through expanded capacity technological development, or discovery of new resources. Where the figures show that we are to remain an increasingly negative nation, to impose trade barriers is against our national interest. Of course, if there is evidence that by some protection we can stimulate exploration at home with an honest hope of increased supplies at competitive costs, then this must take priority.

With regard to export policy, a very real question can be asked. Should the United States permit the unlimited export of elements in which it has virtually zero production without conversion to a higher value when it must reach outside its borders to replace such materials? We are the only industrial nation that permits such a thing to happen. Selected materials for which past production in this country has been in excess of past apparent requirements also need examination. For example, is it in the best national interest to expand foreign markets for bituminous coal when most studies indicate that the United States will have to rely heavily on coal to meet our growing energy demand?

However, my purpose today is not to philosophize on export policy, but rather to make a specific recommendation toward implementing what we believe was the intent of Congress in enacting Public Law 91-84, "The Export Administration Act of 1969."

Section 3, Paragraph (2) of the Act says in part:

"It is the policy of the United States to use export controls (A) to the extent necessary to protect the domestic economy from the excessive drain of scarce materials and to reduce the serious inflationary impact of abnormal foreign demand. . . ."

Whereas, the intent of Congress seems clear, many interpretations have arisen regarding the degree of authority given to the Secretary of Commerce to implement the intent. Past experience of the Steel Industry in seeking limitations on exports of critical steelmaking materials under the 1969 Act indicates that the Department of Commerce believes it can take no action until after

abnormally high exports have occurred over a substantial period of time, and it has a full measure of statistical evidence that the exports in question are causing short-supply and inflationary conditions in the domestic economy.

A procedure so inflexible as this has caused serious problems and hardships to the domestic industry being injured, and, in fact, has negated the protection which the law is supposed to provide. The time period between placement of the export order, actual exportation of the material, gathering of export statistics, gathering of domestic statistics, analysis of the degree of injury caused by the export, and deciding to establish or not establish controls may extend over many quarters or even years. The domestic user of the material suffers serious damage, irrespective of whether or not controls are finally put into effect.

Two relatively recent case histories will help to illustrate the inadequacy of the present procedure for establishing controls. The first one involves the exportation of stainless steel scrap, an important source of chrome and nickel in the manufacture of stainless steel. Exports rose from 45,000 net tons in 1966 to 138,000 net tons in 1967 and 130,000 net tons in 1968. The abnormal foreign demand reduced dealer inventories in this country to minimal levels and caused the domestic price of stainless steel scrap to rise from \$250 a ton at the end of 1966 to \$325 a ton in late 1967, and over \$500 a ton by mid-1969. The added cost to the industry has been estimated at \$100 million.

The second example relates to exports of ferrous scrap from an annual average of 6.7 million net tons in 1966-1968 period to 9.1 million net tons in 1969 and 10.3 million net tons in 1970. The abnormal foreign demand in this period brought about a short-supply condition in this country which raised the average price of scrap purchased by the Steel Industry from \$27.68 in January, 1969, to \$37.36 in January, 1970, and to an average of \$41.19 a gross ton for the year 1970. The inflation in domestic scrap prices during the two years of high exports added \$250 million to steelmaking costs, excluding additional millions of dollars spent in substituting lower grades of scrap for higher grades in short supply.

We believe that preliminary actions can be taken to limit abnormally high exports which will have a disruptive effect on the domestic economy prior to the final availability of hard, statistical evidence. For example, the Japan Ministry of Trade, the European Economic Community, and others generally announce their intentions of increasing their purchases of materials from this country. Trade sources in this country often make similar announcements. The probable impact of the heavier foreign requirements on the domestic demand-supply situation can, therefore, be measured well in advance.

We therefore recommend that the proposed new legislation be expanded to specifically authorize the Secretary of Commerce to take early prospective action to regulate exports of a given material in those instances where there is ample evidence to indicate:

- (1) that an abnormal foreign demand for the material already exists or will soon occur, and
- (2) that such foreign demand will bring about a level of U.S. exports which will be sufficiently high to cause an excessive drain of scarce materials from the U.S. economy or produce a serious inflationary impact.

In other words, surely there must be a way of locking the door before the horse gets out.

#### SECONDARY MATERIALS POLICY

While we have been taking the government to task for permitting excessive exporting of

critical materials, this industry is not without some responsibility. The Scrap Industry has accused us in past years of refusing to purchase material when it was at very low cost and in plentiful supply due to low operating rates in our industry. It is only natural that, as materials backed up in substantial quantities in processors' yards, they turned to the inviting foreign markets. A restudy and reordering of our industry's investment policies may be needed. In this way, perhaps we can make a contribution to the reduction in the rate of outflow of critical materials and in a lessening in the economic swings, price-wise, on such materials.

While we are dealing with the subject of scrap and waste, we cannot ignore the wide attention given to recycling. The importance of recycling is such that it does warrant strong consideration for providing for financial, tax, and regulatory incentives to increase the use of such materials resources. We will know that new scrap is recycled quite efficiently. The vast reservoir, however, of obsolete material is far less utilized. To the extent that we can expand our capacity to recycle material, our dependence upon foreign sources will, of course, lessen. Many of the corporations represented in this room have made, and are making, substantial contributions in this direction. However, all is not sweetness and light. As we struggle to compete in the world market place, we know that we must offer the consumers of our products higher quality material, meeting tougher specs, at lower costs. This, of course, means higher quality raw material going into the heat, faster processing lines, higher yields, and less residual buildup in our revert. One can easily see that this demand is at the opposite end of the pole which encourages us to use lesser quality material available in the obsolete or recycled market.

The Scrap Industry has recognized this gap and has forthrightly informed its members that they must provide a greater technological service to their customers, expend their economic research, improve their price stability, improve the collecting, assembling and transporting of the material they offer. While we agree that the interrelationship will require a concerted and cooperative effort on the part of our industry, the government, and the scrap processing industry in order to solve this problem, the fact remains, consumers will and must make their decisions on economic operating practices and quality considerations if we are to stay in business.

And finally, a complete study must be made to improve the quality and promptness of raw material data. Improved information on projected requirements, productive capacity, prices, availability, etc., is essential. Early warning systems are needed so that we can signal shortages and problem areas far in advance of their occurring and take proper corrective steps.

For raw materials, the broad objective for the next decade will be to obtain reasonable supplies efficiently and at low cost. The direction must be toward cheaper, more plentiful, more reliable, more available raw materials. The struggle between American companies and foreign competitors, with strong support of their governments, for a share of the world's dwindling supplies could be the most critical problem facing this country in the next decade.

We must move quickly and wisely or be shut out from vital mineral resources essential to our very economic existence. This issue must be faced at a time when quality environment, for example, will be receiving increasing priority. Obtaining adequate supply of low-cost raw materials will present industry and government with the difficult problem of finding new and viable trade-

offs between economic health, jobs for our people, and protecting the environment. Sometimes, the trade-off between social, political, and economic considerations will be agonizing; but if we are to survive as a competitive nation in the world market place, government, labor, and industry had better join hands and realistically face and answer the critical materials supply problems that lie ahead.

The rules, the policies, and the thinking that served us well as a "have" nation will not serve us as a "have not" nation.

#### THE MISLEADING INDICATORS: ECONOMIC PROSPERITY NOT AT ALL CLEAR

Mr. PROXIMIRE. Mr. President, during the past 2 weeks several of our leading newspapers and magazines have carried prominent stories hailing the strength of the Commerce Department's index of leading economic indicators. This index, which is supposed to foretell future movements in the economy, has now been rising steadily and rapidly for 18 months. If this index were indeed a reliable portent of things to come, would we not by now have witnessed a significant drop in the unemployment rate? As we all know, there has been no drop in unemployment. The unemployment rate remains stuck at the same deadly 6-percent level.

#### FORMULA TOO MECHANICAL

The fact is that, for all the attention it gets, the index of leading indicators is not a reliable forecasting tool. The individual components are indeed vitally useful pieces of information for the economic analyst, but averaged together in a mechanical fashion, they lose most of their utility. Our economy is far too complex to be reduced to any single mechanical formula.

From early 1971 to early 1972 the index of leading indicators rose 13 percent. Does this mean that the recovery is now strengthening and that unemployment will fall rapidly in the months ahead? We all hope so, but before we get carried away with euphoria, let me point out some history. From early 1961 to early 1962, the leading indicators rose 14 percent. What happened during the next 12 months? Unemployment actually rose from 5.6 percent in the first quarter of 1962 to 5.8 percent in the first quarter of 1963. It was not until additional fiscal stimulus was applied in 1964 that the recovery became strong enough to produce further reductions in unemployment. The leading indicators were, in fact, misleading in 1961.

We can all agree that the economy is recovering today. Real output is rising, not falling. It is rising slightly more rapidly than our long-term potential growth rate. The significant question is whether output growth is sufficient to outpace the growth of the labor force and of productivity, so as to bring down unemployment. While we all hope that the answer to this question is yes, we cannot learn the answer, one way or the other, from the leading indicators.



## WEAKNESS OF LEADING INDICATORS

Let me mention two of the specific weaknesses of the index of leading indicators:

First, important components of the index are entered only with a substantial time lag. Official estimates of corporate profits, for example, are available only quarterly, and then only long after the quarter is over. They are virtually the last major item to be entered into the national income accounts each quarter. Preliminary estimates of first quarter corporate profits were not entered into the index of leading indicators until late May—long after most of us had become aware that profits would show a spectacular rise in the first quarter.

I questioned Commissioner Moore of the Bureau of Labor Statistics about this at a hearing Friday June 2. Commissioner Moore is a leading business cycle analyst. I asked him about the value of this long-delayed data on corporate profits as a leading indicator. He replied, "It is not as good a leading indicator as if we had it more promptly." Yet it goes into this index.

Another example: The discouraging decline in the average work week last month was shown in the BLS employment release Friday, June 2, but it would not show up in the leading indicators until the end of this month. What competent economist would wait an unnecessary 3 weeks to incorporate this valuable statistic into his analysis.

A second difficulty with the leading indicators is that at least three of them are directly affected by the price-wage control program. These three are: sensitive commodity prices, the ratio of price to unit labor cost in manufacturing, and corporate profits.

I asked Commissioner Moore on Friday, June 2, whether the control program might not distort the index of leading indicators. This is what he replied regarding the index of commodity prices:

Its recent behavior, I must say, does not suggest that it is very firmly under control. It has been rising at a very rapid rate.

## IS INFLATION A GOOD OMEN?

I certainly agree with Commissioner Moore that commodity prices are not very firmly under control. They have risen at a 36-percent rate over the past 4 months. But how can we crow about this and call it good news at a time when inflation continues to be such a serious problem? When I pressed Commissioner Moore further by asking whether the control program does not make it hard to know whether or not the leading indicators are telling us something useful, he replied:

I think that is certainly true. You have to interpret all of these data with a view to what is happening both within the economy and outside the economy and make the best judgment one can about it.

Again, I agree with Commissioner Moore. We must gather all the available information and make the best judgments we can. Mechanically contrived indexes are not substitutes for good judgment. We must ask hard questions.

Not just "Is the economy recovering," but "Is the economy recovering rapidly enough to significantly and quickly reduce unemployment?" So far, the answer seems to be that it is not. Effective new policies to provide additional jobs continue to be needed, and needed urgently.

## BURUNDI MASSACRE

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, reports from East Africa tell of a heavy toll paid by civilians as a result of an attempted coup d'etat in the small nation of Burundi late last April. In recent days journalists and others have pieced together a story of bloody civil strife between two tribal groups in Burundi over the last 6 weeks. It is a story of massacre, the execution of leadership elements on both sides, and the suffering and dying of tens of thousands of civilians. It is a story of thousands of refugees in need—within Burundi and across the borders in Zaire and Tanzania and Rwanda.

I do not rise today to blame or condemn, or to offer any magic solution for meeting the political and humanitarian problems in Burundi. But, as chairman of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Refugees, I do rise to express a deep personal concern over the plight of the people caught in the latest link in a chain of war-ravaged populations stretching around the world in recent years.

I fully appreciate the immense difficulties in the Burundi issue. Like so many other problems in the world, the Burundi issue is a complex matter for diplomats and humanitarians alike. Inevitably, it has been labeled an internal affair of Burundi. But when people are being slaughtered at a rate of nearly 3,000 per day, should not there also be some international concern? Should not governments condemn the killing? Should not more concerted efforts be made by regional organizations or the United Nations to offer their good offices to end the strife and human suffering?

Reports suggest that the civil war has ended in Burundi. Reports also suggest that in its aftermath thousands of people are injured and homeless. The full extent of humanitarian need is unknown at this time. But I can report that the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees—UNHCR—has representatives in the area, and is prepared to undertake a relief effort among the refugees in cooperation with the International Committee of the Red Cross and other bodies. I understand that at least two of the countries that have received Burundi refugees have appealed for aid. I am hopeful these requests for aid will be expedited by the UNHCR, and that if additional funds are needed to carry out a relief effort in the area, the international community will generously respond. I am also hopeful that the Burundi Government will cooperate with and facilitate this international humanitarian effort.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include at this point in the Record several news stories relating to recent events in Burundi.

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

[From the Washington Post, June 10, 1972]

## THE QUESTION OF BURUNDI

In the small east African country of Burundi, a great number of people have been killed, mostly by machete and spear, in what was partly a power struggle between factions of the ruling Tutsi minority and partly a rebellion or civil war involving Tutsis and the Hutu majority. The government acknowledging this week that tribal warfare had cost some 50,000 lives, stated that "peace has been restored."

Not the least sobering aspect of this human tragedy is the international community's indifference. To be sure, Burundi is tiny and remote; a former Belgian colony, it is little known to Americans and little covered by the English-language press. As usual, the Organization of African Unity, many of whose members are vulnerable to like tribal frictions, passed the massacre off as Burundi's internal affair and looked the other way. Nor was there any claim made of Russian or American involvement to catch the world's eye.

Burundi's agonies are, as far as is known, of its own making and its own suffering. But this does not dispose of the question. In the international community at large, the attitude seems to be similar to the attitude which once marked local officials' performance in American ghettos: disputes involving only blacks can be ignored. Among American blacks, especially those interested in Africa, the attitude is that the African black states' internal conflicts, however bloody, are their own affair; anyway, who's ever heard of Burundi. About the only misfortunes of Africans that concern American blacks are those which can be laid to white minority governments in Portugal's colonies and in Rhodesia and South Africa, places where the normal prerogatives of national sovereignty are expected to yield to the imperatives of black liberation. This is so even though in terms of sheer "body count," the numbers of Africans killed and uprooted by non-white hands—in Burundi, Sudan and Nigeria, for example—are larger than the numbers similarly persecuted by Africa's white regimes.

A decade ago, optimists hoped the United Nations would undertake to nurse new-born nations in Africa and elsewhere towards stability and economic self-sufficiency. The Congo crisis, and much else, ended such hopes. Now, in the name of national sovereignty and black power, thousands of Africans perish and no one does anything to stop it. Does white precedent require blanket sanction for black barbarism? Could not the United Nations draw a deep breath and resolve that whenever reports were made of large-scale political violence, a commission would be sent at least to see what's going on?

[From the Washington Post, June 11, 1972]

## DOUBLE GENOCIDE TEARS BURUNDI APART: WITNESSES TELL OF ORGY OF KILLING AFTER ABORTIVE HUTU COUP

(By Jonathan C. Randal)

The following dispatch, based on reporting inside Burundi, was filed from Kinshasa, capital of neighboring Zaire (formerly the Belgian Congo).

BUJUMBURA, BURUNDI, June 9.—Terrified by yet another bloody uprising against their 500-year-old domination, the minority Tutsi rulers of Burundi are systematically killing the elite of their former Hutu serfs in what can only be termed genocide.

Official Burundi government and impartial estimates alike claim that as many as 100,000 people have been killed in the six weeks since

Hutu exiles invaded this poor Maryland-sized mountain nation located in Central Africa between Tanzania and Zaïre, the former Belgian Congo.

But such are the difficulties in collecting reliable information in Burundi that the death toll may be considerably higher in the combination Hutu uprising and Tutsi repression in reaction.

By all accounts, the orgy of killing was set off by the invaders' determination to murder all the Tutsis who make up 15 per cent of Burundi's estimated 3.5 million inhabitants. Their plan reportedly then called for the establishment of a purely Hutu regime.

The continuing repression is seemingly dictated by the Tutsis' equal determination to cow Hutu peasants into submission and wipe out the educated Hutu elite in order to ensure Tutsi domination for the foreseeable future.

What has been called an attempt at "double genocide" has few parallels in the post-independence annals of Africa. Even such African tragedies as the Congo turmoil of the early and mid-60s, the Biafran rebellion and the recently concluded Sudanese civil war do not match what has happened here.

Outwardly impervious to international criticism, including from the Belgian government and Pope Paul VI, Burundi President Michel Micombero shows little inclination or ability to stop the killing.

Western embassies are reluctant to talk for fear of jeopardizing the security of their nationals. (There are some 6,000 foreigners in Burundi, half of them Belgians.) Only occasional passes have been issued to diplomats for travel outside the capital since the violence began.

To date the Organization of African Unity, the continent's regional grouping, has refused to investigate the Burundi situation, apparently on the ground that such action would violate its charter forbidding interference in a member state's internal affairs.

At this point, such a move might prove to be too late anyway. The repression has reached down through the ranks of the educated Hutu elite to such an extent that only a thousand or so secondary school students still survive.

In an informal conversation with visiting reporters, President Micombero alluded to the lasting effects of the civil war by quoting—if only to disagree with—an unidentified missionary who told him "80 years of evangelization has been washed down the drain."

Similarly, a longtime foreign resident lamented that the violence had "cancelled out everything that has been accomplished" since Burundi gained its independence in 1962 after some 80 years of first German and then Belgian colonial tutelage. Now, he added, "We have to start from square one."

Such is the Burundi genius for intrigue that some diplomatic observers are convinced that the government, which has conceded prior knowledge of the Hutu invasion, allowed the rebels to make their move from bases in Tanzania April 29 in the hope that they would be crushed and that the invasion would justify subsequent repression.

#### ATTACK NO SURPRISE

Officials from the 31-year-old president on down have admitted that the approximate date of the attack was known in advance. The president, who sports an elegant muttonchop beard, dissolved his government just hours before the attack, and his decision to do so has been interpreted less charitably than his own explanation that he was guided by "divine providence."

The morning preceding the invasion, Congolese in Burundi living along the rich plain bordering Lake Tanganyika, between Bu-

rundi and Zaïre, took to their boats and headed for safety on the Zaïre side.

[Burundi ambassador to the United Nations Nsanze Terence, at a press conference in New York June 1, said that an attacking force of some 8,000 crossed Lake Tanganyika and entered Burundi. He said that 3,000 Burundese constituting their "fifth column" joined with the invading force inside the country.]

Once the attack began on the evening of April 29, the rebels surpassed in violence even the followers of the late Pierre Mulele, the Peking-trained Congolese rebel who led the successful rebellion in Kwilu Province in 1964 and whose tactics inspired the Hutu uprising here.

High on Indian hemp, protected by witch doctors' tatoos, anywhere from 3,000 to 25,000 rebels moved out of their bases in the dense forests on the Tanzanian border and went on a rampage. They chanted "Mai, Mai Mulele," the magic Swahili words for the famous Mulele water which was supposed to dissolve the government troops' bullets.

#### REBELS JUMP GUN

The attacks centered on the south north-east and Bujumbura, a city of 70,000. The rebels jumped the gun in the capital by refusing to pay for gasoline for Molotov cocktails at a downtown filling station, chopping off the attendants' fingers and thus raising the alarm two hours before operations were to begin.

In the northeast, the attackers were quickly repulsed. But in the southern province of Bururi, they struck with great effectiveness, seeking out their victims with lists of names and addresses. Tracts found on captured rebels harangued them to kill Tutsi men, women and children and even disembowel pregnant Tutsi women to ensure that no Tutsi foetus would survive.

A French journalist who interviewed the widow of a Tutsi gendarme captain was told that her three children were beheaded by machetes before her eyes, her husband disembowled and the children's heads stuffed in his stomach while she was repeatedly raped and left for dead.

Micombero recounted that captured documents spoke of plans for a rebel victory parade in Bujumbura on May 19 during which he, as the last surviving Tutsi, was to be killed.

#### SECRET HUTU SOCIETY

Although the government so far has failed to produce the documentary evidence, no responsible observer, Burundi or foreign seriously doubts the government case linking the invasion to a secret Hutu society said to have been formed in 1970 to provide funds to train the rebels.

Monthly contributions varied between 100 Burundi francs (about \$2) for a poor Hutu to \$400 for a rich businessman. The government contends—once again without producing evidence—that thousands of names were on the society's lists, including many prominent Hutus in government and private life.

Bernard Bududira, Tutsi vicar general of the Roman Catholic diocese of Bururi in the south, quoted an eyewitness who saw Alois Barakikana, a Hutu graduate of the University of Arizona and vice director of the government's Economics Ministry, at the lakeside mission at Minago exhorting the rebels to continue their devastation.

According to other testimony, other Hutu leaders were in the vanguard of the southern attack, although, unlike their troops, they were not drugged. Some of the rebel military leaders wore blood-daubed enamel dishpans as helmets.

Although Micombero accused Gaston Soumialot and Martin Kasongo of being in Burundi during the attack, no one else has

corroborated the presence of these two former leaders of the 1964 Simba uprising in the Eastern Congo. All the rebels captured spoke the Burundi language, Kirundi, indicating that foreign intervention was probably limited to adapting techniques perfected in the Congo.

A major variation on the Simba rebellion, however, was the strict order given to avoid harming whites.

#### DEVASTATION EXTENSIVE

The extent of the devastation wrought by the Hutu rebels was brought home by a helicopter flight low over the rich Lake Tanganyika plain and through the green hills where most Burundese live.

Starting at Bugarama Lake, 25 miles south of the capital, and extending to Nyanza Lake near the Tanzanian border to the south, there is an almost uninterrupted record of violence: burned-out cars, huts and buildings in the town of Rumonge; some 30 mutilated bodies, bloated and bleached, in the reeds near the lake shore. They are jealously guarded by crocodiles and a hippopotamus family.

But more telling still was the almost total lack of people seen from the helicopter in this, one of Africa's most densely populated countries.

According to a missionary report, 2,782 homes were burned down in the southern attack, which lasted three days before government forces, reinforced by a company of airlifted Zaïre troops turned the tide.

Although most of the rebels retreated back across the Tanzanian border, President Micombero disclosed the existence of a rebel "People's Republic" of Martyazo, which held sway in the southern hills for two weeks before it was crushed by the army and gendarmerie.

But if there is little real argument with the government's explanations about the initial attack, the same cannot be said for its claims about casualties, the continuing repression or the mysterious death of former King Ntare V in Kitega in central Burundi.

In his formal chat, Micombero recounted the demise of the king, who rashly returned to Burundi at the end of March after accepting the president's assurance that he would be protected.

Terming the ex-king a "fool" to have thought that his return would provoke an uprising in favor of the monarchy, Micombero explained how he had honored the letter of his promise to protect the king by placing him under house arrest in the royal palace in Kitega.

Micombero spiked rumors that Ntare had been killed in fighting between the army and rebels seeking to free and use him as a symbol of their revolt. "The king was not assassinated," the president said, "but judged and executed immediately on the night of April 29."

Angered by the importance the Western press has given the aftermath of the attack, Micombero said: "You people insist on the repression without insisting on its causes."

In his eyes, the attack, but not the repression, constituted genocide, which "no government which is civilized could caution."

Indeed, "It was worse than genocide," Micombero said, because the Hutu attackers killed not only Tutsi men, women and children but also some Hutus who refused to join their ranks.

#### PURSuing GUILTY

He maintained that only those who are guilty are being punished and compared his relentless pursuit of the Hutus to the continuing hunt for Nazis implicated in exterminating European Jews in World War II.

"They're still tracking down those responsible for the Jewish genocide then, and that's more than 20 years ago," he said.



Evasive about the exact death toll, Micombero nonetheless estimated that between 50,000 and 100,000 Burundese had lost their lives. But he insisted that more Burundese were killed in the initial attack than in the subsequent repression.

Since in the past he has said 50,000 Tutsis alone had died in the first rebel push, his estimation was interpreted as the first official admission that large numbers of Hutu were victims of the repression.

Reliable reports from missionaries, the surest sources of information in this country, conservatively estimate that no more than 1,700 Tutsis—and far fewer loyal Hutus—were killed in the south in the initial rebel onslaught, and that no more than 4,000 lost their lives in the entire country.

In the repression, Hutu casualties in the south alone were said to range from 20,000 to 40,000 dead.

Between 3,000 and 4,000 Hutus have been killed so far in the repression in Bujumbura, an equal number in Kitega and some 15,000 to 20,000 in all the rest of the country, except the north where little information has been available.

#### HUTU CASUALTIES

Other reliable sources put Hutu casualties as high as 10,000 in Bujumbura alone.

In the capital, authorities no longer drive trucks with Hutu cadavers through the center of town in broad daylight. But every night trucks carrying the dead are seen either along the lakeside road or along Patrice Lumumba Avenue on their way to a giant bulldozed burial ground near the airport.

With relatively few exceptions, only adolescent male or adult Hutu men have reportedly been killed in the repression. However, Hutu women with skills in teaching or nursing have been killed.

For example, five Hutu women teachers were bayoneted to death by the army at the Bururi mission.

As one source put it, "The army and gendarmes haven't wasted many bullets."

In the early weeks of the repression, personal vengeance played a role in the arbitrary denunciation, arrest and death of many Hutus, although the army has shot several soldiers and volunteers who were guilty of such excessive zeal.

#### ARBITRARY ARRESTS

Now, at least in theory, three citizens must denounce a suspect before he is arrested. But this procedure is not always honored.

The other morning in the center of Bujumbura, a foreign journalist watched three gendarmes jump out of a jeep and bundle three well-dressed men off to an undisclosed destination.

In the south, army atrocities have been reported at at least one mission which was being used as a feeding and pacification center for Hutus lured out of the forests by government promises that calm had been restored. A helicopter mounted with machine guns flew over the assembled Hutus at the Mutumba mission in the south and opened fire, killing about 100 of them.

The United Nations has formally protested against the use of requisitioned UNICEF cars in Bujumbura by the police and against the unauthorized use of a United Nations fishery research vessel which has been armed and used to attack suspected rebel strongholds along the lake shore.

The effects of the repression at Bujumbura University are such that 170 of the 360 Burundese students failed to apply for scholarships for the next school year. Since few Burundese are rich enough to attend without a scholarship, the conclusion is that 170 Hutu students have been killed, arrested or forced into hiding.

Much of the killing at the university and in secondary schools has been carried out by the students themselves. Policemen arrived in some schools with lists, summoned the Hutus outside, and pushed them into trucks where they were bayoneted to death.

At the capital's technical secondary school, a professor recounted that on the night of May 19, the Hutu students suddenly put out the lights and tried to escape. Their Tutsi colleagues killed half of them, but strangely enough some of the 100 or so Hutu students are still in school. "And you would never know anything had happened," the professor added.

The great fear of the foreign community is that the remaining Hutu secondary school students in Bujumbura and elsewhere in the country will "disappear," once the foreign teachers go on their annual summer holidays abroad.

At one point last year, the army numbered some 3,500 men. But it is now reported well below strength, not because of casualties suffered in fighting the rebels but rather because its Hutu officers, noncommissioned officers and men have been either purged or killed.

The Christian churches have also paid their tribute to the violence. Missionary sources report that 12 Hutu Protestant pastors and 14 Hutu Catholic priests have been killed so far in the repression.

What lessons the recent events here will hold for the future are impossible to tell. No one takes seriously the threat of an immediate Hutu revolt.

"All the Hutus who lifted their heads have had them severed," said one foreigner.

Reconciliation seems far off. In the immediate future, foreigners here hope that there will be no prolonged rebel insurgency. But eventually, it is believed the Hutus will rise and try once again to oust the Tutsis, probably in less than 10 years.

#### BURUNDI: LAND OF TRIBAL PASSIONS

Burundi and neighboring Rwanda to the north were both formerly Belgian-administered trust territories. The two countries became independent in July, 1962.

With populations of about 3.5 million each, the two countries are ethnically divided between a Tutsi minority and a Hutu majority. The Tutsis, 15 per cent of the population in Burundi and 9 per cent in Rwanda, are a proud, tall, aristocratic pastoral people who had ruled the poorer, farming Hutus for centuries prior to independence.

In 1959, Belgians and influential Roman Catholic missionaries encouraged a successful if bloody Hutu revolt against the ruling Tutsis in Rwanda. At least 20,000 Tutsis were slaughtered, and some 200,000 others fled the country, many to Burundi.

Following the revolt in Rwanda, the Tutsis in Burundi tightened their control over the Hutus but also sought to establish closer ties. Numerous intermarriages encouraged hopes that a single unified nation would gradually emerge.

Since independence, scarcely a year has passed in Burundi without either an attempted coup, trials followed by hangings or a revolt. But this political turmoil largely involved feuding factions within the Tutsi minority.

In 1966, King Mwambutsa IV of Burundi was forced off his throne by his son, Ntare V, with the help of then Capt. Michel Micombero. Three months later, Micombero, in turn, deposed Ntare and proclaimed a republic with himself as president.

On April 29 of this year, Hutu rebels, some coming from camps in Tanzania and others apparently from across Lake Tanganyika in Zaïre (the Congo), invaded the country. They

were joined by Hutu tribesmen within the country, and together they attempted to oust the Tutsi-dominated Micombero government. The coup failed and the Tutsis began a bloody repression in reaction.

[From the New York Times, June 11, 1972]

#### SLAUGHTER IN BURUNDI: HOW ETHNIC CONFLICT ERUPTED

(By Marvin Howe)

BUJUMBURA, BURUNDI, June 9.—This nation is just beginning to realize the extent of the slaughter that has taken place here over the last six weeks in struggles between the country's two major ethnic groups.

The complete story of an attempted coup at the end of April, and the counteroffensive that followed, cannot be told since only official sources can be quoted and they are clearly biased. Other sources, as well as foreigners, are still generally terrorized and reluctant to jeopardize lives of friends or risk expulsion. However, a six-day visit to Burundi has produced a plausible account of the catastrophe out of a web of rumors, lies and contradictions.

Clear statistics on the extent of the massacres are hard to come by. Information is limited because movement has been severely curtailed by official barricades and curfews. Foreigners must have travel permits and these are very difficult to obtain. Above all, most people are terrorized and reluctant to talk.

Nevertheless, authoritative sources on the scene estimate that about 2,000 people were killed in the initial rebellion, mostly members of the ruling Tutsi tribe, a numerical minority. The reprisals are said to have cost the lives of 2,000 more Tutsis and about 100,000 members of the Hutu, the majority tribe, mainly in the Bururi Province and the area of Bujumbura.

The President of Burundi, Lieut. Col. Michel Micombero, acknowledges that 50,000 to 100,000 people have been killed in the last six weeks, while many foreign residents, estimate the number of victims at closer to 150,000.

The basic struggle involves an attempt by the Hutu majority to overthrow the ruling Tutsi aristocracy, as the Hutus in neighboring Rwanda in 1959. Here the attempted coup has failed, at a terrible price, particularly among the Hutus.

"We have won a reprieve but the final showdown is irreversible," a member of the Tutsi minority said. The dominant Tutsi account for only 15 per cent of the 3.5 million inhabitants of this country, which is about 10,750 square miles in area, roughly equivalent to the state of Maryland.

Colonel Micombero still speaks of his "program of national unity," but most people believe that the progress that had been made toward integration has now largely been erased by the violence.

#### PROVIDENCE DEVASTATED

Bururi Province in the south, where the main part of the Hutu rebellion took place, is now a scene of devastation. The population has almost disappeared from a once densely inhabited area in a 40-mile stretch along Lake Tanganyika.

Some people, estimated to number 10,000 have fled to neighboring Tanzania, and 15,000 have escaped across the lake to Zaïre, the former Republic of the Congo, leaving 175,000 unaccounted for. Many of these people are known to have taken refuge in the bush and marshes but many more are believed to be dead.

Only recently a small trickle of human life has begun to return to Rumonge, the lakeside fishing center of Bururi, the inland farming center, and some of the hill towns.

In the Bururi region alone, 2,000 grassroof huts have been burned. Some 5,000 women and children have taken refuge in the Bururi missions.

The reprisals, on the other hand, have taken a heavy toll not only in the south but in Bujumbura and towns throughout the country. The Hutu elite has been decimated in the government administration, in the commercial world, in the church and in schools down to the secondary school level.

#### LOCAL OFFICIALS CRITICIZED

There have been excesses and atrocities during both the rebellion and the subsequent repression, according to foreign testimony. The burden of private criticism, however, has been directed against the local authorities for neglecting to curb reprisals.

"It is natural to demand greater moral restraint from the established authority than from drugged rebels," a churchman declared.

Foreign diplomats and other residents have generally followed the events in impotent silence, fearing that any intervention would bring grave repercussions for the foreign community of Burundi. The 6,000 or so missionaries, technicians, school teachers and businessmen and their families are considered hostages.

Until now, foreigners have not been the target of either the rebels or the repressors. The only foreigner to be killed was a Belgian technician who lost his life by accident when he went out to the street to observe the first assault at Bujumbura.

The explosion of ethnic antagonism is regarded by many missionaries as evidence of a failure of the Western church, both Roman Catholic and Protestant.

"The church has been humiliated and must start again from zero," a priest said. "Both those who provoked the rebellion and those who carried out the repression were Christians," he noted.

Representatives of seven missionary institutions broke their silence on May 20, with a strong letter to their superiors, and aimed at the Burundi Government, condemning persons responsible for the rebellion as well as the "systematic repression" of the Hutus.

The letter also protested against arbitrary arrests and the ban on priests' visits to the prisons. The only response to the letter seems to have been increased difficulties for missionaries who seek to obtain travel permits.

At the end of last month, a group of diplomats, led by the papal nuncio, applauded the president for starting his pacification program and pledged support for "all victims" of the violence. Even this action brought no direct response.

#### PROTEST BY PRIESTS

Troubled by the continued repression and the official silence around it, three Italian priests and one Spanish priest in the north spoke severely about arbitrary punishment. They were promptly called to Bujumbura for interrogation by the police. Accused of political activity, the four young priests have been put under surveillance.

These protests, however timid and belated, coupled with strong criticism in the international press, seem to have spurred the authorities to move to halt the repression. "Or maybe it's merely that there are no more Hutus who can lift their heads," a churchman observed.

The Burundi Government has publicly blamed "foreign influences for the ethnic war," but has not specifically attacked any country. Diplomatic speculation about this accusation runs from China and North Korea to the Vatican and the United States Central Intelligence Agency.

President Micombero cleared Belgium, which until 1962 exercised a colonial mandate here, of the charges. However, the colonel did accuse Belgian Christian trade unions

and former trusteeship administrators "of sowing division among us." There were no Hutus or Tutsis, but a united people, before the colonial period, he said.

Burundi's ethnic troubles are considered to have been inevitable by scholars who have followed the evolution of this area of Central Africa. The problem can be attributed above all to a rapid breaking up of the federal structures.

More than three centuries ago, the tall handsome Tutsis came with their flocks from the high plateaus in East Africa to settle on the gentle hills of what are now Rwanda and Burundi. The local kings accepted them as colonizers and married the Tutsi women, establishing a royal line of mixed Tutsi and Hutu blood. A feudal hierarchy was established with the Tutsis as lords and the Hutus their serfs.

#### FOREIGNERS BRING CHANGES

This feudal harmony was disturbed by the arrival of European colonizers and by the teachings of the Catholic Church. The area became part of German East Africa in 1899 and after World War I was ruled by the Belgians for 40 years under a League of Nations mandate, followed by the United Nations trusteeship. The outside forces brought basic education and new ideas to the Hutus, such as the injustice of slavery.

In neighboring Rwanda, the Hutus carried out their revolution in the presence of the Belgian administration—and probably with some Belgian complicity. The king there was overthrown in 1959 and the Hutus won control of the Government through elections held under sponsorship of the United Nations.

Some 20,000 Tutsis were killed in the revolt and 300,000 were forced into exile—about 100,000 of them to Burundi.

The Belgians, who granted both territories independence in 1962, generally felt that the transition could be smoother in Burundi, where there were many Hutu-Tutsi marriages and a Hutu middle class was gradually emerging.

Two Hutu risings, in 1965 and 1969, however, were evidence of a growing dissatisfaction within the majority and ambition for more than token responsibilities.

The attempted coup of April 29 this year, to all appearances, follows the same line of rebellions but was organized on a much broader and more violent scale. It was also complicated by the involvement of some monarchist Tutsis as well as opposition elements in Zaïre. But independent sources generally agree that essentially this was another attempt by the Hutus to assume what they consider their rightful place as the majority in Burundi.

The fullest account of the initial attack was given this week by President Micombero in an informal interview by a small group of newsmen. The 31-year-old leader, who ousted young King Ntare V in 1965 to proclaim a republic, discussed for the first time the role of the former King in the recent events.

Ntare was duped by the Hutu plotters, according to President Micombero who said the former King's name had been used to get as wide backing as possible for the uprising. Ntare returned to Burundi after "they convinced him that my regime was very unpopular and that it was now or never to make a comeback," Colonel Micombero said.

The President acknowledged that he had given assurances that the former King would be protected on his return. But he stressed that since Ntare was "trying to trap me," he could not be allowed to move about freely and had been put under house arrest.

After the former King's return, preparations for the plot were intensified, the President said. The army was put on alert two weeks before the rising occurred.

Colonel Micombero declined to link the dissolution of his Government on the morning

of April 29 with the attack that came that evening. The timing, he said, was a matter of "providence."

Monarchists and rebels acted together on the night of the rebellion, the President said. He disclosed for the first time that the former King was immediately tried and executed on the night of the attack. Earlier, official reports said that Ntare had been killed in the fighting when his supporters tried to free him.

The initial rising, according to the first official account broadcast over the Burundi radio on May 29, took place on the night of April 29 between 7 and 8:30 P.M. Some 10,000 Hutus and a number of "Muleleists," followers of the late Congolese revolutionary leader Pierre Mulele, carried out nearly simultaneous attacks in four areas of the country. In most of the places, military balls had been organized by Hutu officers involved in the plot.

The rebels were said to have come mainly from a training base in the woods of northern Tanzania. They were reportedly armed with poisoned machetes, clubs, a few automatic weapons and gasoline bombs.

At Bujumbura, fewer than 100 persons took part in the attack, which was aimed principally at the radio station, near the military camp.

An argument at a service station over payment for the fuel for the gasoline bombs is said to have altered the army camp. Two officers who came out to investigate the incident were killed before the rebels were dispersed. Another group of rebels clashed with troops in front of the cathedral and a third band attacked private vehicles at an intersection near the military camp, burning a dozen cars and killing about a dozen persons.

The main attack took place in the south in an area along the main highway between Rumonge and Nyanza-Lac. It was said that 4,600 rebels took part in a systematic slaughter of Tutsis in the region. Local Hutus were ordered to join in the hunt and shared the Tutsis' fate if they refused.

Another group of 3,000 rebels attacked in the Bururi region, the homeland of the President and most of the present Tutsi rulers. Nearly every army officer is said to have lost some member of his family in the attack. President Micombero said his brother-in-law had been slain.

Forty of the chief administrators were also killed, including the district commissioner, the attorney general and his assistants, doctors and accountants, as well as many of their wives and children.

At the same time, about 100 attackers from Tanzania assaulted the military post of Canakuzo in the east, where a large number of Tutsi refugees from Rwanda had settled. However, this band was rapidly "cut into pieces" by the defending forces, the Bujumbura radio said.

A fourth attack was said to have taken place at Kitega, where the former King was being held. However, although the town was besieged by rebels according to the official report: residents of Kitega said they had heard no fighting.

Eyewitnesses at Bururi confirmed official reports that the assailants were mainly Hutus, using Mulele tactics. They were said to have smoked hashish, to have worn white saucepans stained with blood as helmets, and to have had their bodies tattooed with magic signs as immunity against attack.

The rebels, fired with drugs, were said to have killed all the Tutsis they could find, generally cutting them to pieces with their machetes.

Normally Burundi people are not drug users, but witch-doctors played an important role in this attack, according to Colonel Micombero. He said that the Mulele trainees would shoot blank bullets at a man to



show his immunity and then shoot a dog or cat with real bullets to show that the animal had died because it did not cry out the words that conferred protection.

"We have tangible proof that Mulelists from Zaire participated in the rising," President Micombero said. He charged that the Zairian oppositionists wanted to use Burundi as a base to attack the regime of President Mobutu Sese Seko. He asserted that Martin Kasongo, a well-known Mulelist, had taken part in the Burundi rising, had stolen four million francs at Nyanza-Lac and had disappeared.

"I want his head," said Colonel Micombero, declaring that Mr. Kasongo deserved the death sentence for having organized the massacre.

Asked how long the repression would last, the President snapped: "They're still tracking down the persons responsible for the genocide of Jews in World War II and that's more than 20 years ago. You can easily understand that we are still taking action against criminals six weeks after the genocide here."

The initial slaughter took place in a period of 24 hours, but isolated attacks lasted for two weeks. At Martyazo, in the Bururi region, the rebels set up a "people's republic" and remained entrenched for nearly two weeks before they were routed out, the President said.

The army, gendarmes and youth brigades rapidly put the rebellion down in most areas of the south, according to available information. However, some 100 rebels are believed to be still hiding in the bush, coming out at night to steal food.

The repression that followed the attack has been extreme, according to all independent sources. The authorities announced that they had uncovered a secret "organization for genocide and coup d'etat" and said they had proof that the aggressors not only wanted "to overthrow the republican institutions but also had a highly detailed organized plan for the systematic extermination of the whole Tutsi race."

The President said that "thousands" of Hutu names were on the lists of persons paying dues to the rebel organization.

Large-scale arrests started with the four Hutu members of the Government. Pascal Buhiriza, Minister of Telecommunications, was said to have confessed that the massacre were aimed at the Tutsis.

On May 7, it was announced that "a good number" of Hutus had been found guilty of taking part in the plot and had been executed.

The Revolutionary Youth brigades took the lead in what is widely described as arbitrary arrests and killings. These were aggravated by personal acts of revenge with people being denounced as plotters because of disputes over land or a cow.

"It was barbaric, unbelievably inhuman," said a foreign resident who had seen a man clubbed to death in front of the Bujumbura post office by a gang of Revolutionary Youth.

"They picked up almost all the Hutu intellectuals above secondary level," a Tutsi professor said.

The university was severely affected. Students were seen assaulting Hutus in the university grounds, beating them to death with rocks and clubs. In the beginning, soldiers came into the lecture halls, called Hutus out by name, threw them into trucks and took them away. Most of those have never returned.

In the first week of repression at Dujumbura, witnesses said Hutus were piled up in trucks and taken off for burial at a mass grave at the airport. "I used to see the trucks almost every evening at around 9, after the curfew, going down Avenue Lumumba in front of the cathedral and sometimes I could hear people screaming inside," one resident said.

The churches have been particularly hard hit. Twelve Hutu priests are said to have been killed and thousands of Protestant pastors, school directors and teachers. In the Bujumbura hospitals, six doctors and eight nurses were arrested and are believed to be dead.

In its "truth broadcasts," the Burundi radio has said almost nothing about the repression that has followed the rebellion. The rebels were given "the punishment they deserved" and "only the guilty Hutus" were arrested, it was said. "One cannot even speak of repression but legitimate defense because our country is at war," the state radio emphasized.

Most independent observers are inclined to accept the official position that there was a Hutu plot. However the origin of the name lists, the evidence of guilt and the severity of the punishment are widely questioned.

It is also increasingly asked why the authorities did not act to prevent the initial outbreak, since there had been reports of unusual movements in the south six weeks before the rising. Some church sources wonder whether the attack was allowed to happen so as to provide justification for broad repression.

The slaughter has been a serious blow to the economy. In the south, the missions are trying to get refugees out of the bush to harvest the cotton, bananas and coffee, but it seems that much of the crops will be lost.

Foreign observers generally question whether reconciliation can ever be possible after so much killing. In the city area here where Hutus and Tutsis live side by side, the two tribes are terrified of each other, and word has spread that all Tutsi families should get rid of Hutu houseboys for fear of poison or some other form of retaliation.

[From The Christian Science Monitor, June 12, 1972]

#### A TRAGIC TRIBAL DIVIDE

The world has been extraordinarily slow in waking up to the tragedy that has hit the small central African state of Burundi, where tens of thousands of people have died in an intertribal massacre. The Burundi Government itself puts the death toll at 50,000. Other sources say it is over 100,000.

Tribally, Burundi is divided between the ruling Tutsis, who represent only 15 percent of the country's 3,500,000 population, and the Hutus, who account for the other 85 percent. Traditionally the Hutus have been the subservient group despite their vast numerical superiority.

The Burundi upheaval involved an uprising by part of the Hutus against their Tutsi overlords, and thousands of Tutsis were massacred. Then came massive reprisals by the Tutsis. In this counteraction the Hutu educated class—the civil servants, teachers, and other trained personnel—is said to have been virtually eliminated.

President Micombero of Burundi now says that the conflict is over, but other sources report that sporadic fighting is still going on in the southern part of the country near the Tanzanian border.

The Hutu revolt began at the end of April, but it is only now that we are beginning to learn the full extent of the massacre. Could the outside world have done anything to stop it? Officially it was an internal conflict, as were the Nigerian and Sudanese civil wars. This left outside powers and the United Nations little leverage. The most likely channel of intervention would have been the Organization of African Unity, whose headquarters are in Addis Ababa. But little if anything appears to have been done by that source.

Some West European countries, and particularly Belgium, which give Burundi financial and technical aid, tried to bring pressure to bear on President Micombero to call off the

reprisals. It is difficult to say whether this has had any effect. (Burundi is a former German colony and Belgium took over its administration after World War I under a League of Nations mandate. There are 4,000 Belgians in the country now, including some military personnel helping train the Burundi Army, but the tribal war has not involved the Europeans in any way.)

Belgium threatened to "review" its aid program unless the reprisals stopped. But the Belgian Government is unlikely to cut off its aid altogether. Burundi now will need help more than ever to heal its wounds.

Burundi is one of the poorest countries in Africa, but one of the most densely populated. Some sources say the loss of trained personnel in the past month's mad slaughter will set it back 10 to 15 years.

The long-term solution must be the elimination of Burundi's tribal divide and of the deep hatreds it has engendered. Unfortunately the tragedy of recent weeks has served only to deepen that divide.

#### OFFICE OF EDUCATION PASSES THE BUCK AT TAXPAYER'S EXPENSE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, section 503b of the Higher Education Act of 1965 requires that—

The Commissioner of Education shall prepare and publish annually a report on the education professions, in which he shall present in detail his views on the state of the education professions and the trends which he discerns. . . . The report shall indicate the Commissioner's plans concerning the allocation of Federal assistance under this title . . .

Yet Commerce Business Daily for April 19, 1972, carried an invitation for—

Proposals from individuals or organizations for professional assistance to the Commissioner in preparation of the Commissioner's Fourth Annual Report called for under section 503b. . . . The successful recipient of this contract will (1) review the educational personnel program activities of the U.S. Office of Education, (2) develop a detailed outline of the report, (3) assess the level of statistical support for the program, and (4) prepare first drafts of chapters and "annexes" and prepare a draft of the full report.

The Office of Education pays \$96,142,000 to 114,338 persons, yet apparently finds it necessary for outsiders to prepare this report. This is a deplorable waste of Federal funds. I question the usefulness of a report which is not prepared by those who administer the Higher Education Act, but rather by outside consultants.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial commentary on this absurd situation be printed in the RECORD.

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

#### IT IS YOUR BUSINESS (By John Lewis)

Through the kindness of your hearts, each April 15th or thereabouts, money comes pouring into the coffers of your great and good government. Many are the demands on these funds. Every department, bureau, agency, commission, etc., has worked diligently for the preceding year to formulate a budget to put these monies to their beneficial use beginning with the new fiscal year—commencing each July 1.

Old programs seldom die, and always new programs are begun. The financial outpour-

ings of the American taxpayer are returned to him in the form of more reports, more studies, more deeply entrenched bureaucrats, and at last but not least, a new revised tax form for the next year.

However, before many of the above-mentioned dividends from your taxes are brought to the surface, contracts often must be let to provide you with these services of government. To do this, the Department of Commerce gathers requests for bids and publishes a daily list of procurement invitations in their "Commerce Business Daily"—available from the Government Printing Office at \$25 per year. This notifies all who are interested that certain items, types of specialized work, services, etc., are required by some segment of your federal government. The rational individual would surmise that if the government is extending procurement invitations it has neither the personnel, the capacity, nor the capability to do the job itself. Don't be fooled by logic and reason. Such isn't the case.

On page 3 of Issue No. PSA-5553, April 19, 1972 of "Commerce Business Daily," there appeared the following invitation:

"Drafting of the Commissioner of Education's Fourth Annual Report on the Education Professions. The U.S. Office of Education will solicit proposals from individuals or organizations for professional assistance to the Commissioner in preparation of the Commissioner's Fourth Annual Report called for under section 503b of the Education Professions Development Act of 1967."

The successful recipient of this contract will (1) review the educational personnel program activities of the U.S. Office of Education, (2) develop a detailed outline of the report, (3) assess the level of statistical support for the program, and (4) prepare first drafts of chapters and "annexes" and prepare a draft of the full report.

According to the report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures of January this year, there were 114,338 persons employed in the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. They are paid a total of \$96,142,000. The U.S. Office of Education, which is a part of the Department, had 3,180 full and part time employees in February 1972.

On the surface it seems quite reasonable that within 114,338 total employees in the Department including the 3,180 people in the Office of Education, and the Commissioner himself, there should be someone qualified in his day-to-day work to write the Commissioner's report for him. For \$96,142,000 one would think so.

This is just one more example of dissipation of the taxpayer's monies. All the more reason to keep in touch with your Representative and Senator to have him, along with you, keep a close eye on what government does with your money. It's your business!

#### JUSTICE HARLAN: "THE FULL MEASURE OF THE MAN"

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, all of us in this body are familiar with the immense legal knowledge embodied in the late U.S. Supreme Court Justice John Marshall Harlan. In this month's American Bar Association Journal, one of his former law clerks, Nathan Lewin, discusses the human aspects of Justice Harlan's life. In introducing the article, the ABA Journal editors note that the law was but one measure of the man, saying "What truly set him apart was his character, his spirit, and his human decency."

Justice Harlan's opinions will stand as a record of his superior legal mind. I ask unanimous consent that this fine ar-

ticle by Mr. Lewin appear at this point in the RECORD, so we might be remembering that his contributions went beyond his legal writings.

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

#### JUSTICE HARLAN: "THE FULL MEASURE OF THE MAN"

(By Nathan Lewin)

(NOTE.—Justice Harlan's remarkable legal career, which led him to the front rank of the New York Bar and ultimately to the United States Supreme Court, was but one measure of the man. What truly set him apart was his character, his spirit and his human decency. That he was blessed with an extraordinary intellect used for the benefit of humanity may overshadow his greater legacy—that he was a "patrician of the spirit".)

It came as no surprise to those who had known Justice John Marshall Harlan in the full vigor of life to learn that in his last few months, while he lingered in severe pain in a Washington hospital bed, he was most cheered when visiting colleagues from the Supreme Court described pending business or his former law clerks spun out—in what to others seemed tedious detail—the minutiae of cases in which they were involved or legal problems with which they were grappling as professors of law. For John Harlan was, to his very last breath, totally enraptured by the law and its processes. And so long as his mind was clear—which it remained almost to the very end—it lost none of the zest it always had for legal intricacies and for lawyers' subtle points.

Nor did it surprise those who had known him in health to hear that even in crippling illness he was more concerned with others than with himself. He despised imposing on those who came to call the anguish of seeing him in pain, and he wanted to hear only of the good that visitors could report about themselves, their families and their professional lives. While John Harlan had every earned right to more than the average citizen's share of vanity, he was, in fact, the humblest and gentlest of souls. With ceaseless patience and enduring good humor, he suffered the foolish and the petty. His abiding faith was in reason and in its capacity to withstand temporary turbulence and emerge whole in the quiet that followed.

Although his career as a judge and as a private and government lawyer often placed him in the eye of the storm, Justice Harlan was essentially a calm and reflective man. In this, he was quite different from Felix Frankfurter, his closest colleague on the Court, who has been described as Harlan's mentor. Their *modi operandi* as Justices were totally different.

Justice Frankfurter was an active proselytizer and overwhelmed uncertain brethren by force of his personality. He seized every face-to-face opportunity to persuade, cajole, wheedle, provoke and bewitch the other Justices in order to win them to his side. Justice Harlan did not enjoy this kind of bustle, nor did he poltack the way Frankfurter did. His forte was the carefully reasoned memorandum, circulated "to the conference", aimed at winning over those who were ready to reflect calmly on legal issues and digest carefully what he had to say.

#### HARLAN MAINTAINED HIS MEASURED, DELIBERATE STANCE

Even on the bench—where Frankfurter was a performer during oral argument and during the Court's announcement of opinions—Harlan maintained his measured and deliberate stance. He confided to his law clerks that he was reluctant to ask questions in notorious cases because that would prompt unseemly newspaper speculation as to how he might vote. His questions during argu-

ment were never pedagogical or argumentative. They would probe an advocate's legal argument, but not solely—or even partially—to test his mettle or to score a point. He might, to be sure, rescue a floundering attorney who was unable to keep on track, but Justice Harlan never succumbed to the temptation, which Frankfurter refined to an art, to use the lawyer as a backboard for barbs aimed at the other Justices.

Nor were his oral announcements viewed as opportunities for ripostes of this kind. In the last decade of his career on the Court, Justice Harlan's oral deliveries of opinions were *tours de force*. Because of a degenerative eye condition, he was, by then, able to read only by pressing his face directly onto the printed page and using an extremely high-powered lens on one eye. Yet he recited decisions, without the slightest aid to memory, in more detail and with clearer comprehension of the issues than his brethren were able to command with written opinions and notes before them.

#### LAST OPINION SUPPORTED HIS DEEP CONVICTIONS

In a sense it is fitting, therefore, that Justice Harlan's last opinion was his dissent filed on June 30 last year in the *Pentagon Papers Cases*, 403 U.S. 713, which would have upheld the Government's right to prevent publication of the notorious study of a notorious war. One can quarrel with his result, but the reasons he stated were vintage Harlan and truly embodied his views of courts, their place in our system and the conditions under which they must operate. His lament that the Court was deciding the case "under the pressure engendered by the torrent of publicity that has attended these litigations from their inception," his description of the history of the lawsuits as a "frenzied train of events" and his uncharacteristically sharp charge that the Court was "irresponsibly feverish in dealing with these cases" were no false facades to justify a pro-Government bias. They were, rather, expressions of Justice Harlan's deepest convictions regarding the Supreme Court and the judicial process. And it was typical of the judge and the man that his opinion—alone of the nine separate statements filed in the cases—ticked off the central legal and factual issues, most of which the Court had ignored, even though some, such as the standing of the United States to bring the suits, might defeat the Government's position.

It is a striking tribute to Justice Harlan that when his terminal illness forced him to retire at about the same time that Justice Hugo Black's health compelled Black to leave the Court, equal anguish was expressed by the liberal segment of the Bar over Harlan's departure as over Black's. To be sure, Justice Black's votes in his last years were no longer predictably liberal, and many may have feared (with reason, as matters turned out) that whomever would replace Justice Harlan would be more conservative than he. But above and beyond these pragmatic evaluations, one could sense that activists as well as advocates of judicial restraint recognized in Justice Harlan the intellectual integrity, the moral rectitude and the devotion to judicial independence that are the last and best hope for individual liberties.

No biography of Justice Harlan, no matter how brief, fails to mention his grandfather, who was on the Supreme Court from 1877 to 1911, and whose dissent from the separate-but-equal ruling in *Plessy v. Ferguson*, 163 U.S. 537 (1896), left him with a somewhat undeserved modern reputation for progressivism. The grandson was respectful of his grandfather and of the family tradition; relics such as the senior Harlan's watch and chair were in evidence. But with the usual twinkle in his eye, he would concede that his grandfather was given to overstatement and to ponderous Olympian opinions. And he chuckled over the Japanese dignitary who visited the chambers and, on being told by the Justice who the gentleman was whose



large photograph adorned the wall, responded respectfully. "I did not realize, Justice Harlan, that the post was hereditary."

Justice David Brewer, who sat on the Supreme Court with the senior Harlan for twenty years, said of his colleague that he "goes to bed every night with one hand on the Constitution and the other on the Bible, and so sleeps the sweet sleep of justice and righteousness". The grandson was not given to such certitude, and neither the words of the Constitution nor the letter of Holy Scripture made his sleep less troubled. Skepticism and open-mindedness were his characteristics, and they fit in well with his philosophy of the judiciary and with his own innate modesty. In this, he stood in sharp contrast to Justice Black, to whom right was right and wrong was wrong, and the Constitution could be counted on to mark the difference.

Yet, in the twilight of their careers, Justices Harlan and Black grew so fond of one another and so respectful of each other's views that both were saved excessive grief by their almost simultaneous illnesses and departures from the Court. For in the last years Justice Harlan was given to telling his former law clerks at the annual reunion held each spring that Justice Black was, in his view, the most important of the Court's members and that he gratefully saw no reason to think Justice Black would not go on forever.

It probably was the association with Emory Buckner, whom he really viewed as his mentor, and with Felix Frankfurter that accounted for Justice Harlan's lifelong attachment to the Harvard Law School. In fact, he received only one year's worth of formal legal training in the United States, and that from the New York Law School. When he arrived at the office of Root, Clark, Buckner & Howland in New York in 1923 straight from three years at Oxford, where he had initially come as a Rhodes Scholar and stayed two extra years to study law, Buckner, the guiding partner in the firm, sent him off to law school in the afternoons. Less than a year after his legal education was completed, John Harlan followed Emory Buckner into public service. In March, 1925, Buckner became United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York and took his bright young associate on as an assistant.

#### EARL CARROLL TRIAL HIGHLIGHTS HARLAN'S CAREER

The highlight of a two-year career, during most of which Harlan was chief of the Prohibition section of the United States attorney's office, was the trial of Earl Carroll, producer of *Earl Carroll's Vanities*, for perjury. Newspapers had reported that Carroll had thrown a party at his theater during which a nude girl had taken a champagne bath. Carroll denied under oath before a federal grand jury that there was champagne in the tub; he claimed it was ginger ale. His publicized trial on a six-count perjury indictment was conducted largely by Harlan, who won a conviction that was affirmed on appeal.

One of the stories associated with the trial that the Justice enjoyed telling proved to him that jurors were totally unpredictable. One man sitting in the front row of the jury box, he said, looked to him shortly after the trial began like a determined opponent of Prohibition. As the trial progressed (with the justice would note, a new array of fetching *Vanities* girls gracing the front row of the spectator section each day), the prosecution team became increasingly convinced that the juror would never vote for conviction in a liquor case. So they resigned themselves to a hung jury. After the surprising verdict came in, Harlan made it his business to seek out the juror and test his impression. "I'd never convict anyone of violating any damfool Prohibition law", the juror said. "But when a guy goes out and lies about it

under oath, well, now, that's something else again."

In April of 1927, after having prosecuted two trials of former Attorney General Harry Daugherty, Buckner returned to private practice and took Harlan with him. The future Justice was then under thirty, and he was told that he looked too young for some of his important responsibilities. A news report of the Earl Carroll trial describes him as "faintly stooped"—a habit he later said he fell into to overcome his youthful appearance.

#### HARLAN EARNED RESPECT OF BUCKNER EARLY

While working for Buckner in the United States attorney's office and later, Harlan turned his hand as well to appellate matters. One of his products was a 150-page brief in a case which premises had been padlocked by Prohibition agents. When Buckner rose to argue in the Second Circuit, Judge Learned Hand scowled at him and announced that he would not read the brief because it was too long. Buckner responded that it would be the court's loss, because the brief was a good one. "My assistant wrote it, and I put my name on it." Hand's response was to growl and hurl the massive document onto counsel table. Harlan recalled, however, that Hand told him after the case was decided that Buckner was right; it had been a good brief.

In late 1927 Buckner was asked by Governor Smith of New York to investigate graft charges against Maurice E. Connolly. Borough President of Queens. Buckner appointed John Harlan to head a staff of five, which included—among other future luminaries—J. Edward Lumbard (later to become United States attorney and Chief Judge of the Court of Appeals for the Second Circuit). In Judge Lumbard's words, "John Harlan's thorough and imaginative conduct of the investigation disclosed Connolly's approval of contracts at grossly exorbitant prices." Connolly was indicted. Buckner acted as special prosecutor (against Max Steuer for the defense) and erected a four-by-thirty-foot sign in the courtroom on which the contract prices were chalked as they were testified to. He won a conviction, and John Harlan wrote the brief that preserved the conviction on appeal.

In the decade that followed, Harlan advanced rapidly to a position of leadership at the New York Bar. Because of Buckner's ill health, Harlan (assisted by future Chief Judge Henry J. Friendly, another bright young recruit to the firm) took over the defense of the \$40 million estate of Ella von Eichtel Wendel, a recluse whose death spontaneously generated more than 2,000 self-declared relatives who sought a share of her fortune. The charities that had retained Root Clark to protect the estate against false scavengers were well-served; a contemporary report of the final proceedings in which the most accomplished of the claimants testified and was cross-examined by Harlan says simply that the young attorney "tore the claim to shreds".

John Wood, himself a leader of the New York Bar who joined Root Clark in 1929 and advanced to the status of name partner, recently noted that "by the early 1930's Harlan was in fact the leading trial lawyer in the firm and one to whom all of us working on litigation looked for inspiration and direction. This position he filled, with an interruption for military service during World War II, until his appointment to the Second Circuit in 1954." Judge Lumbard recalls that Harlan "was recognized as one of the leaders of the trial bar by the time he was forty."

The range of his litigation practice was formidable. It spread from the bizarre Wendel litigation to complex questions of railroad accounting and corporate dividend policy to Supreme Court advocacy on the ap-

pealability of interlocutory orders and even to a defense of Bertrand Russell, whom critics at the time of Harlan's confirmation hearing for the Supreme Court called a "well-known leftist". The Russell litigation was an unsuccessful effort by Harlan, representing members of the New York City Board of Higher Education, to overturn a lower court order which had required the board to cancel Russell's contract to teach at City College.

#### ANTITRUST LITIGATION BECAME HIS SPECIALTY

Major antitrust litigation became his specialty. He represented the du Ponts, among others, in antitrust proceedings brought by the Government and was heartened to see in the prosecution of those cases the same rectitude that he had admired in Buckner and would always practice himself while in public service. One incident he often recalled was an early meeting he had with the attorney representing the Department of Justice in the du Pont-General Motors case. The suit was filed in Chicago, and the huge team, which included many of the country's leading law firms, descended on the city and, with supporting personnel, took between two and three floors of a leading hotel. After the first day of the proceedings, Harlan wanted to discuss some housekeeping matters with the lawyer who, singlehandedly, was representing the Government's interests against the phalanx of leaders of the Bar.

He was informed that Government counsel was in the same hotel, and he made his way to the room. "There he was", Harlan recounted, "in a little basement room of the hotel, with every inch of space on the beds, chairs, tables and floors covered with mounds of documents. I asked him whether he was comfortable, and he said yes. I asked whether he mightn't prefer a larger room, and he said he couldn't on his government *per diem*. I felt sorry for him because he barely had room to sleep, and I offered to let him use some of our space, or any other facilities. But", Justice Harlan later reported admiringly, "he politely but flatly refused."

A public figure's real self is disclosed by the company he keeps on his office walls. Many succumb to the temptation to display photographs of themselves beside a President or other distinguished personality, or plaques received from national organizations. Justice Harlan would have none of that. Over the fireplace in his office, surrounded by other family pictures, was a large photograph of the lanky Justice looking way down with a judicial grin at his grandchildren crawling on the floor at his feet. Behind his desk was a double row of photographs of his law clerks, each with its own banal inscription inadequately reflecting how all the clerks felt toward the man. On the wall facing him was an old photograph of Emory Buckner, a formal Second Circuit photograph (of later vintage than when he was on that court) and the succession of formal Supreme Court photographs since he had joined the Court.

The least comprehensible of all, however, were shots of bombers releasing their payload over some unrecognizable territory. They were mementos of his World War II experience when he accepted a colonel's commission to study operational problems involved in daylight bombing raids on Germany. In keeping with the lessons he had learned from Buckner and from his own career as a lawyer, he insisted on firsthand familiarity with the problems and went along on a hazardous mission, where he sat as a tall gunner and he reported, almost shot down one of our own planes.

The seat on the Second Circuit to which Harlan was appointed by President Eisenhower in January, 1954, was that of Augustus Hand. While Learned Hand was more renowned than his cousin and surely showed more flair in his opinions, the Second Circuit Bar had come to respect Gus Hand's judg-

ment at least as much as Learned's. District judges in the Southern District of New York, it was said, adhered to the motto, "Quote Learned, but follow Gus." It was fitting that Harlan succeeded to this seat, because the same could be said of the roles Justices Frankfurter and Harlan occupied on the Supreme Court—Frankfurter was the more quotable, but lower court judges viewed Harlan as sounder.

A Learned Hand story illustrates the point. Judge Calvert Magruder of the First Circuit occasionally visited in New York and sat with the Second Circuit after he retired as an active judge. One admiralty case he heard in New York produced a characteristically short opinion by him for a unanimous panel affirming the dismissal of a seaman's complaint. The Supreme Court, about a year later, reversed the Second Circuit. Magruder, in one of his visits to New York about the time of the reversal, reported to the aging but witty "Old Chief" that he had just been upended by the Supreme Court. Hand replied with one of his customarily candid and unflattering characterizations of the Court. "What's more," Magruder continued, "Felix dissented and would have affirmed my opinion." "Well, that's pretty good authority on your side," Hand responded, "but who wrote for the majority?" Magruder answered that Harlan had. "Then you were wrong", Hand replied, ending the discussion.

#### APPOINTMENT TO THE BENCH AFFECTED LIFE STYLE

With his appointment to the bench, Harlan's life took on a certain austere quality. He viewed the obligations of a federal judge to avoid embroilment in anything other than judicial issues coming before him as seriously as had Justice Brandeis. He began returning gifts that were sent to him for the holidays and refused to vote in any elections. And with the withdrawal from the bustle of an active law practice came a closing of the circle of friends and associates. His work as a judge occupied him fully, and those with whom he worked—his brethren on the court of appeals and, later, on the Supreme Court and the law clerks on whom he relied—became a second family to him.

Harlan's appointment to the Supreme Court to replace Justice Jackson in November of 1954 was applauded by the press, with one magazine reporting enthusiastically that its reporter had "never seen a man fitter to be on the Supreme Court". Confirmation hearings dragged on, however, because Southern Senators feared how the grandson of the *Plessy v. Ferguson* dissenter might vote in school desegregation matters. Wild allegations were made by right-wing organizations as to his participation in the Bertrand Russell litigation and alleged membership in left-wing international organizations. Through it all, Justice Harlan kept his cool and, unlike later nominees, refused on principle to discuss any views that might ultimately touch on litigation before the Court.

He was finally confirmed and took his seat in March, 1955. Substantive evaluation of his decisions over the following period of more than sixteen years is not within the limited writ of this article, but one proposition as to which there can only be total agreement is that craftsmanship marked all his work. Those who were fortunate enough to be chosen as his clerks learned soon that in the Harlan chambers argumentativeness was encouraged, imagination was stimulated, humor was appreciated—but sloppiness was never tolerated.

#### CONCRETENESS, SPECIFICITY CHARACTERIZED HIS STYLE

Justice Harlan's style within the Court was always one of concreteness and specificity. If he could not agree with what had been written in a draft majority opinion or dissent

circulated for concurrences, he would compose his own statement and send it around as a separate opinion. Often the author of the original draft would modify his opinion, and Harlan might then withdraw his separate statement and join the proposed majority or dissent. (This was, in fact, how the original school prayer decision, *Engel v. Vitale*, 370 U.S. 421 (1962), came to be narrowly drawn and to have the famous footnote distinguishing "patriotic or ceremonial occasions" expressing faith in a Supreme Being from "the unquestioned religious exercise" of an official prayer). If no change were made, Justice Harlan felt it his duty to state his own reasons for reaching his result. It did not take long, therefore, for him to become among the most prolific of the Court's opinion writers. In his second, third and fourth full terms on the Court he ranked second, first and second, respectively, in the total number of opinions written.

His style was lucid and always understandable to lawyers. He was never given to question begging or evasion of "gut issues", although one early law clerk's anecdote demonstrates that, even as a judge, he could not entirely cast away the advocate's cunning. The clerk reports that a draft opinion worked over by the Justice in a significant case closed one section of its discussion with the conclusion that rejection of the petitioner's position "was clear". The law clerk protested, insisting, for reasons he elaborated at length, that it was not clear at all. Maybe so, said the Justice, nodding sagely. Down went his pencil to the paper, slashing in the word "manifestly" to modify "clear".

Working for Justice Harlan was a delight, and there is no law clerk of the approximately forty he had who felt differently. He ran his chambers like a first-class law firm, and his clerks were, like Emory Buckner's "Boy Scouts", junior partners in the adventure. The Justice was gracious, but never stuffy; courteous, but never stiff. He was demanding and serious in the Court's business but always ready to laugh and even, at times, to join in the law clerks' foolish pranks. He insisted on discretion from his clerks but reported fully and frankly to them what had happened in the Friday conferences attended only by the Justices.

Justice Harlan's work habits were hit hard by the eye ailment he began to suffer in 1963. To the very end, he insisted on writing opinions by hand; efforts to use recorders and dictating machines were abandoned after several unsuccessful tries. He could no longer read petitions and briefs, however, and the clerks would read these documents, as well as circulated opinions, to him. But he hated to appear handicapped, and it took a while before he was ready to use his heavy lens and try to read a document while on the bench in public sessions.

His products never slackened, and a historian of the Court who judges it purely by the opinions of the Justices twenty years from now will be unable to tell that Harlan, J., was almost totally blind in the last six years of his tenure on the Court. They were years of change, in which many of precedents he thought important were being overturned. During all this time, notwithstanding his own illness and his wife's, he conducted business as usual and did what he could to keep the Court (if one may borrow one of his favorite phrases) "on an even keel".

When John Harlan died, Justice Potter Stewart, who was of those remaining on the Court probably the closest to him, issued a short statement which eloquently captured the man. After noting Justice Harlan's "intellect, learning and diligence", he said, "to remember him simply as a fine legal scholar is to miss the full measure of the man. What truly set him apart was his character, not his scholarship. His generous and gallant spirit,

his selfless courage, his freedom from all guile, his total decency. . . . He was a human being of great worth."

Justice Harlan came of noble lineage, and he measured up to his ancestry. He was blessed with extraordinary intellect, and he utilized that blessing for the benefit of humanity. But what was more important to him and those who knew him—but will, unfortunately, be lost to history—is that he was a patrician of the spirit.

#### THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION AND THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, some opponents of the Genocide Convention have objected to the fact that the treaty and its implementing legislation would make genocide a Federal offense. In the absence of a treaty, they argue, Congress would have no power to outlaw genocide. Thus, it is said, if a Federal law against genocide is passed in fulfillment of a treaty, the treaty has enlarged Federal power and at least strained the spirit of the Constitution.

This argument is misleading. Many authorities in constitutional law have pointed out that a Federal law against genocide would be similar to recent civil rights legislation upheld under the commerce clause and the 14th amendment. Even without reference to those provisions, however, article I, section 8 of the Constitution quite clearly permits a Federal law against genocide—with or without a treaty.

The 10th clause of article I, section 8 gives Congress authority:

To define and punish Piracies and Felonies committed on the high seas, and Offenses against the Law of Nations;

Since genocide has been outlawed by 75 nations, it is obviously in some sense an "offense against the law of nations." And since Congress also has the power to "define" these offenses, a law against genocide seems an eminently reasonable exercise of congressional authority. But to assure that this power of "definition" is not being stretched by the Genocide Convention, we need only examine the explanation of the purpose of this section of the Constitution provided by James Madison in the *Federalist*, No. 42. Madison notes that this provision was missing from the articles of Confederation:

The power to define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas and offenses against the law of nations belongs with equal propriety to the general government, and is a still greater improvement on the Articles of Confederation. These articles contain no provision for the case of offenses against the law of nations; and consequently leave it in the power of any indiscreet member to embroil the Confederacy with foreign nations.

Thus the purpose of this provision is to give Congress authority to outlaw acts which would threaten our Nation's peaceful relations with foreign countries. Surely acts of piracy committed by Americans have no more adverse effect on our foreign relations than would acts of genocide committed by Americans. Genocide is an act with serious international consequences; such acts are properly outlawed not only by international



treaties, but also by a Federal Government with responsibility for our Nation's foreign policy.

Mr. President, there can be no doubt that the Genocide Convention and implementing legislation are well within the constitutional powers of the Federal Government. This is not just a happy accident; the Genocide Convention is directed against "offenses against the law of nations" which threaten peace—and the framers of the Constitution intended precisely that Congress have authority to outlaw those offenses. I ask the Senate to proceed without delay to ratify the Genocide Convention.

#### MILITARY JUSTICE REFORM

Mr. BAYH. Mr. President, for some time now I have been acutely aware of the desperate need to reform our system of military justice. Nearly 9 years ago I introduced a comprehensive reform bill—the Military Justice Act of 1971—in the hopes of spurring this much-needed reform, and finally eliminating the problem of command influence which plagues our military courts. Unfortunately, the Committee on Armed Services has yet to hold hearings on this or any of the other military justice reform bills which have been introduced. I am hopeful, however, that in the near future they will be able to find the time to deal with this most important subject. We simply cannot afford to accord to our military men a second-class system of military justice.

I would like to share with the Senate just one example of the many articles I have seen recently which call for the type of military justice reform which I have proposed. This article, "Let's Improve Military Justice" appeared in the May 1972 issue of the American Bar Association Journal. I think that this fine article, which calls for the elimination of command influence and the increased independence of military judges, deserves the full attention of every Senator. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

##### LET US IMPROVE MILITARY JUSTICE

Vietnam unquestionably is responsible in large measure for the current interest in the interest in the administration of justice in the Armed Forces. Although much of the attention given to military justice has focused on the trials of Lieutenant Calley, Captain Medina and Colonel Henderson, as well as the curious cases of the "Green Berets", Lieutenant Howe, Captain Levy, and Lieutenant Colonel Herbert, considerable interest also has been generated as to the system of military justice itself. With the possibility of an all volunteer force within the near future, lawyers should seriously re-examine the administration of justice in the military services and actively support needed changes.

To some, military justice is in a deplorable state and in need of drastic revision, while to others it is "roughly as fair as the criminal justice dispensed in most states" and without need of radical change. Although a sizable portion of the career military and the public regards the Department of Defense and the courts as to permissive with respect to servicemen's rights, almost everyone ap-

pears to have rejected the once popular notion the Bill of Rights has no application to servicemen.

Regrettably for the legal profession as well as the military, the Armed Forces have not committed themselves fully to the concept of an adversary system. The Military Justice Act of 1968 and policies instituted within the services have served to insulate the military judiciary from command influence, and the Air Force and the Army have instituted on an experimental basis the utilization of "trial command", which in effect put judges and defense counsel in a chain of command separate from that of the convening authority, but in my judgment these largely internal changes do not go far enough. Further legislation is necessary.

The current system of military justice based on the Uniform Code of Military Justice is chiefly the product of the late Professor Morgan's thinking. The code does contain express provisions designed to ensure impartiality and to eliminate command influence, but it is the practical operation of the system that prevents a commitment to an adversary system.

Within the services, career lawyers (unlike physicians, optometrists and dentists) are almost completely dependent on local commanders for their efficiency reports. These reports are in turn reviewed and promotions made not upon the determination of fellow lawyers but upon the determination of promotion boards weighted heavily in favor of the nonlegal branches. As a result, officers with little or no legal education determine the success of a lawyer's career in the service. The code also allows the local commander, or convening authority, as he is referred to in this respect, to determine what charges are brought to trial and the severity or type of court martial to which the case is referred, and to select the personnel to comprise the court, that is, the jury. All this necessarily has a chilling effect on the adversary system and permits both career lawyers and commanders in the Armed Forces to operate the system without the degree of fairness and impartiality most lawyers would feel is essential for the successful administration of justice.

The system understandably is viewed with skepticism by servicemen in general as well as the civilian Bar. Lawyers who have served temporarily in the military in a legal capacity generally are surprised to find that the Uniform Code functions as well as it does. In a large measure this is because the commanders and their staff judge advocates act in good faith and with intelligence. It is the controversial case, a case in which the commander's judgment is questioned or in which the values of the military are questioned, that exposes the inherent weaknesses of the code. In the controversial case the local commander, who is both commander and convening authority, rightfully gives precedence to what he believes is in the best interest of his command. It is not humanly possible for a good commander in this situation, no matter how laudable his intentions, to be faithful to his command and also to serve in an impartial capacity in administering justice. Forcing the local commander and hence his staff judge advocate, who values his relationship with the commander, to have divided loyalties is unfair both to the commander and the accused.

I believe that a better system could be devised from both the standpoint both of an effective military organization as well as the preservation of the necessary degree of impartiality. As a minimum, the Uniform Code should be revised as follows:

1. Elimination of the two-thirds vote requirement for conviction and sentence in favor of the widely accepted unanimous requirement.

2. Military judges should be given com-

plete authority in all noncapital cases to determine the sentence imposed, and their sentencing powers should be enlarged to permit the granting of probation.

3. The power to authorize searches and issue arrest warrants, except where a military necessity or emergency demands otherwise, should be given solely to military judges.

4. Military judges should receive special pay and retirement provisions so as to ensure that they are of a high caliber and are not forced to retire in their late forties and early fifties.

5. Defense counsel should be assigned by military judges much as lawyers are now assigned under the provisions of the Criminal Justice Act in the federal courts. Defense counsel should in no respect be under the control of promotion authority of local commanders and should be authorized at all times without prior approval to seek any collateral relief available to their client in the federal courts.

6. Random selection of court members, i.e., jury selection, should be instituted with no requirement as to rank for eligibility for the array.

7. Local staff judge advocates should be the direct equivalent of district attorneys. Local commanders, on the advice of their staff judge advocate, should exercise no other function in the administration of justice than determining what charges are brought to trial after an investigation has been completed.

8. The present intermediate appellate courts, known as courts of military review and entirely composed of military personnel, should be abolished. The Court of Military Appeals should be enlarged and have authorization to sit in panels of three members.

9. Lawyers who serve in a legal capacity in the Armed Forces should be afforded treatment similar to that now afforded members of the medical branches. All lawyers in the legal branches should be given credit for promotion and pay purposes for their years attending the law school. Separate and accelerated promotion lists and boards should be authorized.

These proposals have merit regardless of the future success in implementing the all volunteer concept of military service. In fact, without these improvements, it is hard to imagine that the Armed Forces will have significant success in attracting the caliber or number of servicemen the military feels is necessary for an effective organization. Lawyers should support legislation to accomplish them. After all, there are many arguments in favor of the adversary system that apply with equal force in the military and civilian environments.

#### THE MIAMI CONVENTION AND AMERICA'S HISPANOS

Mr. MONTROYA. Mr. President, for decade after decade the minorities in America's melting pot were allowed minimal participation in our national political process. Lipservice was paid them by national political leaders, without their realizing the actual substance of significant participation. Token participation was always available to mollify a given group at a given time. More than this, however, was begrudged and denied. Here is a fact of American history.

Now this is changing with a vengeance. The "melting pot" concept has been held out to them as an ideal, and as they grasped for it, it has been yanked away in reality. This is especially true of our millions of Spanish-speaking Americans. Now they are affirming their existence

within the American framework of reference. This complements rather than hurts our American dream.

Today such groups are surging forward in the political arena, reveling in their uniqueness, seeking from political parties recognition in a formal sense of their power and maturity. Only the Democratic Party is prepared to grant full political participation to all such groups.

The Republican Party, still wedded to a concept of tokenism, selects but few members from each group willing to parrot the party line, and frantically shoves them forward to conceal the reality of the narrowness of the Republican Party's popular base. While they welcome the rich and privileged WASP, they only open their door a crack to ethnic minorities. The very political ethic of this administration and the Republican Party could not allow full minority participation for fear of upsetting an existing imbalance in favor of special interests. Opportunity for the dispossessed means less for the powerful few. So it is only to the Democrats that such minorities may turn with any hope of a hearing and opportunity.

The Democratic Party has made a commitment to the Black Congressional Caucus that black delegates to our national convention in Miami would number 20 percent of all delegates. Here is indisputable evidence that we are prepared to back up rhetoric with performance.

Now it is the turn of Spanish-speaking Americans to step forth, announce their own arrival at full political maturity and claim their rightful share of place at our national gathering in Miami.

Hispano-Americans of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, and Dominican descent have truly been the silent people, excluded on every level from full participation in American life. Such status is today completely unacceptable to the approximately 12 to 15 million Americans of Latin background. They deserve a voice in selecting persons who will carry the standard of the Democratic Party and who will lead our Nation in turbulent times to come.

I believe a similar guarantee can and should be made to Hispano-Americans of our Nation by the Democratic Party. Such a commitment is especially vital at this time, for the President is putting on a Hispano road show rivaling the Wizard of Oz in puffery and meaninglessness.

From the wings troop forward a group of high-visibility Hispano appointees; people who do not reflect the makeup of our community. They are token appointees, acting as icing on a cake made of paper mache. Across broad levels of American economic and political life, this administration has closed rather than opened doors to the mass of our people. All the more reason for a true commitment now by the Democratic Party to Hispano Americans.

Such a sign of recognition by the Democratic Party can and should serve as a clearly visible, unmistakable sign to our people that full participation by

Hispanos is welcomed and sought by the Democratic Party.

It is a step forward in the further opening of our American democratic political process. It is a tangible advance in the struggle to broaden the base of popular political participation by our people. Such an expansion can only serve the cause of popular government and democracy. Such a series of internal reforms in the long run will continue to establish the primacy of the Democratic Party's claim to be the only party of the people in this land.

Mr. President, last week a delegation of Spanish-speaking Americans who serve as Democratic Members of the 92d Congress visited with Mr. Larry O'Brien to discuss such recognition by the Democratic Party of the Nation's Hispanos. We stressed to Chairman O'Brien the fact that America's Hispanos vote overwhelmingly in favor of the Democratic Party. We sought his aid in insuring that they received proper recognition at the Miami convention.

Mr. O'Brien, true to his heritage and position, lent us a sympathetic and compassionate ear. While his recommendations are not binding upon the party at Miami, we all know how much respect and credibility he possesses with the Democratic Party's leadership. He assured us that he would make a series of recommendations to insure such recognition. Here are the agreed-upon recommendations:

First. Receive a commitment of at least 10 percent Spanish-speaking delegates at the convention;

Second. Receive a commitment of proportionate representation of Spanish-speaking persons on the three standing committees—rules, credentials, and platform;

Third. Receive a commitment of the use of Spanish-speaking convention personnel at all levels—arrangements, support services, reception, parliamentarians and legal staffs, press, et cetera;

Fourth. The use of Spanish-speaking publications for advertisements and full accreditation for Spanish-speaking media;

Fifth. A prominence of minorities, including Spanish speaking, on the convention platform;

Sixth. Full Spanish-speaking representation at regional platform hearings;

Seventh. The past and future role of the Spanish speaking in the DNC Policy Council;

Eighth. Spanish-speaking representation in the final writing and editing of the platform document on all issues;

Ninth. A commitment from the DNC that provisions will be made for low-cost housing, transportation and food for delegates unable to pay the astronomical Miami Beach prices;

Tenth. An explanation of the steps to be taken to include the Spanish speaking on the DNC's executive committee;

Eleventh. An explanation of the steps to be taken to assure that the Spanish speaking and other minorities will be properly represented in the "draft proposal of a new charter for the Democratic Party" in the O'Hara-Fraser reforms;

Twelfth. The role of the Spanish speaking in the permanent staffing of the DNC.

Mr. President, I believe that the overwhelming majority of these recommendations will receive sympathetic, positive attention by the Democratic Party and its convention. There is no doubt in my mind that a successful effort will be made to open the infrastructure of our party to this, the second largest minority group in the Nation. We can do no less. Certainly, significant gains are to be expected.

#### THE SOVIET FLEET IS NO MATCH FOR THE U.S. FLEET—REPLY TO ADMIRAL ZUMWALT'S LETTER OF JUNE 2, 1972

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, on May 19, I wrote the Chief of Naval Operations, Adm. Elmo R. Zumwalt, asserting that the Department of Defense has been systematically distorting the size and threat of the Soviet navy. I requested that he address himself to a number of points I made in that letter by Wednesday the 24th in order that I could include it in a speech I gave in the Senate on May 25.

The admiral answered but said he did not have enough time to reply—even though he had many more days and man hours than it required of my staff to work on the letter and my speech. On May 25 I gave the speech and a full breakdown comparing United States and U.S.S.R. as well as allied naval forces.

Finally, on June 2, we received a substantive reply from Admiral Zumwalt, the Chief of Naval Operations.

Looking over his letter, I am struck by several points.

First, even though the admiral claims that my information is conceptually flawed, he agrees with me on a wide range of points.

Second, there is an equally large incidence of specific points he does not address or dispute thereby suggesting that my previous analysis was accurate.

Third, I find a certain number of his arguments misleading in that they give only partial answers.

Fourth, I want to recognize that some aspects of the admiral's discussion are well made and I will take them into consideration.

Before I begin a point-by-point comparison of his material, let me restate that my conclusions remain firm. Based solely on U.S. Navy data, including the recent exchange of correspondence, it remains clear that the U.S. Fleet is far more powerful in almost every aspect than the Soviet Fleet and that of all its allies. What is so hard to understand is why our Navy and our Defense Department keep downgrading the U.S. Navy and U.S. military strength when we are clearly No. 1 and will remain so.

Our Navy is bigger, better, more powerful, more sophisticated, and far better trained than the Soviet Navy. Why do not our admirals start to stand up for the United States?

Now for the details.



## THE ADMIRAL'S SELECTIVE PERCEPTION

Admiral Zumwalt claims that my information and that of the Defense Monitor from the newly formed Center for Defense Information, is "biased and conceptually flawed." He cites my acknowledged decision to speak only of major combatants as a case in point. I deliberately left out small gunboats of less than 1,000 tons from the calculations of force strength for both the United States and the U.S.S.R. I did that for an obvious reason. By including the 970 small Soviet patrol boats, which admittedly can operate only in low sea states and protected bodies of water, the total numbers in an overall comparison become distorted. It is like comparing 1,000 ants to a dozen hungry anteaters. Number do not mean everything.

The use of such inflated figures in the past, counting every minor Soviet patrol boat as equivalent to a U.S. destroyer, is one of the biggest reasons why there has been such a distortion of the size and power of the Soviet fleet.

Furthermore, the admiral commits the very error he warns against. He does not include either the 130 major U.S. Coast Guard vessels or the countless hundreds of similar ships in navies allied with the United States around the world. What is this if not selective perception? The large number of small Soviet ships reflects the fact that she has a large land mass, a defensive posture, and a heavy commitment to minesweeping operations.

The admiral also mentions Soviet land-based naval aircraft, some of which are equipped with anti-ship missiles. This is a good point, one that was not in my previous speech because basically I was comparing ships. But even so, it is not adequate to compare these 900 Soviet planes with the 292 P3 ASW aircraft of the United States. One must also consider the 8,500 sea-based aircraft at our disposal. In this light, the 900 Soviet aircraft do not look quite so threatening, especially since their land-based air coverage is not as mobile as our sea-based planes. They have a limited geographic coverage.

In his criticism of the Defense Monitor, the CNO states that a certain chart is misleading because it does not differentiate between vessels under construction and those deployed. I sense that the admiral is stretching our credibility here. That chart as well as all others in the Defense Monitor are clearly marked with the status of the vessel, operational or under construction, so noted as well as tonnage, class, and date of operation. There was no comparison of future force strengths. If there are more Soviet ships under construction, then their types and numbers should be made public.

In certain instances, Admiral Zumwalt updates my data which was taken, by the way, from testimony of Admiral Rickover which I clearly stated in my speech was as of February 1972. Thus, the Soviets now have 28 rather than 25 cruisers. When it comes to comparing these with U.S. cruisers, however, the admiral makes some distinctly misleading statements. He claims that all U.S. cruisers are as old as the four Soviet cruisers being retired. He fails to state that all

but one of the U.S. cruisers has been extensively modernized and are now equipped with missiles.

When speaking of the two Soviet helicopter carriers, the *Moskva* and *Leninograd*, Admiral Zumwalt points out that these are not cruisers. True, they are not cruisers, but they have cruiser type hulls not dissimilar in concept to the first U.S. fleet aircraft carrier, the *Lexington* in 1927. In no way can they be compared to modern U.S. attack aircraft carriers.

## IRONIC CRITICISMS

Returning for a moment to the charge of flawed analysis, I note the admiral's ironic criticism of my ship by ship comparison. But our Navy does this day in and day out. If the admiral really believes this, then the U.S. Navy should stop releasing total force level figures to the media which include so many small Soviet ships that the overall significance of any comparison becomes meaningless. The admiral states:

This simplistic and outmoded approach to the complex process of "net assessment" was abandoned as inadequate by competent specialists in the field many years ago.

This ironic admission of inadequacy points to the Navy itself. Why do they keep doing it? And if the Navy is doing "net assessment" then this should be supplied to Congress instead of the simple approach the admiral himself criticizes.

When the admiral speaks of building programs, I find clear areas of disagreement. He states that the U.S.S.R. has built 89 missile configured surface ships and nuclear submarines between 1967 and 1971 while the United States produced 42. That is accurate. But it is a very selective figure for a very short period of time. It certainly does not prove that the Soviet Navy is building faster than we are. It is, in fact, misleading.

My figures show that since 1960 the United States has built 304 ships of over 1,000 tons in size to the Soviets' 203. Furthermore I stand by my construction data which show that Soviet naval programs did not receive their primary impetus from the 1962 Cuban missile crisis but from military and political decisions taken before that time.

## AREAS OF SUBSTANTIAL AGREEMENT

But what is clear is that the admiral has, in fact, agreed with a substantial part of my analysis. Let me provide some examples of where we share the same conclusions. Here are some of the things we both say:

First. The U.S. Navy has a unique superiority in aircraft carriers.

Second. The primary role of the U.S. Navy is offensive as opposed to the primary defensive role of the Soviet Navy.

Third. Many Soviet ships have less endurance and sea capability than U.S. ships.

Fourth. The air power of the U.S. fleet is overpowering.

Fifth. The Soviet Navy suffers from geographic operating constraints.

Sixth. We both agree that what the United States needs is an "adequate naval capability." I certainly agree that we need a good strong Navy, a Navy which is No. 1.

Seventh. The Soviets do not have any aircraft carriers and only a modest amphibious force.

Eighth. The U.S. Navy has nuclear powered combat ships while the Soviets do not.

Ninth. The United States has a significant lead in helicopter carriers.

Tenth. Soviet cruisers are smaller than their Western counterparts.

Eleventh. The United States is continuing to build a mix of large and small destroyers and destroyer escorts and will equip many of our ships with the Harpoon surface-to-surface missile.

Twelfth. Our most recent nuclear attack submarines are superior to their Soviet counterparts.

Thirteenth. Allied forces must be considered in any force comparisons.

Fourteenth. The U.S. submarine fleet, though smaller than the U.S.S.R., has specific qualitative advantages.

Fifteenth. That the U.S. Navy has far more aircraft than has Soviet naval aviation—8,500 to 1,100.

## POINTS NOT ADDRESSED

What is even more amazing is that Admiral Zumwalt does not even address himself to a number of vital points in my speech. In general these are specific areas where the United States has a commanding lead over the Soviet Union. But in the entire 27 pages he sent in reply, he failed even to talk about or dispute or argue about many of these matters. Let me point out the most obvious ones. Here is what he left out:

First. That the United States has a lead in major combatants.

Second. That 10 Soviet cruisers are actually smaller than U.S. nuclear destroyers.

Third. That the United States enjoys a commanding numerical lead in destroyers and patrol escorts—PE's.

Fourth. That U.S. building programs in destroyers, PE's, and attack submarines will keep us in the lead for the foreseeable future.

Fifth. That U.S. submarines are entirely more sophisticated in speed, quietness, and operating techniques than the Soviets.

Sixth. That due to the U.S. MIRV program, our sea-based strategic capability is imposing.

Seventh. That major NATO combatants number 767 compared to 583 for the Warsaw Pact.

Eighth. That in the Mediterranean either the French or Italian Fleet is numerically, at last, the equal of the Soviet Mediterranean Fleet.

Ninth. That we must also consider the four British Polaris ballistic missile submarines with 16 tubes and the A-3 triple warhead and the single French ballistic missile submarine with 16 tubes in comparing strengths.

Tenth. That the United States has an overwhelming advantage in overseas bases.

Eleventh. That U.S. Navy surveillance and communications systems are far more sophisticated than anything the Soviets have.

Twelfth. That we have a significant lead in the critical area of strategic and tactical antisubmarine warfare—ASW.

Thirteenth. That the Soviet Fleet is no match for the U.S. Navy which is a worldwide balanced open ocean force with advanced bases, sea knowledge, staying power, and air coverage.

#### THE QUESTION OF MISSIONS

It is quite apparent both from my original speech and the Zumwalt reply that the two navies are dramatically different. In large measure, this is due to varying missions and responsibilities. Thus, as Admiral Zumwalt correctly points out, it is difficult to compare the fleets on a ship-by-ship basis. But when our Navy uses such statistics to justify new U.S. Navy spending programs, it is not only time to examine the specific facts involved, but to rethink basic missions.

Our aircraft carrier force is designed to project U.S. power overseas. What does this mean? The answer should be obvious. The United States now has six or seven aircraft carriers stationed off Vietnam. This is how we project U.S. power overseas. We could use this power in the same way in Central America, South America, Africa, or elsewhere in the Far East. Is this why we need a new billion dollar aircraft carrier, the CVN-70? If it is, we need to reconsider seriously our national goals and our role in a world filled with day-to-day crises and long term problems of population, pollution and food.

The cold facts are that the U.S. Navy has enough building programs already underway to fulfill any reasonable mission in today's or tomorrow's world. We do not need a massive new building program. Nor should we be pushed into buying expensive ships because the Soviet Union is selectively modernizing its fleet.

Fear is a powerful weapon. Let us not use it against our own people.

Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that my speech of May 25, my letter of May 19, Admiral Zumwalt's May 23 acknowledgement, Admiral Zumwalt's reply, my May 26 letter, and Admiral Zumwalt's detailed reply of June 2, 1972, to my speech plus his accompanying analysis be placed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

Let me also state that after I had prepared this statement and a release—which I had originally intended to give on Friday, June 9, 1972—Admiral Zumwalt sent me a further 12-page statement.

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

#### THE U.S. NAVY'S EMPHATIC SUPERIORITY OVER THE SOVIET NAVY

Mr. PROXMIER. Mr. President, all too often when it comes to the complex questions of national security there are insufficient facts available to make sound judgments. Sometimes this is due to our system of classification. Sometimes it is because the issues are terribly sophisticated and technical in nature. And sometimes it is simply a case of being supplied with partial or incomplete data.

The size of the Soviet Navy is just such a case.

We have heard that the Soviet Navy is growing dramatically, challenging the United States in every ocean, and that unless we meet this challenge by abruptly increasing expenditures on our own Navy, we will no

longer be able to defend the Nation's interests.

Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has recently told the Senate Armed Services Committee:

The continuing growth of Soviet naval capabilities relative to our own is a matter of increasing concern to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Soviet Navy has already acquired a global reach. Their ships are now operating on a sustained basis in the Atlantic, Pacific, and Indian Oceans, the Mediterranean and increasingly in the Caribbean. Unless we accelerate the modernization of our fleet, the Soviets will increasingly challenge our control of the seas in those maritime regions essential to the success of our forward defense strategy, as well as in ocean areas closer to our shores.

Inevitably, comparisons are drawn between the United States and U.S.S.R. naval forces. This is a very difficult business. If comparisons are to be accurate, they must range along a number of lines, not only in numbers, but tonnage, sophistication, and effectiveness. But this has not been done. We have had too many half-truths. The Pentagon has artificially made it appear that the Soviet Navy is a massive, modern force that directly threatens the United States. Now what are the facts? Who has the naval power? The answer, the United States leads the Soviet Union in almost every major naval category and current building programs will keep us on top.

My information shows that a number of significant variables have been overlooked thereby giving the impression that the Soviet and Warsaw Pact nations are enormously more powerful than they are in fact. Let us look at some of these comparisons, based on Navy data as of February 1972.

#### TOTAL NUMBERS AND CAPABILITIES

In terms of overall numbers of ships, we should talk about major combatants or ships of about 1,000 tons or over. This leaves out small vessels used in coastal areas that might distort the total numbers. The United States has 246 surface major combatants compared to 222 for the U.S.S.R.

The capabilities of the U.S. fleet, however, are far superior. For example:

The United States has four nuclear powered surface ships and is building seven more. The Soviets have none.

The United States has 14 attack aircraft carriers with up to 95 aircraft each and nuclear weapons. The Soviets have none.

The United States has two antisubmarine carriers. The Soviets have none.

The United States has seven amphibious assault helicopter carriers and is building five more up to 35,000 tons. The Soviets have two cruisers of 15,000 tons with helicopter pads for this category. The Soviets have a large ship under construction in the Black Sea that has not yet been identified. It could be a merchant ship or possibly an aircraft carrier.

The United States intends to add a fourth nuclear carrier, the CVN-70, and a fleet of eight follow-on small carriers called Sea Control ships.

In short, our superiority in aircraft carriers, seabased air operations, and nuclear surface ships is absolute.

#### CRUISERS

There is considerable confusion about modern day definitions of cruisers. The United States is not building any more traditional cruisers. Instead, we are producing various destroyers, some of which are larger than traditional World War II cruisers. The Soviets, on the other hand, are emphasizing cruisers, but these turn out to be smaller than some U.S. destroyers.

Nevertheless, the Soviet Union has 25 cruisers, but 14 of them are without missile capability. Four of the 25 cruisers are so old that they probably are being deactivated.

Ten others are actually smaller—4,800 to 6,000 tons—than the U.S. nuclear destroyers—7,600 to 9,000 tons. The U.S.S.R. also has three converted and three new cruisers of 12,000 to 15,000 tons under construction.

The United States has eight conventional cruisers and one nuclear cruiser. All but one of the U.S. cruisers carry missiles. In addition, the United States is planning to build a number of 10,000-ton cruiser-size, surface-effects ships.

#### DESTROYERS

In terms of destroyers, the United States has 65 missile-equipped destroyers to the Soviet's 40. Two U.S. destroyers are nuclear and five more under construction. No Soviet destroyers have nuclear propulsion. The Soviets have about 155 older nonmissile destroyers and they are building a new sophisticated class called the *Krivak*, two of which are already operational. The United States has some 115 additional nonmissile destroyers and is building 16 modern DD963—*Spruance*—class vessels and 14 *Knox* class destroyer escorts. The first procurement request for 50 3,400-ton patrol frigates—PE's—is in this year's U.S. budget. The PE's will be larger than most Soviet destroyers. By mid to late 1970's, the United States will have an advanced surface-to-surface missile called the Harpoon onboard all our major combatants and some of the patrol boats. How about submarines?

#### SUBMARINES—ATTACK AND CRUISE MISSILE

During World War II, Stalin decided to build 1,200 submarines. This plan was never carried out. However, the submarine remains the major offensive weapon of the Soviet fleet. They currently have 343 submarines, a number that is decreasing yearly as the World War II vintage submarine becomes obsolete. Of the 343, 190 are old diesel attack submarines of limited operational capabilities and are being retired. They also have 65 nuclear attack submarines of which 40 are cruise missile equipped and they have 28 older diesel attack submarines equipped with cruise missiles.

The United States has at least 56 nuclear attack submarines, none with cruise missiles, and 41 older diesel attack submarines without missiles which are being retired. We are building 21 new SSN-688 class and SSN-637 class nuclear attack submarines. The SSN-688 will be the most modern, sophisticated attack submarine in the world. Plans are even being made to produce a follow-on to the SSN-688 which will have a long-range cruise missile capability.

Overall, the Soviet Union retains numerical superiority in submarines, but the speed, quietness, sophistication, and operational techniques of U.S. attack submarines are entirely higher quality. U.S. submarines get much better tactical training and have better equipment.

#### STRATEGIC SUBMARINES

The figures for ballistic missile submarines show a disparity in strength favoring the United States. U.S. seabased strategic capability is imposing. We have 41 ballistic missile submarines with missile ranges up to 2,500 nautical miles. The Poseidon version carries 16 missiles with about 10 multiple independently targeted reentry vehicles—MIRV's—each. By fiscal year 1975 we will have 31 Poseidon boats with 4,960 reentry vehicles plus 10 older Polaris boats of 16 launchers, each with three multiple reentry vehicles—MRV's.

The Soviets have about 25 Y-class ballistic missile submarines and 17 more under construction, but their missile range is 1,200 nautical miles less than Poseidon, they have neither MRV's nor MIRV's, they have less accuracy, their boats are noisier and thus are more susceptible to ASW techniques. They do not have as long on-station time as U.S. boats, and they suffer from restricted geo-



graphic operating conditions. Older versions, the Hotel and Golf classes are smaller, with even more restricted missile range and operating conditions. Of the entire operational Soviet ballistic missile fleet of 60—roughly 25 Y, 25 Golf, 10 Hotel classes—only 8 to 10 of their ships or 16 percent are on station at any one time. The United States has 32 operational Polaris/Poseidon boats with about 16 or 50 percent on station. A new long-range naval missile, the SS-NX-8 has been tested by the Soviets and may be retrofitted into their Y-class submarine or alternately, placed aboard a new class of submarines.

#### ALLIED FORCES

A simple point-by-point comparison between United States and U.S.S.R. navies is a seriously incomplete picture, however. Allied combatants ships must also be included. Major NATO combatants number 757 compared to 583 for the Warsaw Pact. This case is aptly demonstrated in the Mediterranean. The total average number of Warsaw Pact and their allied—Egypt, Yugoslavia, Albania—major combatants in the Mediterranean ranges from 43 to 54. The counterpart NATO and our allied forces—one-half French fleet, Spain, Israel—total is 164 or almost four times as many.

In fact, either the French or Italian Mediterranean forces is numerically, at least, the equal of the Soviet Mediterranean fleet.

We must not overlook the British and French strategic forces. The British have four Polaris ballistic missile submarines which carry the A-3 triple MRV. The French have one ballistic missile submarine with 16 tubes and have four more under construction.

#### ADDITIONAL ADVANTAGES

Let me mention a few other areas in which the U.S. Navy has a decided advantage. We do not operate under the restricted geographic conditions that hamper the Soviet fleet. They must face ice-in ports and narrow transit waters where they can be detected and even bottled in during wartime. We have numerous overseas bases for replenishment, crew liberty, and repairs. Advanced bases also provide for quick reaction time.

The U.S. Navy surveillance and communications systems are far more sophisticated than anything the Soviets have.

We also have a significant lead in the strategically important area of anti-submarine warfare—ASW. The U.S. Navy confidently states that no U.S. Polaris-type submarines are being detected or followed by Soviet submarines. On the other hand, U.S. listening devices and attack submarines do detect, identify, and track Soviet submarines. No one questions our superiority in this field. U.S. capability in tactical ASW is likewise far superior and this moderates, to some degree, the heavy Soviet emphasis on submarines. The 5nm ASROC and 35nm SUBROC, for example, are ASW innovations used exclusively by the United States.

So far I have pinpointed a number of distinctions between the United States and U.S.S.R. fleets. I think it is apparent that our conventional and nuclear surface fleet is far more powerful, in almost every category, than their Soviet counterparts. I have also shown that in terms of some types of submarines, and possibly surface-to-surface missiles, Soviets lead at present.

#### MODERNIZATION AND CONSTRUCTION

But what about modernization and construction rates? Are not the Soviets gaining on us rapidly?

The answer: "No." It is true that since the Soviets have decided to modernize some of their fleet and replace older vessels and then show these ships in some new areas of the world, they have attracted a lot of attention. It must be noted, however, that they have had limited open ocean experience, nothing comparable to the U.S. fleet. The decision to enter new waters was political, not the result

of an increasing number of ships. The Soviet fleet still is defensive in character as opposed to the primary offensive capability of the U.S. Fleet. They have held only one major worldwide ocean exercise, OKEAN, in April of 1970. Since then they have only modestly increased their training exercises in foreign waters.

Now for the facts on modernization. Between 1960 and 1969, and according to the U.S. Navy's own data, the U.S. shipbuilding program has exceeded the Soviet's in every type of ship except the surface-to-surface missile ship. During that period we completed:

- Five attack carriers—the Soviets none;
- Six helicopter carriers—the Soviets two;
- No surface-to-surface missile ships—the Soviets 14;
- Fifty-five surface-to-air missile ships—the Soviets 15; and
- Eighteen antisubmarine warfare ships—the Soviets none.

The U.S.S.R. has expanded shipyard capacity particularly for Y-class submarines, to accommodate their modernization program but there was Soviet naval buildup as a result of the Cuban missile crisis of 1962.

The Soviets have some good weapons, particularly their anti-ship cruise missiles which directly threaten our aircraft carriers. And they have been modernizing their fleet selectively including the use of more efficient gas turbines. But there has been no crash program. There has not even been a buildup in numbers. They do not belong in the same category with the U.S. Navy, a worldwide balanced open ocean force with advanced bases, sea knowledge, staying power, and air coverage.

#### WELL-KNOWN TECHNIQUE

The Pentagon's buildup of the Soviet Navy is a strange but well-known technique. Clearly, if the Soviet Navy is suddenly that much of a threat, our own Navy has not been wisely using its funds, even though they get more money from Congress than the other two services.

It is more likely that the Pentagon is again crying "wolf" in the hope of stampeding Congress into buying the new billion dollar aircraft carrier, the CVN-70, and the multi-billion-dollar Undersea Long-range missile System—ULMS. The Navy has conducted a skillful and extensive lobbying campaign in Congress but we must not be swayed by their incomplete data.

This kind of exaggeration drives the defense budget up every year. But even worse, it is a misstatement of the facts. We are No. 1 militarily, and we should not be afraid to say so.

#### FACTS IN LETTER UNANSWERED

I have written Admiral Zumwalt, the Chief of Naval Operations, challenging the Pentagon to give the full story about the Soviet Navy—a net assessment as this administration prefers to call it.

The admiral has replied but he has not offered a rebuttal to any of the facts. The point is that while he has written that he disagrees he offered not one single specific fact in rebuttal—not one.

Thus, while he states that he believes that many of the assessments in my letter are incorrect, he offers only to "brief me."

I am writing back and insisting that he reply to my facts in writing. I was briefed by Admiral Zumwalt on the F-14. First of all, he brought a flotilla of admirals, captains, and commanders to my office. There was so much gold braid that I calculated that almost half the funds for Navy pay and allowances must go to these gentlemen.

#### GOLD-BRAIDED BRIEFINGS

Then he gave me a "selected" briefing. He justified that biggest lemon of all lemons, the F-14 fighter plane, which will cost at least

\$16 million a copy. The way he did it was to take some relatively unimportant factors to try to show that it was superior to the F-4 in those single facets.

It reminded me of the way baseball records are kept. They now talk about the record for left-handed catchers who hit singles in the fourth inning of the fifth game of a seven-game World Series against a rookie left-hander.

It was that kind of "selected" information the briefing used to justify the F-14.

I am, therefore, refusing a briefing which, if like the last one, never would produce any solid answers and which was largely a gold-braided snow job.

I am insisting that the admiral answer me in writing and put it down on paper where we can see it, analyze it, and not be overwhelmed by uniforms and charts.

The main thrust of my remarks should now be clear. Why should we sharply increase the spending for our Navy when we are so emphatically superior to the Soviets in so many ways? The facts dictate otherwise. Let us be prudent in our fiscal judgments and not overreact to inflated threats.

I ask unanimous consent that the exchange of correspondence with Admiral Zumwalt be placed in the RECORD at this point. I also ask that the May issue of the Defense Monitor, which contains a breakdown of United States-Soviet naval forces be inserted in the RECORD. The Defense Monitor is published by the newly formed Center for Defense Information, headed by Rear Adm. Gene R. LaRocque, U.S. Navy, retired who, I think, is going to make a tremendously useful contribution to our understanding of the real facts on defense.

U.S. SENATE,

Washington, D.C., May 19, 1972.

Adm. ELMO R. ZUMWALT,  
Chief of Naval Operations,  
The Pentagon,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ADMIRAL ZUMWALT: I do not believe that the Department of Defense has presented Congress and the public with a full and complete comparison of the naval programs of the NATO countries and the Warsaw Pact. My research shows that a number of significant variables have been overlooked, thereby giving the impression that the Warsaw Pact nations are enormously more powerful than they are in fact.

I intend to make a full presentation to the Senate on this subject May 25th, demonstrating that the present balance of naval forces is dramatically weighted on the side of the U.S. and NATO countries. I invite you to comment on the following points which I will make, and I will submit your reply to the Senate at the same time so that comparison can be drawn. It is imperative that you respond no later than noon Wednesday, May 24th.

Our conventional and nuclear surface fleet is far more powerful, in almost every category, than their Soviet counterparts. Even though we have 246 major surface combatants and the Soviets have 222, the capabilities of the U.S. vessels are far superior.

For example, the U.S. has four nuclear powered surface ships and is building seven more. The Soviets have none. The U.S. has 14 attack aircraft carriers with up to 90 aircraft each. The Soviets have none. The U.S. has two anti-submarine carriers. The Soviets have none. The U.S. has seven helicopter carriers and is building five more up to 35,000 tons. The Soviets have two converted cruisers of 15,000 tons with helicopter pads. A large new Soviet ship under construction in the Black Sea has not yet been identified. It could be a merchant ship or possibly an aircraft carrier.

A numerical comparison of cruisers points up further misleading statements. The Soviets have 25 to our 9 but only one large Soviet cruiser has any missile capability while all but one of the U.S. cruisers carries missiles. Four of these Soviet cruisers are so old that they probably are being deactivated. Ten Soviet cruisers are smaller in size than many U.S. destroyers.

Considering destroyers, Soviet ships are less numerous (65 to 40) and much smaller in size.

The figures for submarines also show a disparity in strength favoring the United States. U.S. ballistic missile capability is imposing. We have 41 ballistic missile submarines with missile ranges up to 2500 n.m. The Poseidon version carries 16 launchers with about ten Multiple Independently-targeted Reentry Vehicles (MIRVs) each. By 1975 we will have 31 Poseidon boats with 4,960 reentry vehicles plus ten older Polaris boats equipped with triplet multiple reentry vehicles (MRVs). The Soviets have about 25 Y-class ballistic submarines and 17 more under construction, but their missile range is 1200 n.m. less than Poseidon, they have neither MRVs or MIRVs, they have less accuracy, their boats are noisier and thus susceptible to ASW techniques, they do not have as long on-station time as U.S. boats, and they suffer from restricted geographic operating conditions. Older versions of Soviet submarines, the Hotel II and the Golf II classes are smaller with even more restricted missile ranges and operating conditions.

It must be noted that the Soviets do possess some 68 cruise missile submarines which present a threat to U.S. surface craft. They also have a large but quickly obsolescing number (190) of diesel attack submarines of greatly limited capabilities. The U.S. has 56 nuclear attack submarines, more than twice the Soviet's 25. Furthermore, U.S. models are of across-the-board better quality and we are building a more modern submarine class (SSN-688) at a fast pace.

In view of these specific facts, the United States has a clear naval advantage over the Soviet Union in tonnage, conventional fire power, bases, modernization and nuclear warheads. If you dispute this apparent advantage in any respect, please give me your detailed rebuttal.

A simple point-by-point comparison between U.S. and Soviet navies is a seriously incomplete picture however. Allied combatant ships must also be included. Major NATO combatants number 767 compared to 583 for the Warsaw Pact. The case is aptly demonstrated in the Mediterranean. The total average number of Warsaw Pact and Allied major combatants in the Mediterranean ranges from about 43 to 54. The counterpart NATO and Allied forces total is 164 or almost four times as many. In fact, the French and Italian Mediterranean forces are at least, individually, the equal of the Soviet Mediterranean fleet!

Just as present comparisons greatly favor NATO forces, long-term projections also show that this dominance is likely to prevail. The U.S. has 63 major new combatants authorized and under construction ranging from nuclear aircraft carriers to the ill-fated DE-1052 Knox class escorts. This is not to mention the \$1 billion new nuclear aircraft carrier or \$942 million as a down payment on a \$11.9 billion ULMS fleet the Department of Defense is requesting in the Fiscal Year 1973 budget.

I am enclosing a table prepared by the Center for Defense Information on which I base some of my conclusions.

Please give whatever evidence you have to contradict this table and the conclusion that the present U.S. Navy building programs are

more than enough to keep the U.S. far ahead of the Soviets Union in significant categories of naval warfare for the foreseeable future.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM PROXMIER,  
U.S. Senator.

CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS,  
Washington, D.C., May 23, 1972.

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIER,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIER: Thank you for your letter of May 19, 1972 giving me the opportunity to comment on the points you propose to make in your presentation to the Senate on May 25th.

I am sure you recognize that I am in substantial disagreement with many of the statements in your letter. The Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency, the Secretary of the Navy, other Navy witnesses and I have presented all the facts we know concerning the relative naval posture of the United States and our allies and potential adversaries to the Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committees in executive session. This testimony is in the process of security review and the unclassified portions will be published by the cognizant committees in conjunction with their reporting out the military procurement authorizations and appropriations bills.

I regret that the time available from receipt of your letter to the deadline you have set for receipt of my reply is not sufficient for me to address adequately the issues you have raised. Further, since the President is at this moment in Moscow engaging in a series of extremely serious discussions on a number of sensitive subjects, it would be inappropriate for me at this time to engage in correspondence concerning the issues raised in your letter.

Let me assure you that I am perfectly willing to discuss the issues with you after the President returns. In order to do so, it will be necessary to assemble in one presentation the pertinent facts. Therefore, I will be happy to discuss these issues with you and answer any questions you may have.

Since I believe that many of the assessments in your letter of May 19 are incorrect, I would suggest that you avail yourself of this briefing before making the presentation to the Senate. Should you decide, however, to proceed with your presentation without this briefing, I would appreciate your including this reply with your presentation to the Senate.

E. R. ZUMWALT, JR.,  
Admiral, U.S. Navy.

[From the Defense Monitor, May 1972]

#### THE SOVIET NAVAL THREAT: REALITY AND ILLUSION

Admiral Thomas H. Moorer, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, has told Congress that "a major shift in the naval balance between the United States and the Soviet Union" is taking place.

"Unless we accelerate the modernization of our fleet," he told the Senate Armed Services Committee on February 15, 1972, "the Soviets will increasingly challenge our control of the seas in those maritime regions essential to the success of our forward defense strategy, as well as in ocean areas closer to our shores."

On the basis of these arguments, the Defense Department has asked Congress for \$9.7 billion in new Navy procurement funds for fiscal 1973, about \$1 billion more than in 1972, which was in turn about \$1 billion more than in 1971. These funds are part of a

Navy "modernization" program: 42 major combat ships and 21 submarines now under construction or authorized by Congress and more than 60 major surface ships and a new fleet of ballistic missile submarines contemplated (see tables 4 and 5).

The Center for Defense Information has made its own study of the naval balance and has reached the following conclusions:

The balance is heavily in favor of the United States.

The Soviet Union is doing little which would significantly change the balance in the next few years.

There is little evidence to support the request for a large increase in money for ships designed to protect US power overseas and to greatly expand US strategic weapons capability.

#### A LOOK AT THE BALANCE

Defense Department testimony to Congress on the Soviet naval threat stresses such trends as an increase in the number of Soviet major combat surface ships in the last five years (from 185 to 215, including two new helicopter carriers, seven new missile cruisers, 18 new missile destroyers and 36 new escorts). It stresses Russia's numerical advantage in submarines (about 343 Soviet to 138 US), new Soviet anti-ship missiles, and increases in Soviet naval operations in the world's oceans.

But these presentations fail to give a fair picture of the relative strengths of these two navies. The diagrams and data on the following pages give a fair picture. They show that:

1. The Soviet Union has no nuclear-powered combat surface ships and is not reported to be building any. The United States has four and is building seven more.

2. The United States has 14 attack aircraft carriers which carry from 40 to 90 jet aircraft each, used for striking land or sea targets. Two nuclear carriers are under construction. The Soviet Union has no attack carriers and no sea-based fixed-wing aircraft. The Defense Department has asked for funds in 1973 to start building the power plant for a fourth nuclear attack carrier. It also has asked for funds to design a new fleet of at least eight smaller follow-on carriers to be called Sea Control Ships.

3. The United States has two anti-submarine carriers which carry helicopters and fixed-wing anti-submarine aircraft. The Soviets have two anti-submarine carriers which are actually cruisers with large helicopter landing decks. One 35,000-ton ship is under construction in the Soviet Union which may be a carrier or some other type of ship.

4. The United States has seven "assault" helicopter carriers designed to move marines ashore. Five more, twice the size of the existing ones, are under construction. The Soviet Union has no comparable ships.

5. The United States has nine cruisers. The Soviets have 25. But four of the Soviet cruisers are pre-World War Two and are probably being retired. Ten of the Soviet cruisers are smaller than many US destroyers. The US Navy wants to build two 2200-ton prototypes of what would eventually be a cruiser-size hovercraft called a "surface effects ship."

6. Soviet missile-firing destroyers are fewer and smaller than their US counterparts. Congress has already authorized 30 new destroyers (DD963 Spruance Class), which are larger than any destroyers of the Soviet Union. The US Navy is asking for funds for 50 new "patrol frigates" which will be larger than most Soviet destroyers. By the late 1970s all US destroyers and patrol frigates are to be equipped with the new Harpoon surface-to-surface missile.

7. The present US fleet of 41 strategic ballistic missile submarines has 2800 separately



targetable warheads.<sup>1</sup> Russia's ballistic missile submarines have about 500 warheads (see Table 1). Also, a greater percentage of the US ballistic missile submarines are on station at a given time than is the case with the Soviet submarines. By 1976, the number of separately targetable US submarine-launched warheads will increase to almost 7000. This figure does not reflect the proposed new ULMS ballistic missile submarine system which will be the subject of a subsequent edition of *The Defense Monitor*.

8. The Soviets have a fleet of 68 submarines armed with anti-shiping "cruise" missiles. The United States decided in the 1950s not to develop a capability in this area and abandoned its Regulus missile program. Recently, the Pentagon decided to go ahead with development of a new cruise missile for a new attack submarine.

9. The US has more than twice the number of nuclear-powered attack submarines as the Soviet Union. The Russians have 190 diesel attack submarines as compared to 41 for the US, but these are being phased out of both navies. The total number of Soviet attack submarines has decreased from 430 in 1960 to 283 in 1972, and Admiral Moorer states that he expects this number will continue to decline as newer submarines are introduced at a slower rate than older units are withdrawn. The US is building a new class of nuclear attack submarines (SSN 688 Los Angeles Class).

#### CONSTRUCTION

Admiral Moorer told Congress: "The rate of modernization in the Soviet surface fleet

<sup>1</sup>To put in context with overall U.S. strategic capability, Secretary Laird gave these comparative figures for nuclear weapons for mid 1972:

Total offensive strategic nuclear weapons (warheads):

U.S.	5,700
U.S.S.R.	2,500

is expected to accelerate during the next few years."

The Russians are building mainly light cruisers and destroyers. These include Kresta II cruisers, and Krivak and Kashin destroyers. Recently these have been built at a rate of about one per year in each class. Defense Department reports have suggested another "possible" cruiser construction program and a "possible" carrier.

But in view of the U.S. construction program already in progress, Soviet "acceleration" would have to be enormous to make a significant difference in the overall balance.

#### REGIONAL BALANCES

When talking about a shifting balance, Defense Department witnesses limit themselves to comparing the US and Soviet navies. Yet, many NATO allies have modern effective navies that must be taken into account. When NATO and Warsaw Pact forces are compared the balance clearly favors NATO (see Table 2).

The balance is even more striking when naval forces in the Mediterranean, for example, are examined alone (see Table 3). (Not shown in the table are the more than 50 small patrol boats armed with anti-ship missiles which the Soviet Union has given many of her allies in the area. These boats normally operate relatively near shore.)

#### OTHER FACTORS

The map on page seven shows that Soviet fleets suffer geographic and climatic handicaps—limitations not faced by the US Navy. Some fleets are partially iced-in during winter. Others can be bottled up in home waters because of narrow passages through which they must travel. These "choke points" also facilitate NATO's monitoring of Soviet fleet movements.

In discussing the US-USSR naval balance, Defense Department witnesses neglect to consider the US Coast Guard—a force which possesses over 50 ocean-going cutters of naval

destroyer size, armed with guns and anti-submarine weapons.

#### CONCLUSIONS

The overall balance favors the United States. The Soviet Union is not likely to change this status in the near future.

The naval "balance" argument does not, therefore, justify, by itself, the kind of naval buildup which the Defense Department has under way now or plans in the future. However, Defense Department testimony makes clear that the Navy has other purposes in mind. Admiral Elmo R. Zumwalt Jr., Chief of Naval Operations, told Congress that the Navy's four "capabilities" are:

"Assured second strike" (This refers to the Polaris-Poseidon fleet retaliating with strategic missiles after a Soviet nuclear attack on the United States.)

"Control of sealines and areas"

"Projection of power ashore"

"Overseas presence"

The first "capability" is defensive. In view of the overwhelming second strike capability which the U.S. possesses, the new ULMS program is not needed at this time. The American public deserves a much clearer definition of the other Navy "capabilities": What kind and degree of "control of the seas" has the U.S. decided to pursue? Under what conditions and in what areas of the world will it "project power ashore"? What portion of the present Navy and what portion of the "modernization" program is designed for overseas presence? These are questions which must be publicly asked and answered before additional programs are approved by Congress.

"Every addition to defense expenditure does not automatically increase military security. Because security is based upon moral and economic, as well as purely military strength, a point can be reached at which additional funds for arms, far from bolstering security, weaken it."—President Eisenhower.

TABLE 1.—CURRENT BALLISTIC MISSILE SUBMARINE COMPARISON

Type	Number of submarines	Missile type	Missile range	Number of launchers per submarine	Total number of launchers	Number of independent warheads per submarine	Total number of warheads
<b>U.S. 1:</b>							
Poseidon.....	12	Poseidon.....	2,500 nautical miles.....	16	192	192	2,304
Polaris.....	21	A-3.....	2,500 nautical miles.....	16	336	16	336
Polaris.....	8	A-2.....	1,500 nautical miles.....	16	128	16	128
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>41</b>				<b>656</b>		<b>2,768</b>
<b>U.S.S.R. 2:</b>							
Yankee.....	26	SS-N-6 (Sawfly).....	1,300 nautical miles.....	16	416	16	416
Hotel II.....	9	SS-N-5 (Srb).....	650 nautical miles.....	3	27	3	27
Golf II.....	25	SS-N-5 (Srb).....	650 nautical miles.....	3	75	3	75
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>60</b>				<b>518</b>		<b>518</b>

Figures as of June 1972.

<sup>2</sup> Figures of February 1972.

TABLE 2.—MAJOR NAVAL COMBATANT COMPARISON

[Figures as of February 1972]

#### NATO

	Total	United States	United Kingdom	France	Canada	Denmark	Netherlands	Italy	Norway	Portugal	Greece	Turkey	West Germany
Attack and ASW carriers.....	20	16	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Helicopter carriers.....	12	7	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cruisers.....	16	9	3	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Destroyers and escorts.....	460	214	76	48	20	2	18	24	5	11	12	10	20
Submarines.....	259	138	34	20	4	6	5	10	15	4	2	10	11
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>767</b>	<b>384</b>	<b>118</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>31</b>

## WARSAW PACT

	Totals	U.S.S.R.	Bulgaria	Czechoslovakia	East Germany	Hungary	Poland	Rumania
Attack and ASW carriers.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Helicopter carriers.....	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0
Cruisers.....	25	25	0	0	0	0	0	0
Destroyers and escorts.....	206	195	2	4	3	0	2	0
Submarines.....	350	343	2	0	0	0	5	0
Total.....	583	565	4	4	3	0	7	0

TABLE 3.—MAJOR NAVAL COMBATANTS IN MEDITERRANEAN AREA

	NATO and U.S. allies					Warsaw Pact and U.S.S.R. allies					
	Total	NATO <sup>1</sup>	Spain <sup>2</sup>	Israel	Morocco	Total	Warsaw Pact (U.S.S.R.) <sup>3</sup>	Egypt	Yugoslavia <sup>4</sup>	Albania <sup>4</sup>	Others <sup>4</sup>
Attack and ASW carriers.....	5	4	1	0	0	0-0	0-0	0	0	0	0
Helicopter carriers.....	3	3	0	0	0	0-1	0-1	0	0	0	0
Cruisers.....	3	2	1	0	0	2-4	2-4	0	0	0	0
Destroyers and escorts.....	106	86	17	2	1	14-17	5-8	7	2	0	0
Attack Submarines.....	47	41	3	3	0	27-32	7-12	12	5	3	0
Total.....	164	136	22	5	1	43-54	14-25	19	7	3	0

<sup>1</sup> NATO includes U.S. 6th Fleet; United Kingdom forces normally in the area; one-half of the French Navy; and the naval forces of Italy, Greece, and Turkey.

<sup>2</sup> One-half of the Spanish Navy.

<sup>3</sup> U.S.S.R. totals are normal and highest observed.

<sup>4</sup> Yugoslavia and Albania are included though the political situation with the U.S.S.R. may be strained at the moment.

<sup>5</sup> Others include Syria, Libya, Algeria, Tunisia, and Lebanon.

TABLE 4.—Summary of major US Combatant ships authorized or presently under construction.

2—Nuclear Attack Carriers.
5—Large Amphibious Helicopter Assault Carriers.
5—Large Nuclear Guided Missile Destroyer Leaders.
16—Large All-Purpose Destroyers (DD963 Spruance Class).
14—Large Escorts (DE 1052 Knox Class).
12—Large Nuclear Attack Submarines (SSN688 Los Angeles Class).
9—Medium Nuclear Attack Submarines (SSN637 Sturgeon Class).

TABLE 5.—Summary of major US combatant ships, fiscal year 1973 requested.

\$299 million for long lead items for one additional nuclear attack carrier (OVN-70). (Eventual total program will cost an estimated \$951 million.)

\$10 million for contract design for a "first buy" of eight new follow-on carriers called Sea Control Ships (SCS). (Eventual total program will cost an estimated \$1 billion.)

\$50 million for two 2200-ton prototypes of a new major surface combatant called Surface Effect Ship (SES), which will be a large hovercraft. (Eventual total program cost is not available.)

\$945 million for advanced development of a new strategic-missile nuclear submarine called Undersea Long-Range Missile System (ULMS). (Eventual total program will cost an estimated \$11.2 billion as "presently constituted.")

\$612 million for procurement of seven additional all-purpose destroyers of the DD963 Spruance Class. (Eventual total program will cost an estimated \$2.7 billion.)

\$192 million for the lead ship of a new fifty ship class called Patrol Frigate (PF). (Eventual total program cost is estimated at \$2.4 billion.)

\$1.05 billion for procurement of six additional nuclear attack submarines of the SSN688 Los Angeles Class. (Eventual total program will cost an estimated \$6.8 billion.)

(All total program cost estimates are based on Department of Defense figures.)

	United States	U.S.S.R.
Surface:		
Aircraft carriers.....	16	0
Helicopter carriers.....	7	2
Cruisers (with missiles).....	8	11
Cruisers (without missiles).....	1	14
Destroyers and escorts (with missiles).....	65	40
Destroyers and escorts (without missiles).....	149	155
Surface total.....	246	222
Submarines:		
Nuclear submarines (with ballistic missiles).....	41	35
Diesel submarines (with ballistic missiles).....	0	25
Nuclear attack submarines (with cruise missiles).....	0	140
Diesel attack submarines (with cruise missiles).....	0	28
Nuclear attack submarines (without missiles).....	56	25
Diesel attack submarines (without missiles).....	41	190
Submarine total.....	138	343
Major naval combatant total.....	384	565

<sup>1</sup> Estimated.

## THE CENTER FOR DEFENSE INFORMATION

The enormous size and complexity of the military effort in this country has outrun the institutions established for citizen understanding and control of public policy. An informed public opinion on national defense and foreign commitments is lacking in our society.

For these reasons the Center for Defense Information has been established. The Fund for Peace has encouraged and made possible the initiation of this Center. Further funding will be provided by private foundations and interested individuals. The Center will be under absolutely no financial or other obligation to any government, military, industrial or individual special interest.

The Center will concentrate exclusively on analyzing and circulating public information on matters of national defense and overseas commitments, as well as scrutinizing our national defense program on a day-to-day basis. Its appraisals will challenge existing assumptions about national defense and

provide the basis for rational alternative policies and budgets to be measured against those of the Department of Defense.

The Center will disseminate its research and information to the broadest public possible through position papers; a journal, *The Defense Monitor*, of which this is the first edition; and material designed for the news and other media. In addition, the Center will respond to requests for information on defense matters. Future editions of *The Defense Monitor* will include analysis of the defense budget, ULMS (Underwater Long-range Missile System), the B-1 Bomber, technological superiority, the proposed attack carrier, U.S. forces overseas and military commitments to foreign nations, as well as other topics of vital national and military concern.

The Center and its rapidly developing inventory of information will be a reliable and non-partisan resource for all individuals and groups, insisting upon a military that will genuinely defend and strengthen American society, not weaken it by overcommitments and waste of resources.

MAY 26, 1972.

Adm. ELMO R. ZUMWALT,  
Chief of Naval Operations, The Pentagon,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR ADMIRAL ZUMWALT: I appreciate having your "reply" to my letter which I have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. But I note that while you disagree with me you do not cite a single "fact" in support of your position.

I noted your complaint about not having sufficient time to answer my letter. May I say that working with me on my material were two aides, each devoting only part time to this matter. And they organized the material in far less than five days in which I asked you to reply to my letter. With the entire Navy Department at your disposal and with the massive work that has already gone into your and other Navy testimony, I see no reason why you could not have given a detailed reply to my statements in the five-day period.

You offer to "brief" me, but for reasons I mentioned in my speech, what I want is your answer in writing so that we can see the facts, analyze them, and not be overwhelmed by uniforms and charts.



Would you therefore reply to my Senate speech, which is based on public data as of February 1972, and answer these questions?

Is it not true that our superiority in aircraft carriers, seabased air operations, and nuclear surface ships is virtually absolute? If not, what specific facts deny that?

Are any of the facts in my statement concerning cruisers and destroyers incorrect in any substantial way? Is it not true that many of our destroyers are in fact bigger than some Soviet cruisers, and that the 3,400-ton patrol frigates will be larger than some Soviet destroyers?

Are not my facts with respect to Soviet attack and strategic submarines correct?

Is it not correct that while the Soviets retain some numerical superiority in diesel attack submarines, that the speed, quietness, sophistication, and operation techniques of the U.S. attack submarines are of entirely higher quality than the Soviet's?

Does the U.S. not have a 2 to 1 lead in nuclear attack subs?

Is it not true that while both we and the Soviets have about the same number of strategic ballistic missile submarines, that the disparity in overall strength favoring the U.S. is imposing?

Is it not true that the Soviet SLBM's have a missile range of at least 1,200 nautical miles less than ours, that they have neither MRV's or MIRV's, that their missiles are less accurate, and that their boats are noisier and far more susceptible to ASW techniques? Is it not true that they do not have as long on-station time and suffer from limited geographic operating conditions including iced-in ports and bottleneck transit points?

Is it not true that major NATO combatants number 767 compared to 583 for the Warsaw Pact?

Is it not true that either the French or Italian Mediterranean force is numerically at least the equal of the Soviet Mediterranean fleet?

Is it not also true that we have a decided advantage over the Soviet fleet because of its restricted geographic limitation, our advanced overseas bases, our far superior surveillance and communications system and superiority in our ASW techniques?

Do you deny the facts I inserted in the Record on the shipbuilding programs between 1960 and 1969 which show that we have exceeded the Soviets in every type of ship except surface to surface missile ships?

Is it not true that our conventional and nuclear surface fleet is far more powerful, in almost every category, than their Soviet counterparts?

Is it not true that the Soviet fleet does not belong in the same category with the U.S. Navy which is a world-wide balanced open-ocean force with advanced bases, sea knowledge, staying power, and air coverage?

Is it not true that our Navy is Number One? Is it not true that under present plans and programs we will continue to be Number One for the foreseeable future?

I am enclosing the text of my Senate speech so that you can reply to the additional details contained there.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM PROXMIRE,  
U.S. Senate.

CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS,  
June 2, 1972.

HON. WILLIAM PROXMIRE,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR PROXMIRE: As you know, the diplomatic situation made it inappropriate for me to respond fully on 23 May to your letter questioning official assessments of relative U.S.-Soviet naval capabilities. Now that the President has returned, I welcome the opportunity to do so, because this subject is central to our plans for meeting the Navy's assigned responsibilities.

As you requested, I have had a detailed reply prepared to the points you have raised. In addition, my staff has prepared, in both conceptual and tubular form, a comparison of the navies of the United States and the Soviet Union. Both statements are enclosed. They present a far more complete and correct comparison and inventory of the two navies than does Table Seven of the May, 1972, *Defense Monitor* which you sent me, indicating that it provided the basis for some of your conclusions, and which you specifically asked me to respond to. This table does not appear in the copy of the *Defense Monitor* which you inserted in the *Congressional Record* with your remarks.

The Navy and other agencies are continuously collecting and refining information and examining its implications for the relative capabilities of the U.S. and the Soviet Union. We strive constantly to improve the methods by which these complex and difficult assessments are made. That is why I was dismayed at the dubious quality of the analytical work on which some of your condemnation of the Defense Department was apparently based.

#### DEFECTS IN ANALYSIS

Simply put, the analysis given you by the Center for Defense Information is biased and conceptually flawed.

First, the data has been qualified or selected in such a way as to be misleading. Important elements of Soviet naval capability are ignored or improperly compared. Some of these are so well known by every competent analyst who is concerned with the subject that exclusion of them raises serious questions about the competence of the work as a whole.

Second, I believe that this research is tainted by so basic a conceptual flaw that, even if the study had been competently and accurately carried out and contained no serious bias, intentional or otherwise, it would not support the firm conclusions you have drawn.

#### BIAS

My first concern deals with several biases in the research provided you. Elements important to a fair comparison are simply omitted. For instance, the large segment of Soviet naval capability that consists of smaller combatants was disregarded. These units play an important role in Soviet naval planning and have significant combat capabilities in such enclosed seas as the Mediterranean, the Persian Gulf, and the Caribbean.

The Soviets have 970 of these vessels; 150 of them are equipped with anti-ship missiles similar to the ones that sank the Israeli destroyer *Eilat* in 1967.

The Soviets have:

- 150 missile patrol boats (Osa, Komar, and Nanuchka), armed with surface-to-surface cruise missiles
- 250 fast patrol boats
- 250 coastal escorts and submarine chasers
- 195 fleet minesweepers
- 125 coastal minesweepers

In contrast to these 970 vessels, the U.S. has 31 ocean minesweepers and 16 patrol gunboats in a similar category; two of the patrol gunboats have undergone trials with missiles.

The Soviets have some 900 land-based naval aircraft, over 300 of which are equipped with long-range, sophisticated, anti-ship missiles. The only comparable U.S. airplanes are our 292 P-3 ASW aircraft. Our aircraft, however, do not have a long-range anti-ship missile capability. In addition, a significant portion of the Soviets' counterpart to our Strategic Air Command, their Long Range Aviation—strategic aircraft, armed with cruise missiles—is now assigned against our Navy. This reassignment of mission has been made possible by the growth of the Soviet land and sea-based strategic missile forces. Again no mention of these capabilities is made in your statement.

In addition to these omissions, the nu-

merical comparisons you provided are biased. Table Seven of the May 1972 *Defense Monitor*, which you enclosed in your letter as the basis for some of your conclusions for instance, overstates U.S. forces by including 127 ships that are under construction or have been requested for the future. For the Soviets, however, it lists only two ships under construction. In actuality, we know that the Soviets have been building ships at a faster rate than the U.S. and that, over the past decade, have increased their shipbuilding capacity enormously.

The statistics you have cited, therefore, compare a whole U.S. Navy that we would like to have in the 1980's, some of it not even yet approved by the Congress, with a portion of the Soviet fleet of today.

The Soviets have 28, not 25, cruisers, 14 of which—one "large" and 13 smaller—are missile equipped. Moreover, the smaller cruisers have impressive armament, including both surface-to-surface missiles (not one of our ships has any) and surface-to-air missiles, as well as anti-submarine weapons and guns. There are about 100 missile rails on these 13 ships.

You declare that four Russian cruisers are so old that they are "probably" being deactivated. You do not add that all of the U.S. cruisers, except for *LONG BEACH*, are of the same vintage as these four "old" Soviet ships.

Another error of detail deserves mention at this point: The Soviets' helicopter carriers are not the cruisers you term them. They represent an important new capability, designed and built from the keel up, as new, highly specialized ships, with excellent anti-submarine sensors and a long-range anti-submarine rocket system.

I would note here that you have cited our unique superiority in aircraft carriers over the Soviet fleet. In the total calculation of general purpose naval forces, it is, in fact, the only clear margin of superiority we now have. It is for this reason that I have stated a strong case, supported by the Secretary of Defense and the President, for inclusion of CVN-70 in this year's budget. Our oldest attack carriers, built in the mid-40's, are fast approaching the end of their service life. It is essential that we maintain a modern and effective carrier force if we are to sustain this vital margin of superiority.

#### FUNDAMENTAL FLAW

Your statement points out that comparisons of forces, to be valid, must include "not only numbers, but tonnage, sophistication, and effectiveness." I would add that these simplistic force comparisons do not begin to come to grips with an overall assessment of capabilities to implement either national security or military strategy. The total force concept is designed to do this. However, since you opened our exchange with a comparison of specific forces—navies—I will discuss the subject of the two navies, and a comparison of these forces. Let me point out, though, that any comparison, to be valid, must first determine what it is the individual forces are intended to do. This crucial element is missing entirely from the study you have cited.

Both navies are designed, in part, for nuclear deterrence. To that extent, our tasks are similar. Beyond that point, however, U.S. Naval forces are designed to support distant U.S. forces overseas, and, under the Nixon Doctrine, when required, the indigenous armies of our allies, necessitating forward defense, sea control, and the ability to project power ashore. Accordingly, the U.S. Navy has substantial components of tactical air and Marine forces, whose primary missions, while essential to our defense posture, are not directed solely at deterrence of the Soviet Navy through a direct capability to defeat that navy. We have, in addition, a logistic defense requirement of vast proportions.

The Soviet Navy, by contrast, as a Navy in

support of a nation whose vital interests are those of a land power, is designed largely to prevent the U.S. Navy from carrying out its missions. At the same time, we see increasing evidence of the growing use of the Soviet Navy to further the political designs of the USSR. The Soviet Naval units have been optimized in design for strong initial striking power, with relatively limited reload and endurance and hence less tonnage per unit and little need for nuclear propulsion. Except for their submarine force, the Soviets' naval forces are expected to operate closer to home, to be brought to bear against our Eurasian allies, and hence to require less endurance than our forces.

These differences in mission must be taken into account when the two navies are compared.

The relative adequacy of the two navies has been strongly affected by geography, as you point out. For many years we designed our forces to be able to contain the Soviet Navy, if required to do so, by exploiting the geographic barriers that constrict its access to the open sea. But we can no longer count on this strategy. The extended and rising levels of distant, continuing deployments by Soviet forces have nullified it.

Other effects of relative geography, which your statement does not mention, operate to make our task far more difficult than theirs. For instance, geography permits the Soviets to use land-based aircraft; we are forced to rely on sea-based air. Geography forces us to use the seas to communicate with our allies; the Soviets can reach almost all of their allies by land.

Finally, the same geography that used to bottle up the Soviets now imposes on our sea-based offensive forces a need for strategic missiles of longer range. The Soviets, by contrast, with two major oceans washing the shores of the U.S., are enabled by geography to make much better use of shorter range SLEMs than we are.

In summary, as these few examples show, direct comparison of force levels or unit-tonnage can lead to clearly erroneous conclusions regarding the relative capabilities of the two sides. This simplistic and outmoded approach to the complex process of "net assessment" was abandoned as inadequate by competent specialists in the field many years ago.

#### TRENDS

For these reasons, I do not believe that the analyses that have been provided you are adequate grounds for concluding that the U.S. is "far superior" to the Soviets in naval strength. On the contrary, the examples I have cited reflect general trends that are running against the U.S., trends that are of deep concern to me. Some of the evidence of these trends appeared in the unclassified version of my testimony before Congress, several months ago. In fact, similar concern has been expressed by Department of Defense spokesmen for a number of years.

The ships of the U.S. Navy are 16 years old, on the average; in the Soviet Navy, the average age of ships is 9 years.

The Soviets operate only 4 major surface ships built before 1952; we are operating 132.

The greater obsolescence of our Navy is a direct consequence of construction rates in the two countries. The Soviets built 89 missile configured surface ships and nuclear submarines between 1967 and 1971; the U.S. produced 42.

#### CONCLUSIONS

The most important conclusions which can be drawn from a comparison of force levels and mix are: (1) that the two navies are structured differently—as attested to by type comparisons—which is indicative of their differing missions; and (2) that the Soviets pose a serious challenge to our previous superiority at sea.

In his unclassified testimony before the Congress this year, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff stated the problem as follows:

"The Soviets still cannot match our capabilities to project sea power and control the sea lines of communication. However, they already have a formidable capacity, particularly in their large and varied antiship missile forces, to attack our sea power projection forces and to sever our sea lines of communication."

The problems we face with the continuing growth in Soviet naval capabilities relative to our own is a matter of increasing concern to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. The Soviet Navy has already acquired a global reach. Their ships are now operating on a sustained basis in the Atlantic, Pacific, and Indian Ocean, the Mediterranean, and increasingly in the Caribbean. Unless we accelerate the modernization of our fleet, the Soviets will increasingly challenge our control of the seas in those maritime regions essential to the success of our forward defense strategy, as well as in ocean areas closer to our shores."

In my unclassified testimony before the Congress, I came to the logical conclusion following Admiral Moorer's statement on the Soviet capacity to attack our sea power projection forces and to sever our sea lines of communication, and said, "We are in a period in our history in which we face grave risks from circumstances over which we may have little control. Our Navy can be a decisive factor in such circumstances. As an island nation, we cannot rationally engage in commerce, honor treaties or deploy forces overseas without the protection of a strong Navy. Without adequate naval capability we cannot deter conventional war, let alone win it."

I hope you find this assessment helpful. I am, of course, ready to provide you with any additional information you may require, either in person or in writing. In the meantime, I trust you will feel free to include this letter and its enclosures, as a whole, in the record.

Sincerely,

E. R. ZUMWALT, Jr.,  
Admiral, U.S. Navy.

P.S. I am also enclosing a copy of a speech by Admiral Rivero on the occasion of the change of command of Commander Allied Forces, Southern Europe on 31 May 1972. Please note the deep concern over the growing Soviet naval threat expressed by one of our elder statesmen with extensive first-hand knowledge of the situation.

Your letter of May 26th arrived just before I left for Naples. After I had prepared their response to your letter of May 19th I will reply to your latest specific questions in a few days.

#### COMPARING THE U.S. AND SOVIET NAVIES

Comparison of the U.S. and Soviet navies requires an understanding of their different missions.

#### MISSIONS

The United States has traditionally been a maritime nation, dependent on the sea for its livelihood. In contrast, the Soviet Union, despite its historical aspirations to maritime preeminence, has traditionally been a Continental land power.

The United States requires extensive sea lines of communication for peacetime trade and to be able to support allied and U.S. forces overseas. Our European and Asian allies are separated from us by vast expanses of ocean. Our interests are world-wide in scope. Our fleet has been developed to support these interests to assure free use of the seas. Our naval forces have been charged with a strategic second strike mission, with protecting our vital sea lines of communications, with projecting power, through sea-based air and amphibious forces, wherever necessary in support of U.S. and allied forces and with main-

taining an American presence in distant areas.

As a result of assiduous efforts over a half century, on the other hand, the Soviet Union is self-sufficient economically. The United States clearly is not. Soviet economic lines of communication are largely confined to land routes and to coastal shipping. The USSR's principal allies are contiguous to its borders. The evolution of the Soviet Navy has reflected these factors. The Soviet Navy shares with its U.S. counterpart a strategic attack mission and the task of maintaining a naval presence commensurate with the Soviet Union's great-power status. But direct comparisons end with these missions. The Soviet Navy's other missions are not to guard sea lines of communication nor, currently, to project power ashore, but to keep Western forces from doing so—i.e., to prevent, in wartime, the functioning of the free world maritime alliances, economically and militarily.

They are tasked with countering Western naval forces and with disrupting our sea lines of communication.

Because the two navies differ in mission, they differ in composition. There are disparities in force structure, hardware, and operations. Because of the requirement in support of U.S. interests to be able to project power, the U.S. Navy relies on carriers, carrier-based attack and fighter aircraft, and amphibious ships.

Because of the need to protect all shipping, we have built surface ships including carriers, attack submarines, and aircraft with an antisubmarine warfare and antiaircraft capability. Further, since our forces must operate worldwide, we need large service forces to sustain them, with their own requirements for escorts.

Since the Soviet Navy, in its present stage of evaluation, does not have the same missions, it does not require the same forces. Consequently, the Soviet Navy does not yet have aircraft carriers, has only a modest amphibious force, and is only beginning to develop a sizeable at-sea logistic capability. Instead, the Soviets have built up a variety of general purpose forces, designed to keep us from carrying out our missions.

The Soviets have the world's largest submarine force. They have long range reconnaissance aircraft, medium bombers equipped with anti-ship missiles, and multi-purpose surface ships with anti-ship cruise missiles.

Thus, a direct comparison of the two fleets, unless heavily footnoted, cannot mean very much. Nor is a direct comparison of platforms useful. With very few exceptions, U.S. ships are not designed to fight Soviet ships of similar classes. Therefore, it is of little value to contrast the characteristics of, say, a Soviet Kresta-class cruiser with a U.S. missile cruiser, or a Kashin-class frigate with the DD 963. What is important is how well the platform, or the fleet, can carry out its assigned tasks. A recent quotation from the Soviet Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral S. G. Gorshkov, indicates that he has come to a similar conclusion:

"The qualitative transformation which has taken place in naval forces has also changed the approach to evaluating the relative might of navies and their combat grouping: We have had to cease comparing the number of warships of one type or another, and their total displacement (or the number of guns in salvo or the weight of this salvo) and turn to a more complex, but also more correct appraisal of the striking and defensive power of ships based on a mathematical analysis of their capabilities and qualitative characteristics."

#### SOVIET NAVAL EVOLUTION

The Cuban missile crisis was very definitely a turning point in the development of the Soviet Navy. However, to appropriately un-



derstand the significant growth trends requires consideration of qualitative and capability factors as the process is too complicated to be reflected in a purely numerical comparison. For example, we consider 1947 to 1957 as the quantitative buildup period for the Soviet Navy. This program, in less than a decade, delivered about 20 cruisers, over 100 destroyers, over 1,000 coastal patrol ships, hundreds of minesweepers and nearly 350 submarines. But the force that resulted was only capable of World War II type operations, short-range defense of the maritime approaches to the USSR, and interdiction of merchant shipping in the northeast Atlantic and Western Pacific.

Thus, the Cuban missile crisis of 1962 found a Soviet Navy with very limited capabilities to conduct distant operations. Moscow's basic concern—military operations on the Eurasian landmass—had guided conventional weapons procurement and force deployments. The Soviet Navy was large but ill-equipped for distant operations: it lacked experience, the armament of Soviet ships offered little protection against aircraft, and logistic support ships were not available. Tactical air and naval infantry units were also equipped and trained for continental warfare: tactical aircraft were short-ranged, and the naval infantry was structured for shore-to-shore operations in support of the army.

Lift capabilities to transport forces to distant areas by air or sea were negligible. Amphibious assault shipping was suitable only for shore-to-shore operations in calm seas. The Soviet merchant fleet was small, totaling only 600 ships; only a few were suited for the needs of a military sealift, as the Soviet program for procuring large hatch ships was just beginning in the early 1960s.

Since the Cuban missile crisis, Soviet forces and capabilities for distant operations have grown significantly, primarily through the introduction of a wide variety of antiship and anti-air missile systems and Soviet achievements in nuclear propulsion techniques. New multipurpose naval ships, better suited to distant operations, have entered the Soviet Navy. Naval Infantry and amphibious shipping have doubled in size; the Soviet Merchant Marine has tripled its tonnage, and now includes nearly 400 ships suited to the needs of military sealift.

This growth has been magnified as a result of a Soviet policy of more forward deployments of its naval forces. In the last decade Soviet naval ship days outside of the areas close to the USSR have grown tenfold, and port calls by Soviet naval ships in foreign ports have grown a hundredfold. This has included the gaining of access to port and/or airfield facilities in many strategic areas; i.e., the Mediterranean, Caribbean, Southeast Atlantic and Indian Ocean. In addition, the Soviets are making overtures to several nations and access to those facilities would provide additional valuable links.

The following table compares Soviet open-ocean unit construction for the five year period before the Cuban missile crisis (1958-62) with the last five years (1967-71), the period that witnessed the fruit of the Soviet decision to accelerate naval expansion after the 1962 missile crisis.

SOVIET NAVAL CONSTRUCTION

	1958-62	1967-71
Helicopter ships.....	0	2
SAM missile ships.....	0	18
SSM/SAM missile ships.....	1	10
Nuclear powered attack submarines.....	10	17
Nuclear powered cruise missile submarines.....	7	12
Nuclear powered ballistic missile submarines.....	9	30
Total.....	27	89

Even these figures, however, must be qualified, as the 89 ships and submarines built during the last five years are considered second generation and far superior to the 27 built in the pre-Cuban period. To further complicate a purely numerical comparison, all of the time-consuming efforts, i.e., shipyard modernization, redesign, retooling etc., are now well along and the leaderships of a considerable number of new classes have entered the operational inventory. However, series production for the majority of these new classes is just now getting underway. Thus, we now have only the first few units of many new classes in the order-of-battle and production rates are now expected to accelerate. This is based not only on the commencement of series production, but the fact that the Soviets are expanding construction capabilities at a large number of their shipyards—in some cases doubling construction facilities.

The important point is that this spurt of growth is not just an overall numerical growth but a growth in capabilities based on a combination of qualitative and numerical factors. This process has converted a navy designed to dominate the water contiguous to the Eurasian landmass into a true Blue Water Navy; one capable of projecting Soviet influence into distant areas and of challenging the U.S. Navy anywhere on the high seas.

## DISCUSSION OF FORCES

(1) *Conventional versus nuclear power.* While it is true that the U.S. Navy has nuclear-powered combat ships and the Soviets do not, the reason is that the U.S. must operate surface combatants for protracted periods in distant areas—the Soviets need not. This is one of the reasons why we are building more nuclear-powered surface ships—to reduce the reaction time needed to get to combat zones at great distances and to increase our capability to sustain combat when we get there.

While packing a great deal of firepower into relatively small hulls, the Soviets have pioneered in development of new propulsion techniques. For example, their 4,500 ton KASHIN-class guided missile frigate is the world's largest naval ship that is powered by gas turbines. Moreover, as Soviet surface forces deploy to distant areas for protracted periods, we foresee the day when they will introduce nuclear powered surface ships. They already have nuclear powered ice breakers; and a new class in the planning phase. With research development, and operational testing completed, introduction of nuclear power into the surface fleet will be a relatively easy matter.

(2) *Aircraft carriers.* As pointed out earlier, the missions of the two navies differ. The U.S. requires carriers to protect the sea lines of communication to our allies and to project power ashore when they require our support. During the past few years, we have sharply decreased our carrier force levels. Building programs for carriers beyond CVN-70 are not yet firm. We hope that the Sea Control Ship Program will be approved. This will provide a ship with some capability to operate aircraft in support of the sea lines of communication. The Soviets have not until now, found it necessary to take tactical aircraft to sea. They have relied entirely on submarines and land-based jet bombers equipped with air-to-surface missiles. Because their Navy's mission has been to attack our surface ships rather than to project power ashore, the Soviets are able politically to acquire increasing access to airfields in other nations and thus, without aircraft carriers, have the ability to disrupt U.S. sealines of communication across both the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. Nevertheless, we now have evidence that the Soviet Navy, in light of its newly assigned mission of projecting Soviet influence into distant areas, is reevaluating its requirements and is

planning to take tactical aircraft to sea. We project that the Soviet's first carrier will, in fact, appear within the next few years—a small carrier by current U.S. standards, possibly carrying vertical take off and landing aircraft, but, like an ESSEX class carrier, an important first step.

(3) *Helicopter Carriers.* The U.S. Navy has traditionally been assigned the mission of deploying, and landing against opposition if necessary Marine and Army ground forces in areas distant from the United States. The evolution of amphibious assault forces has resulted in the concept of vertical envelopment, which employs shipbased helicopters. Our LPH and LHA amphibious assault ships give us this capability. The Soviet Navy, however, does not require vertical envelopment capability. The primary mission of the Soviet Naval Infantry (the counterpart to the U.S. Marine Corps) is to support land campaigns probably along the flanks of the Eurasian landmass, or possibly to assist in seizing the Scandinavian peninsula, driving a wedge across the Baltic Sea to separate the northern and central tiers of Europe, and to seize the Turkish Straits in the event of war in Europe.

The Soviets have introduced two MOSKVA-class guided missile helicopter carriers, ships of 20,000-ton displacement, designed and built from keel up as antisubmarine warfare task force command ships. They carry surface-to-air missiles, antisubmarine rockets, torpedoes, about 20 specially designed ASW helicopters, a new generation of ASW sensors, and an entirely new and sophisticated electronic suit. These ships are somewhat analogous to the two ASW Support Carriers (OVS) in the U.S. fleet. We also plan to operate ASW helicopters and fixedwing aircraft from our larger carriers (CV) for strike and Sea Control operations in a multi-threat environment.

(4) *Cruisers.* The Soviet Navy has the most modern and capable cruiser force in the world. There are 28 cruisers in the inventory, of which 13 are equipped with both surface-to-surface and surface-to-air missiles and one with surface-to-air missiles only; eight of the nine U.S. cruisers have air defense missile systems and rely on conventional guns or accompanying aircraft for defense against Soviet surface ships. Here, too, the Soviets are not content. Having developed the KYNDA, KRESTA-I and KRESTA-II multi-purpose guided missile cruisers, they are developing another new class in the Black Sea; this ship, we estimate, will be larger and even more powerfully armed than its predecessors. The Soviet cruiser force is the newest in the world. Of their 28 active cruisers, only four were completed before 1950, and these are reserved for training or heavy shore bombardment. Eight of the nine U.S. cruisers are of World War II vintage. It is true that Soviet cruisers are smaller than their Western counterparts, but they are generally classified as cruisers under a multifactor formula that includes firepower, rather than tonnage alone.

(5) *Destroyers and Destroyer Escorts.* The Soviets have 193 ships in this category. Some 81 are destroyers and 112 are destroyer escorts. There are 41 missile equipped destroyers. Of these 41, about one-third carry surface-to-surface anti-ship missiles, for which there is no U.S. counterpart. These units, like Soviet cruisers, are smaller than their Western counterparts, but the newer classes are faster, more seaworthy, and have greater firepower than U.S. destroyers. The newest class—the KRIVAK—has been described by a NATO naval officer as "ton-for-ton the most powerful warship ever built". Displacing approximately 3,500 tons the KRIVAK is equipped with a surface-to-surface missile launcher that carries four missiles, as well as two retractable surface-to-air missile launchers, conventional guns, ASW

rockets, torpedoes, mine rails, and new generation sensors and electronics. This multipurpose destroyer is now under series production; we expect the Soviets to build many.

The United States has 215 destroyer and destroyer escorts. Of these, 62 are equipped with surface-to-air missile systems. None yet carry a surface-to-surface missile comparable to the Soviet SSMD. The U.S. Navy has built and will continue to build a mix of large and small ships in these categories. The large ship programs—nuclear powered ships and the DD-963 program—are designed to provide ships with the capability to run with the carriers and to protect them in the very severe environment created by the Soviet missile and submarine threat. The smaller ship program—DE-1052 and the PF—are designed for less demanding roles. The Harpoon program now underway is designed to give our surface ships a specially designed surface-to-surface missile system.

(6) *Ballistic missile submarines.* The U.S. presently enjoys a margin of advantage in submarine launched ballistic missiles (SLBMs), but this lead is rapidly diminishing. In addition to the accelerated construction of Y-class nuclear powered ballistic missile submarines (SSBNs), which carry the 1300 mile SS-N-6, the Soviets are actively testing an extended range SLBM (about twice the range of the SS-N-6). We believe that a construction program of a follow-on class to the Y-class SSBN to carry the new extended-range SLBM, is a logical and likely development. Thus, what may be described as the Soviet "ULMS (or TRIDENT)" is more than mere concept; in the near future it could enter their operational inventory. The recently signed SALT agreement permits the Soviets to have 950 ballistic missile launchers on 62 modern submarines, compared to 710 launchers on 44 submarines for the U.S.

It must be borne in mind that the U.S. is geographically smaller than the Soviet Union; a 3000 mile SLBM will allow Soviet SSBNs to target all of the United States while remaining some 1500 miles at sea. We do not have similar coverage of Soviet territory.

(7) *Attack Submarines.* Having optimized against the U.S. fleet, the Soviets now possess an attack submarine force which surpasses ours in many respects. They have about 290 anti-shipping submarines; 65 of these are nuclear powered and the remainder are diesel craft of post-1951 vintage. Of the 290 submarines, 65 are equipped with advanced anti-shipping cruise missiles, which introduce an entirely new aspect to submarine warfare at a time when the latest U.S. submarine continues to carry torpedoes as its primary anti-ship weapon system. Considering on-station time and geographical limitations, there is no evidence that Soviet submarine patrols are of short duration or that Soviet submarines or crews suffer from extended deployments.

Geography works against only those units which remain in port after hostilities break out; these disadvantages are compensated for by a high state of readiness, which permits "surge" deployment in periods of greater tension. In this regard, both the Northern Fleet and the Pacific Fleet, where the vast majority of Soviet submarines are homeported, have year-around, unimpeded, ice free transit lanes to the North Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

The U.S. attack submarine force consists of 55 nuclear-powered and 41 diesel-electric ships. None are armed with cruise missile. Qualitatively, we believe our late-model nuclear attack submarines are today superior to their Soviet counterparts, although the aggressive Soviet submarine construction program threatens to nullify this advantage.

(8) *Allies.* The proposition has been put forward that a point by point comparison between the navies of the U.S. and USSR yields a seriously incomplete picture—that the combined navies of all our allies should be counted in the balance against the navy of the Soviet Union, the only maritime power in the Warsaw Pact. As has been pointed out, the concept of counting navies to evaluate the naval balance is erroneous. On the other hand, it is true that a proper evaluation of opposing naval capabilities must consider the contribution of allies on both sides. But, this is possible only in situations where their allies can be expected to participate. The historical fact is that the U.S. has some interests that are not shared by our allies. The U.S. and the Soviet may oppose each other in situations in which the allies of neither are involved.

#### COMPARISON

With these facts in mind, we can make some observations about the effectiveness of the two largest navies in the world.

Both are capable, professional forces, the Soviet Navy has more major surface combatant ships and submarines than the U.S.—about 568 to our 378. Our forces normally operate in large task organizations, our ships supporting each other to fulfill the overall mission. Soviet surface combatants usually operate in small groups, often integrated with submarines and aircraft equipped with anti-ship missiles.

The Soviet submarine force is some 2½ times as large as ours, but the U.S. under-seas fleet, has specific qualitative advantages.

The U.S. Navy has far more aircraft than has Soviet Naval Aviation—8,500 to 1,100. Here again, a purely numerical comparison is meaningless because of differing missions. Our carrier-based aircraft are intended primarily to attack targets ashore in defense of U.S. or allied forces and to protect our fleet; the primary mission of the Soviet aircraft is to attack Western navy forces. Therefore our naval air arm has small, versatile, attack aircraft for delivering both conventional and nuclear weapons, and fast, maneuver-

able fighters for fleet defense. The Soviets have no naval fighters and have instead concentrated on medium and heavy bombers with superior range capabilities and stand-off missiles for use against ships.

The Soviet Fleet, on the average, is far newer than ours. The average age of the Soviet Fleet is 9 years; ours is 16. More important, the Soviet Navy has only 4 major ships that are more than 20 years old; we have 132. Age is not necessarily the measure of fighting ability, but these figures do serve to underscore one important point: the Soviets are striving hard to modernize their fleet in an era when the United States is struggling to overcome the obsolescence of many of its principal ships.

As for overall effectiveness: Both fleets are capable. Neither can be confident about the outcome of a large-scale engagement at sea. Just a few years ago, the U.S. Navy could have been highly confident of the outcome. The Soviets have been good at exploiting some of our weak points; we hope that we have identified some of their shortcomings and are turning them to our advantage. The Soviets have a formidable anti-ship missile capability—a capability against which we have been hardpressed to provide defense. We have seen the need for such missiles and missile defenses and are working on them. We are already ahead in anti-submarine warfare, though—numerically, at least the threat we face is greater.

In the past five years alone, about ten new and advanced classes of major surface combatants and submarines have entered the Soviet's operational inventory.

Since the sinking of the Israeli destroyer *Elit* in late 1967, we have been striving toward attainment of an effective counter to the Soviet SS-N-2 (STYX) and other anti-ship missiles. The Soviets, however, have continued their accelerated research and development program and have moved even further ahead by introducing five entirely new and different cruise missile systems into their fleet.

The table, attached, compares the two navies numerically, as of 1 April 1972, without projections for either side.

#### CONCLUSION

The most important conclusions that can be drawn from a comparison of force levels and mix are: (1) that the two navies are structured differently—as attested to by type comparisons—which is indicative of their differing missions; and (2) the increased commitment the Soviets have displayed by having become one of the world's two most powerful maritime nations poses a serious challenge to our previous superiority, and (3) unless we continue a dedicated and determined naval modernization program, expanding Soviet naval capabilities could in the not too distant future, put the Soviet Union in a position to disrupt our use of the seas in pursuing our national interests at home and abroad.

#### COMPARISON OF U.S. AND U.S.S.R. NAVAL COMBATANTS

[Active April 1972]

Class	U.S.		Operational date	Class	U.S.S.R.		Operational date
	Number of active units	Tonnage			Number of active units	Tonnage	
NUCLEAR AIRCRAFT CARRIERS							
Enterprise	1	89,600	1961	None.			
Total	1						



## CONVENTIONAL AIRCRAFT CARRIERS

[Active April 1972]

Class	U.S.			Class	U.S.S.R.		
	Number of active units	Tonnage	Operational date		Number of active units	Tonnage	Operational date
Kitty Hawk.....	4	80,800	1961	None.			
Forrestal.....	4	78,000	1955				
Midway.....	3	64,000	1945				
Hancock.....	2	44,700	1944				
Intrepid.....	2	42,000	1943				
Yorktown.....	1	40,600	1943				
Total.....	16						

## HELICOPTER CARRIERS

Iwo Jima.....	7	18,000	1961	Moskva.....	2	20,000	1967
Total.....	7				2		

## NUCLEAR CRUISERS

Long Beach.....	1	17,331	1961	None.			
Total.....	1						

## CONVENTIONAL GUN CRUISERS

Salem.....	1	20,950	1949	Sverdlov.....		19,200	1951
				Chapayev.....		15,000	1941
				Kirov.....		11,500	1938
Total.....	1			Total.....	14		

## GUIDED MISSILE CRUISERS (SURFACE-TO-AIR)

Albany.....	3	19,000	1945	Sverdlov.....		19,200	1951
Galveston.....	2	15,200	1944				
Providence.....	2	15,192	1944				
Total.....	7			Total.....	1		

## GUIDED MISSILE CRUISERS (SURFACE-TO-SURFACE AND SURFACE-TO-AIR)

None.				Kresta I.....		6,500	1967
				Kresta II.....		7,500	1969
				Kynda.....		6,000	1962
				Undesig.....		Unknown	Unknown
				Total.....	13		

## NUCLEAR DESTROYERS (SURFACE-TO-AIR)

Truxton.....	1	8,659	1967	None.			
Bainbridge.....	1	8,590	1962				
Total.....	2						

## GUIDED MISSILE DESTROYERS (SURFACE-TO-AIR)

Adams.....	23	4,480	1960	Kashin.....		5,200	1962
Decatur.....	4	4,088	1956	Kanin.....		4,600	1967
Mitscher.....	2	5,281	1953	Kotlin.....		3,900	1969
Farragut.....	9	5,800	1960				
Leahy.....	7	7,903	1962				
Belknap.....	9	7,940	1964				
Total.....	54			Total.....	30		

## GUIDED MISSILE DESTROYERS (SURFACE-TO-SURFACE) (SURFACE-TO-AIR)

None.				Krupnyy.....		4,600	1958
				KPLdin.....		4,000	1957
				Krivak.....		3,500	1971
				Total.....	11		

## CONVENTIONAL DESTROYERS

Fram I and II.....	80	3,203-3,520	1944	Kotlin.....		3,800	1954
Sherman.....	14	4,090-4,200	1955	Tallinn.....		4,300	1953
				Skoryy.....		3,500	1949
Total.....	94			Total.....	40		

## GUIDED MISSILE DESTROYER ESCORTS (SURFACE-TO-AIR)

Brooke.....	6	3,476	1966	None.			
Total.....	6						

## CONVENTIONAL DESTROYER ESCORTS

Class	U.S.			Class	U.S.S.R.		
	Number of active units	Tonnage	Operational date		Number of active units	Tonnage	Operational date
Dealey.....	3	1,940	1954	Riga.....	1,600	1952	
Courtney.....	6	1,892	1956	Kola.....	1,900	1951	
Jones.....	4	1,873	1959	Mirka.....	1,100	1964	
Bronstein.....	2	2,629	1963	Petya-I.....	1,150	1960	
Garcia.....	10	3,403	1964	Petya-II.....	1,150	1960	
Knox.....	31	4,100	1969				
Savage (Der).....	3	1,740	1943				
Total.....	59			Total.....	112		

## BALLISTIC MISSILE SUBMARINES (NUCLEAR)

Washington.....	5	6,019	1959	Yankee.....	7,300	1969	
Ethan Allen.....	5	6,955	1961	Hotel.....	3,500	1960	
Lafayette.....	9	7,250	1963				
Madison.....	10	7,300	1964				
Franklin.....	12	7,320	1965				
Total.....	41			Total about.....	35		

## BALLISTIC MISSILE SUBMARINES (DIESEL)

None.				Golf.....	2,700	1958	
				Zulu.....	2,000	1956	
				Total.....	20		

## CRUISE MISSILE SUBMARINES (DIESEL)

None.				Juliett.....	2,800	1962	
				Whiskey.....	1,300	1956	
				Total.....	28		

## MISSILE PATROL BOATS (SURFACE-TO-SURFACE)

None.				Osa.....	100	1959	
				Komar.....	100	1960	
				Nanuchka.....	700	1971	
				Total.....	150		

## MOTOR TORPEDO/GUN BOATS

Asheville.....	16	240	1966	Various.....	80-150	1951-1963	
Total.....	16			Total.....	250		

## SUBMARINE CHASERS

None.				Various.....	250	1945-1971	
				Total.....	250		

## FLEET MINESWEEPS

Agile.....	1	755	1956	Various.....	600	1948-1965	
Aggressive.....	26	775	1954				
Acme.....	2	750	1957				
Ability.....	2	934	1958				
Total.....	31			Total.....	195		

## COASTAL MINESWEEPS

None.				Various.....	250	1946-1956	
				Total.....	125		

## CRUISE MISSILE SUBMARINES (NUCLEAR)

None.				Echo.....	4,500	1962	
				Charlie.....	4,800	1969	
				Total (about).....	37		

## TORPEDO ATTACK SUBMARINES (NUCLEAR)

Nautilus.....	1	3,764	1955	November.....	3,500	1958	
Seawolf.....	1	3,765	1957	Victor.....	4,000	1960	
Skate.....	4	2,570	1957	Undesignated.....	Unknown	Unknown	
Skipjack.....	5	3,075	1959				
Halibut.....	1	3,840	1960				
Permit.....	13	3,700	1962				
Tullibee.....	1	2,317	1960				
Sturgeon.....	28	3,640	1967				
Narwhal.....	1	4,450	1969				
Total.....	55			Total (about).....	28		



## TORPEDO ATTACK SUBMARINES (DIESEL)

[Active April 1972]

U.S.				U.S.S.R.			
Class	Number of active units	Tonnage	Operational date	Class	Number of active units	Tonnage	Operational date
Tang	12	2,108	1951	Foxtrot		1,700	1956
Blackfin	2	1,816	1944	Zulu		1,900	1951
Extemedor	9	2,058	1943	Bravo		Unknown	1969
Dogfish	9	2,093	1945	Whiskey		1,100	1956
Clamagore	9	2,074	1945	Quebec		650	1954
				Romeo		1,100	1958
Total	41			Total	197		

**TEXT OF ADDRESS GIVEN BY ADMIRAL HORACIO RIVERO, USN, ON THE OCCASION OF THE CHANGE OF COMMAND OF COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF—ALLIED FORCES SOUTHERN EUROPE, AND HIS RETIREMENT ON 31 MAY 72**

Mr. Minister, General Goodpaster, Admiral Zumwalt, Your Excellencies, distinguished guests, officers and other ratings of Allied Forces Southern Europe, first let me acknowledge with deep appreciation the very kind remarks of Minister Salizzoni, General Goodpaster, and Admiral Zumwalt, and the great honor bestowed upon me by the Government of the United States. I am greatly moved by the presence here of so many with whom I have worked closely: leaders of government, professional military colleagues of all services, members of the diplomatic service, and so many good friends who honor me and my successor by coming to these ceremonies. Some of you have come from very far, and I doubly appreciate this generous gesture of friendship and esteem. I have been privileged to serve as commander, Allied Forces Southern Europe for four and a quarter years, years that have seen the unfolding of momentous events in this area which throughout history has been at the center of the world events. I have seen the ominous growth of the Soviets' power and influence in this Mediterranean basin as they have taken advantage of every opportunity to improve their strategic and tactical positions in relation to the west. Our peaceful peoples look with apprehension at the presence of the powerful Soviet Mediterranean fleet, with a sizeable submarine component whose only valid wartime mission would be to attack our naval forces and to disrupt those sea lines of communication which are so very vital to the survival of our three peninsular countries in the alliance. They view with concern the constant increase in Soviet military expenditures, the feverish pace of their armaments programs, the pressures they apply to neutral and non-committed countries on the periphery of the alliance. It is clear that the Soviets have one aim, and that aim is to achieve such an overwhelming degree of superiority in all aspects of military strength that our countries could be intimidated and could be forced to submit to their political demands.

I hope that the peoples of all our NATO countries, heeding the lessons of their history, will continue to recognize the dangers and will make the necessary sacrifices to improve our defenses, and to present a solid front to any aggression in accordance with the principle of collective security which underlies the NATO alliance. It has been highly satisfying to me to observe the substantial progress that has been made improving our defensive posture in the southern region during the past four years, not only in the equipment of our forces, but also in their training as members of a fully integrated NATO team.

Even more importantly it has been gratifying to see the growth of that genuine solidarity which is the hallmark of the most effective and durable peacetime alliance the world has ever seen. But our material improve-

ments, substantial as they have been, have not matched the efforts made by the potential aggressors, and our forces still suffer from serious material deficiencies which continue to place them at serious disadvantage in event of attack. I ask the leaders of our southern region countries not to slacken in their defense efforts and I enjoin the more prosperous members of the alliance to continue to extend needed help to those of our developing countries such as Greece and Turkey whose economies are strained by the magnificent efforts they are making to provide for their own defense within the limits of their resources.

Western Europe, for the first time in its history, has been blessed by a generation of peace, a peace that has made possible an unprecedented era of economic growth and prosperity. This attests to the success of the NATO alliance. Yet this success, and this extended period of tranquility have brought with them a disturbing euphoria which threatens to undermine the very foundations of this mighty edifice that was built by over twenty years of sacrifices.

We have had a quarter century of peace in western Europe. A new generation has grown up who have been blessed by the absence of the sound of guns, who have been privileged to grow up in an atmosphere of relative internal tranquility and international peace, who have enjoyed the blessings of ever increasing material prosperity. This younger generation will soon take in their hands the destinies of our countries, and their actions will determine that fate of generations yet unborn. I appeal to this younger generation to heed the lessons of history, to reflect on the events of the past twenty-five years, to look on the other side of the Iron Curtain and see what can happen when brute force and a godless, ruthless and unprincipled ideology is allowed to hold sway over freedom-loving people, because these people lacked either the will or the means to provide for their defense. Let them ponder over the fate of the once independent Baltic States, of the courageous people of Poland, of Hungary and of Czechoslovakia.

I have great faith in our youth. The flower of this youth mans our defensive ramparts on land, at sea, and in the air. They are the future, but they bear a heavy responsibility to the many generations before them that have sacrificed their blood in the cause of peace and liberty. Let them remember that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance.

I bequeath to my successor, not only the honor of commanding the NATO forces of southern Europe, but also the burden of improving on the efforts of the past to the end that the peoples of this region may continue to be sheltered from the fury of war. The southern region is fortunate indeed to see installed as its new commander a distinguished officer whose qualifications for this challenging assignment are unexcelled. I know of no officer more worthy to assume the heavy responsibilities of the NATO defense of Italy, Greece and Turkey than Admiral Richard G. Colbert. I turn over to him a command and a staff of which I am supremely proud and for whose dedication

and support I will be forever grateful. I am confident that he will receive the same devoted loyalty and cooperation that were my great privilege to have during my tenure. And I know that he and Mrs. Colbert will cherish, as Mrs. Rivero and I do, the warmth, the hospitality, and the sincere friendship extended to us not only in Naples, our true home for over four years, but also by the wonderful people of the rest of Italy, of Greece and of Turkey. This is my last day on active duty, the end of a career that has been both challenging and satisfying. I am humbly grateful that it has been my good fortune to serve in my last duty this great alliance and the peoples of Italy, Greece and Turkey. And now, as I lay aside my sword, I want to pay tribute to my wife, whose love, understanding, loyalty and devotion encouraged and sustained me throughout the years. Whatever I have accomplished in my career I owe to her.

Thank you again for being here, all of you who came from near and far, and thank you especially, our Neapolitan friends who took us to your hearts and made us feel as yours.

**ADMIRAL ZUMWALT'S FURTHER REPLY—COMMENTS ON HIS LETTER OF JUNE 8, 1972**

Mr. PROXIMIRE. Mr. President, on June 8 I received a reply from Adm. R. Zumwalt regarding my letter to him of May 26. In that letter, I asked a number of specific questions comparing United States and Soviet naval forces that were left unanswered by our previous correspondence. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my letter of May 26, 1972, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

Before dealing with his reply, I have several general observations.

**THE RUSSIANS ARE COMING**

Admiral Zumwalt goes to great lengths to keep from saying that the U.S. Navy is No. 1 in the world. It is a strange, even melancholy, attitude. There once was a day when a U.S. military officer was proud of his service and his Nation. It was a source of pride to say that we were on top. Now all we hear is "The Russians are coming, the Russians are coming."

Let us reflect a minute about why a senior naval officer would systematically make it appear that the U.S. Navy is a second-class power. What psychology is involved here? What forces a man to build up the potential enemy while decrying our own position?

One might think it would be a little embarrassing. After all, if the admiral's facts are accurate, and the Soviets are running us out of the Pacific, Atlantic, Mediterranean, Indian Ocean, and the Caribbean, if they are outbuilding us yearly, if they have surface-to-surface weapons superior to anything we have,

if their ships have more firepower, if we do not have an advantage in our sea-based deterrent or any other aspect of our fleet except aircraft carriers—if all these things are true—then the U.S. Navy is guilty of the greatest squandering of funds in the history of the world.

#### WHERE DID \$188 BILLION GO?

The last 10 years, U.S. Navy has spent \$188 billion. Where has the money gone? Has it evaporated into thin air?

The Brookings Institution has recently stated:

Contrary to popular impressions, there has not been a major recent expansion in the size of the Soviet navy, although its quality has improved. Since 1958, . . . manpower in the Soviet navy has been cut by more than  $\frac{1}{3}$ , Naval Aviation by  $\frac{1}{4}$ , and the attack submarine fleet has been considerably reduced.

We have been told that the Soviets have either gained on us or surpassed us in all the categories Admiral Zumwalt mentions and that they have done this while reducing their forces by the percentages I just cited. Either the Soviets are the world's most efficient, most technologically advanced nation or, the U.S. Navy has dramatically wasted its funds.

The admiral cannot have it both ways. He cannot argue that the Soviets, with a smaller economy and a smaller naval budget are outproducing the U.S. Navy without the admission that our Navy has not been doing its job.

What is really going on? There is an answer to why these inflated threat figures have shown up on the pages of national magazines and leading newspapers. It has a lot to do with timing and money.

Simply put, the more the U.S. Navy inflates the Soviet threat, the more money they can squeeze from Congress. Admiral Zumwalt has carried on an extensive lobbying campaign in the Halls of Congress, seeking to add to a Navy budget already much larger than either of its sister services. The fact that it comes at this time of the year is no accident for it is now that the military budget is under review in the Armed Services and Appropriations Committees.

#### BIG NAVY PUSH

Having explored some of the underlying reasons related to the big Navy push for increased appropriations, let me now comment on the specifics of Admiral Zumwalt's most recent reply.

Regarding the 2-to-1 lead in nuclear attack submarines, I chose to place Soviet nuclear cruise missile attack submarines in a separate, distinct category to emphasize that the United States did not have any such weapon. I understand that we once had such a program but gave it up and now we are going back to it. The combined totals, however, for both United States and U.S.S.R. attack submarines are clearly stated in my May 25 Senate speech and I notice that the admiral has substantially agreed with these figures. If the admiral had read that speech he must have noticed that I singled out the Soviet cruise missile capability in all my figures and also that I mentioned that these same cruise missiles make purchase of the CVN-70 most unwise. The most that can be said is that

he and I differ by one ship in the figures we have used.

In reference to shipbuilding between 1960 and 1969, I stand by my figures in the May 25 speech which demonstrated that the United States leads in every major surface building program except surface-to-surface missile ships.

#### ADMIRAL ZUMWALT AGREES WITH PROXIMITY ANALYSES

We now come to a series of questions where Admiral Zumwalt actually agrees with my position. For example:

That Soviet submarine on station time "is less—than ours—due to longer transits." He qualifies this statement by saying that their situation will improve if they ever acquire overseas bases. This lack of bases was another of my major points.

That the U.S. Navy has superior surveillance, communications, and ASW techniques. If the admiral in any way can document where the Soviets lead in these areas, I request him to do so.

That "United States ASW capabilities are the best in the world."

That "the total Italian Navy is numerically larger—than the average Soviet Mediterranean force" I specifically said numerically because we have heard so often how large the Soviet Fleet is in the Mediterranean. Admiral Zumwalt notes Soviet superiority in combat capability over the Italians, however, he errs in saying that the Italians have no surface-to-surface missile capability. The Italians have two operational systems, the Sea Killer I and II.

That the Soviet submarine "sensors are not considered as sophisticated as ours."

That "qualitatively, we believe that our late model nuclear attack submarines are today superior to their Soviet counterparts."

That the Soviet SS-N-6 has a more limited range than Poseidon and "is somewhat less accurate than ours."

That the Soviets have neither MRV's or MIRV's and that the United States will retain a lead in nuclear warheads at sea.

I note that in other areas, Admiral Zumwalt disagrees with some of the data I have presented. I have taken his comments into consideration and find that some of them have merit. In fact, I want to thank Admiral Zumwalt for taking the time to give me as complete a reply as he did, even though as I have mentioned, some questions remained unanswered. There is a useful service in airing both sides to these difficult questions.

Again and again in the data coming from the Navy Department we hear that the Soviet navy is increasing in size, while ours is being reduced. Admiral Zumwalt made exactly this point in his last letter. That simply is not true. Both navies are decreasing in size. Both navies are modernizing. Both Navies are different in composition and mission. But the two navies are not equal. The mix of U.S. naval forces is such that it will allow for far more flexibility and levels of reaction than the Soviet Fleet. We are far stronger.

All I ask for is a balanced point of view.

I ask unanimous consent that Admiral Zumwalt's letter of June 8, 1972, which is in reply to my letter of May 26 and my speech of May 25, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS,

June 8, 1972.

DEAR SENATOR PROXIMITY: I am pleased to be able to respond fully to your letter of 26 May. My views on many of the questions you raise were contained in my 2 June letter response on the subject of your remarks on the Senate floor 25 May. Nevertheless, at the risk of some necessary duplication I will attempt to provide herein a complete response to your inquiries.

As previously noted, the fundamental shortcoming of the information that has been supplied you and which appears in your letters to me is that it is conceptually flawed. In assessing the relative capabilities of the two navies, simple comparisons of force levels—ship-type by ship-type—are inadequate unless they are evaluated within the larger context of the missions the ships are designed to perform and the opposition they must overcome.

Moreover, the material that was provided to you was very selective and, hence, suggested an unbalanced set of questions. By way of example, one could use the same approach and produce a set of questions which convey an entirely different impression:

Is it not true that the Soviet Navy's superiority in anti-ship missiles is virtually absolute?

Is it not true that the Soviet Navy has an absolute advantage in cruise-missile launching submarines?

Is it not true that the Soviet Union has an absolute advantage in long-range land-based anti-shipping missile-armed aircraft?

Is it not true that the Soviet Union has three times as many submarines designed to attack surface ships as the U.S.?

Is it not true that the Soviet Union possesses in a single facility a submarine construction capacity that exceeds the entire submarine building capacity of this country?

As you no doubt know this format for investigating these serious and complex matters is not efficient, revealing, or relevant.

The questions you raise fall into 4 groups: (1) those which publicly available information shows to be factually inaccurate; (2) those which are affected by the recent SALT agreement; (3) those which are in reality appropriate starting points for analysis rather than useful conclusions; and (4) those which represent general assessments of the relative capabilities of the two navies. I will address them under these headings.

#### FACTUAL INACCURACIES

Question: Does the U.S. not have a 2 to 1 lead in nuclear attack submarines?

Response: No. The total number of nuclear attack submarines possessed by the Soviets is 65; the U.S. has 55. Of the Soviets' total 37 are also armed with antiship cruise missiles. In addition, the Soviets have 225 conventional attack submarines—28 of which are equipped with anti-ship missiles—to our 41 armed only with torpedoes, a 5 to 1 Soviet advantage. I do not understand why the data provided to you eliminated Soviet cruise missile-armed nuclear attack submarines from the comparison. It could not be because they cannot attack surface ships, they can; nor because they are not intended to do so, they are; nor even because they don't carry torpedoes as well as missiles, they do. In fact,



they are more capable of attacking surface ships than torpedo-only submarines.

Question: Do you deny the facts I inserted in the actual Record on the shipbuilding programs between 1960 and 1969 which show that we have exceeded the Soviets in every type of ship except surface-to-surface missile ships?

Response: Yes, I deny your alleged facts. The facts show that the Soviets have out-built us. The table enclosed with this letter summarizes information provided to the Subcommittee on Seapower of the House Armed Services Committee in 1969. Inspection of the table does not support your statement. The table shows that the Soviets have out-built us in 6 of the 7 categories normally used to categorize naval vessels. What the table also shows is the striking difference in the navies which derives from the differing missions and purposes. For example, they have built cruise missile armed submarines and surface ships designed to combat our fleet. We have built carriers in order to be able to control the sea lines of communication as well as to project tactical air power overseas from flexible, mobile, air bases in support of U.S. and other forces of the free world maritime alliance.

Question: Is it not true that they (Soviet strategic submarines) do not have as long on-station time (as the U.S.) and suffer from limited geographic operating conditions including iced ports and bottleneck transits?

Response: There is no evidence that Soviet submarine patrols are of short duration or that either Soviet submarines or crews suffer during extended deployments. To the contrary, patrols in excess of 60 days have been observed and the Soviets maintain ballistic missile submarines continuously on station off both the east and west coasts of the United States. The on-station time of their submarines is less due to longer transits; however transits will be shorter, and on-station time longer, if they should acquire bases or facilities overseas. Deployability of Soviet SSBs or SBNs is not limited by ice conditions during any time of the year. A principal source of our concern regarding the Soviet Navy, in both its strategic and general purpose force components, is that it is now, through peacetime overseas deployments, nullifying our earlier strategies of exploiting geographic bottlenecks to contain it.

Question: Is it not true that we have a decided advantage over the Soviet fleet because of its restricted geographical limitation, our advanced overseas bases, our far superior surveillance and communication systems and our superiority in ASW techniques?

Response: The advantage to us of Soviet geographic restrictions has largely been dissipated because of greatly increased Soviet current deployments. Concomitantly these deployments pose an increasing challenge to our access to the seas; access which is essential in view of our position as an essentially island nation and one at the center of a maritime alliance. It should also be remembered that the geographic configuration and position of our nation, stretching 3000 miles and washed by the Atlantic and Pacific oceans, provides a strategic advantage for the Soviet sea-based missile system. We do not enjoy a similar advantage since the vital areas of the vast Soviet homeland are buffered by land mass virtually on all sides.

These geographic differences have resulted in the different force structures, different missions, and different tactical and strategic options that have been the subject of our exchange of views. It has also resulted in our need for advanced overseas bases, and

for superior surveillance, communications and ASW techniques. Regrettably Soviet surveillance and communication systems are in many respects superior to ours.

U.S. ASW capabilities are the best in the world. The point is that they must remain so since the Soviets have a much larger and increasingly more sophisticated submarine force, and we have an essential requirement to defend our sea lines of communication from this force.

Question: Is it not true that either the French or Italian Mediterranean force is numerically at least the equal of the Soviet Mediterranean fleet?

Response: Simple numerical comparisons of forces do not indicate relative naval capabilities. Using simple numerical comparison, we cannot estimate whether the French or Italian navies would prevail in an actual conflict.

Table 3 accompanying your remarks of 25 May indicates that the USSR deploys the following force levels into the Mediterranean.

	Average	Highest observed
Helicopter carriers.....	0	1
Cruisers.....	2	4
Destroyers and escorts.....	5	8
Attack submarines.....	7	12

More accurate figures for table 3 are:

	Average	Highest observed
Helicopter carriers.....	0	2
Cruisers.....	2	6
Destroyers and escorts.....	5	17
Attack submarines (including 2-3 nuclear powered).....	9	22

The total Italian Navy is numerically larger (22 major surface combatants including ships in overhaul) than the average Soviet Mediterranean force, but it is not a match in combat capability for even the routine Soviet Mediterranean force. It is deficient in submarines (10 conventional units and it has no sea-based air or surface-to-surface missile capability. The French navy's standard force, stationed in the Mediterranean is composed of one light aircraft carrier with no attack air capability, 18 destroyers, and 10 conventional submarines. These forces are not designed to deal with the Soviet Mediterranean fleet on their own.

Question: Is it not correct that while the Soviets retain some numerical superiority in diesel attack submarines, that the speed, quietness, sophistication and operation techniques of the U.S. attack submarines are of entirely higher quality than the Soviets?

Response: The Soviets have more than "some numerical superiority," they continue to retain a very marked numerical superiority in diesel attack submarines, some 225 to our 41, a 5 to 1 superiority. Moreover, theirs are newer than ours; most of ours were built during World War II. In addition, the Soviets have been unique in the development of submarine-launched antiship cruise missiles and a series of complementing systems are now deployed aboard a number of different classes. They have introduced a submerged-launch capability which greatly complicates our anti-submarine effort and adds a new dimension to submarine warfare. The new Soviet nuclear submarines are relatively quieter than their predecessors. Their sensors are not considered as sophisticated as ours. Qualitatively, we believe that our late-model nuclear attack submarines are today superior to their Soviet counterparts. In recent years, the Soviets

have developed six new classes of submarines. Not only is the quantity of design effort being expended remarkable, but so too is the quality of what they are doing. Their new design efforts demonstrated the need for a high speed U.S. nuclear attack submarine to offset the gains by the Soviets in this area.

#### ISSUES AFFECTED BY THE SALT AGREEMENT

Question: Is it not true that while both we and the Soviets have about the same number of strategic ballistic missile submarines, that the disparity in overall strength favoring the U.S. is imposing?

Response: While it is true that the Soviets now have operational, and under construction, about as many ballistic missile nuclear powered submarines as we have Polaris/Poseidon submarines, they have in addition approximately 30 older submarines carrying on the order of 100 strategic ballistic missiles. Moreover, they are permitted by the SALT agreements to have, eventually, 950 ballistic missile launchers on 62 modern submarines as compared to the 44 modern ballistic missile submarines and the 710 missiles allocated to the United States. Under the completed Poseidon program, the U.S. is expected to maintain more nuclear warheads at sea than the Soviets.

Question: Is it not true that the Soviet SLBM's have a missile range of at least 1,200 nautical miles less than ours, that they have neither MRV's or MIRV's, that their missiles are less accurate, and that their boats are noisier and far more susceptible to ASW techniques?

Response: Geography gives the Soviets an advantage in relation to SLBM ranges in that major segments of the U.S. command and control structure, the National Command Authority, and most of our urban-industrial complex are within a few hundred miles of the sea. This is not true of the Soviet Union. The primary SLBM now employed by the Soviets is the SS-N-6 with a range of 1300 nautical miles. Although it is believed that this missile is somewhat less accurate than ours, it is clearly within necessary accuracy parameters. The Soviets, however, have been actively testing an extended range SLBM with a range in excess of 3,000 nautical miles. This missile coupled with their modern nuclear submarines gives them a marked increase in future operating flexibility. We do not believe that they have MRV's or MIRV's at sea at this time.

ASW techniques would not necessarily be effective against Soviet ballistic missile submarines on station within range of continental U.S. targets since the submarines could launch all their missiles prior to being destroyed by U.S. forces.

#### ISSUES WHICH ARE STARTING POINTS FOR ANALYSIS

Question: Is it not true that our superiority in aircraft carriers, sea-based air operations, and nuclear surface ships is virtually absolute?

Response: If by virtually absolute superiority you mean that at this time we have aircraft carriers and the Soviets do not, you are correct. If you mean that consequently we have sea based air operations and the Soviets do not, you are correct. If you mean that we have nuclear powered surface warships and they do not, you are correct. If, however, you mean to imply that the Soviet Navy does not pose a serious challenge to the interests of the United States you are incorrect. I have previously referred in my letter of 2 June to the differing missions of the two navies. We have attempted to optimize our forces and systems to fulfill our missions.

The Soviet Navy has a principal role in the thwarting of those interests and has optimized accordingly. It is not germane to argue

that we have no cause for concern since they don't have what we have. They do have the forces to significantly counter what we have and what we are tasked to do. And since we cannot survive as a viable nation, nor can our allies, without the ability to use the seas, whereas the Soviets can, their significant capability to counter our Navy ought to be of serious concern.

Question: Are any of the facts in my statement concerning cruisers and destroyers incorrect in any substantial way? Is it not true that many of our destroyers are in fact bigger than some Soviet cruisers, and that our 3400-ton patrol frigates will be larger than some Soviet destroyers?

Response: The Soviets have three times as many cruisers as the U.S. (28 to 9) and about the same number of destroyers of all types (U.S. 215 and USSR 193). Four of the Soviet cruisers are quite old as you point out, but all U.S. cruisers except Long Beach are of equally ancient vintage, which you did not point out. With regard to the size and nomenclature of naval ships, they reflect the missions they are designed to perform. Gross tonnage alone is an incomplete measure of combat capability. The primary reason our ships are larger than some Soviet ships with the same nomenclature is that our ships are designed to have the endurance and range necessary to carry out their assigned missions (in support of our essentially island nation and its overseas sources of supply, and its allies) which involve relatively greater distances. The modern Soviet cruiser acquired its nomenclature—in both the U.S. and abroad—in recognition of its high firepower, light armor, and high speed. Soviet ship designers have traditionally traded range and staying power for high initial striking power to give the Soviet land power a significant capability to sever our sea lines of communication closer to the Eurasian Continent where our principal allies and sources of supply are located.

Question: Are not my facts with respect to Soviet attack and strategic submarines correct?

Response: The facts lead to the conclusion, that the Soviet Union has the largest submarine force in the world. I have commented on many of your facts about submarines elsewhere in this letter. The Soviets now operate 197 diesel torpedo attack submarines, about 1/3 of these were built during the 1960's and would not be "old diesel attack submarines of limited operational capabilities" as you assert. You imply they are World War II submarines. In fact, the Soviets have not operated World War II submarines in at least the last 5 years. Most U.S. diesel submarines were built during World War II. The table provided in my earlier letter provides our estimate of Soviet submarine numbers. My earlier testimony to the Congress points out that the total Soviet submarine inventory has declined as they have substituted more capable nuclear submarines for their conventional submarines. Your statement describes our highly publicized building programs and plans. It fails to mention their much larger submarine building capacity or the new submarine classes they have developed and deployed during the past few years.

Question: Is it not true that major NATO combatants number 767 compared to 583 for the Warsaw Pact?

Response: A simple and selective numerical comparison of this sort reflects the two shortcomings mentioned with regard to the U.S.-USSR comparisons. It ignores the differences in mission. Moreover, it ignores important elements of the total forces; for example, it ignores about 1800 Soviet and Warsaw Pact small combatants. NATO has less than 600 ships in this category. These small

craft would play an important role in conflicts around the periphery of Europe, where they would be used to assist in cutting our sea lines of communication to our principal sources of supply and to our allies.

Table 2 of your remarks of 25 May indicates:

Total ships:

NATO	767
Warsaw Pact	583
United States	384
U.S.S.R.	565

If total numbers of ships were an adequate measure of relative combat capability, we ought to be even more concerned about the 565 to 384 advantage which the U.S.S.R. possesses over the U.S., according to table 2, above, since there are many contingencies wherein we would not have major allies to assist us against the Soviets. Aggregative ship counts, however, are not an adequate measure. The more fundamental point is that the U.S. Navy should be prepared to deal with the Soviet Navy in conflict situations where the allies of neither are involved. The size and composition of our Navy have been determined by the missions which have been assigned to it in support of our national policies. For some, but not all policies, this involves integrated planning with our allies.

GENERAL ASSESSMENTS

The three questions with which you close your letter deal with general assessments of the relative capabilities of the two navies.

Question: Is it not true that our conventional and nuclear surface fleet is far more powerful, in almost every category, than their Soviet counterpart?

Response: No, it is not true. The fact that this and the two following questions have been asked in the manner they have, indicates the weakness of the purported study you have used as your basis for comparisons. My letter of 2 June and the subsequent points advanced earlier in this letter have pointed out these weaknesses. In short, you have chosen to rely upon outdated "gun for gun and ship tonnage for ship tonnage" methods rather than recognizing that the proper basis for comparison takes into consideration the fundamental question of what each navy is designed to accomplish. We can no more compare the U.S. and Soviet navies ship-to-ship or inventory-to-inventory than we can compare the U.S. and Soviet economies without considering their structural difference.

Question: Is it not true that the Soviet fleet does not belong in the same category with the U.S. Navy which is a worldwide balanced open-ocean force with advanced bases, sea knowledge, staying power, and air coverage?

Response: Again your question, and the purported study which raises it, misses the point. The question as asked is, or course, rhetorical, but the answer is not. As a force designed to deny us control of our vital sea lines of communications, the Soviet Navy is a powerful, viable one increasing in size and capability at the very time when, because of cuts that have been made below the President's defense budgets, we are reducing ours.

Question: Is it not true that our Navy is Number One? Is it not true that under present plans and programs we will continue to be Number One for the foreseeable future?

Response: An examination of the record will show that I have not asserted that total Soviet naval inventories have been growing in number. Rather, I have asserted that the essential composition and employment policies of the Soviet Navy have been changing in ways which make it a significantly more capable and challenging force. I cited the

growth of its nuclear submarine forces and its cruise-missile capabilities from air, surface, and subsurface platforms as the central features of this change in capabilities. Its long-range, steady-state deployments have imposed the requirement for new strategies and programs on our Navy. It is my considered judgment that the trends in the net capabilities of the two navies have been running rapidly against the U.S. The President's budget is, as Mr. Laird has pointed out, the baseline from which to build.

If I were sure that we would be permitted to move forward with our plans and programs, as your question suggests, there would be no doubt in my mind that we would be able to have superiority at sea against the Soviet Navy. However, the entire thrust of your correspondence and the purported study your questions are based upon, clearly provides no justification for such an optimistic supposition.

Sincerely,

E. R. ZUMWALT,  
Admiral, U.S. Navy.

U.S. AND U.S.S.R. SHIP AND SUBMARINE DELIVERIES  
1960-69<sup>1</sup>

	Jan. 1, 1969 <sup>1</sup>	
	U.S.	U.S.S.R.
Major combatants.....	77	102
Attack aircraft carrier, nuclear.....	1	0
Attack aircraft carrier.....	4	0
Guided missile:		
Helicopter ship.....	0	1
Cruiser, nuclear.....	1	0
Cruiser (mixed battery).....	0	8
Frigate, nuclear.....	2	0
Frigate.....	27	15
Destroyer.....	23	3
Destroyer (surface-to-surface).....	0	10
Destroyers.....	0	0
Guided missile escort ship.....	6	0
Escort ship <sup>2</sup> .....	13	65
Minor combatants.....	9	475
Patrol gunboat.....	7	0
Patrol craft/submarine chaser.....	0	175
Guided missile patrol craft/large guided missile patrol craft.....	0	150
Mine warfare.....	2	150
Amphibious ships, total.....	16	40
Auxiliary ships, total.....	17	140
Nuclear attack submarines.....	30	50
Submarine, nuclear.....	30	20
Guided missile submarine nuclear.....	0	30
Conventional attack submarines.....	0	75
Submarine.....	0	60
Guided missile submarine.....	0	15
Ballistic missile submarines.....	40	35
Fleet ballistic missile submarines, nuclear.....	40	15
Fleet ballistic missile submarine.....	0	20
Total.....	189	917

<sup>1</sup> Status of naval ships; report by the Seapower Subcommittee of the House Committee on Armed Services, 91st Cong., 1st Sess.; Mar. 19, 1969, pp. 416-418. Soviet deliveries have been derived by adding inventories in the age categories 0-4 years and 5-9 years in the cited table. Actual Soviet deliveries in some categories may have been larger than indicated since Soviet inventories have been reduced as a result of retirements and transfers to other nations. U.S. data has been revised to correct errors in the printed table appearing in the cited record.

<sup>2</sup> Includes Soviet patrol escort ships which are employed in roles comparable to U.S. destroyer escorts.

S. 3442—THE COMMUNICABLE DISEASE CONTROL AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1972

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, S. 3442 was passed by the Senate last week, and



as the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Health of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee, stated at that time, I have some comments I would like to make on this bill at this time.

Mr. President, S. 3442, the proposed "Communicable Disease Control Amendments Act of 1972," will enable the Nation to maintain a concentrated and continuing effort against the far-reaching consequences of communicable disease. These diseases include tuberculosis, rubella, venereal disease, measles, polio, Rh disease, diphtheria, tetanus, and whooping cough, among others. While we have made tremendous advances in our ability to conquer these diseases, we have also tended to sit back and rest on our laurels, thinking that the ability to conquer them alone will be sufficient to stop the diseases from appearing or spreading. Unfortunately, these are very stubborn diseases. If we should stop our preventive measures we would again be faced with the strong possibility of epidemics such as we faced in previous decades.

To prevent this occurrence, S. 3442 will authorize the funding of programs specifically geared to support States and local communities in fighting these diseases, and will authorize grants and contracts for special programs to educate and inform the public of the nature and the consequences of communicable diseases. Only by continuing vigilance on the

part of our local health authorities can we be assured of success in controlling these diseases. The provisions of title I of S. 3442 will provide those local authorities with the means to protect the communities from the serious and tragic consequences of these diseases.

#### VENEREAL DISEASE PREVENTION AND CONTROL

A communicable disease which has reached a dangerous potential recently is venereal disease. Because of the very serious statistics on the incidence of venereal diseases, the bill incorporates in title II a comprehensive program aimed at fighting them. Title II includes the National Venereal Disease Prevention and Control Act, which had been sponsored principally as a separate bill, by Senator WILLIAMS, Senator JAVITS, Senator KENNEDY, Senator DOMINICK, and myself.

Mr. President, the Nation faces a very serious crisis today in the increasing incidence of venereal disease. The rate of increase is so great that the American Social Health Association has labeled it a pandemic—which is a disease affecting an exceptionally high proportion of the population over a wide geographic area. There was a 15.6-percent increase in reported cases of primary and secondary syphilis during fiscal year 1971, and this has been followed by a further increase of 6.1 percent during the first half of fiscal year 1972.

The increase in reported cases of gonorrhea is even more staggering. This disease is the most frequently reported of all communicable diseases; the number re-

ported in fiscal year 1971 was 624,371, almost a 9-percent increase over the previous year. The incidence of this disease has continued to expand in the current year with reported cases showing a further increase of 8.9 percent over the previous year.

In my State of California the epidemic has already reached tragic proportions.

In 1970, for the first time in California's history, reported cases of syphilis and gonorrhea exceeded 100,000 in a single year; the incidence increased again in 1971 when 110,114 cases were reported. This is part of a continuing upward spiral, for the number of reported cases of gonorrhea in California has increased 132 percent over the past 6 years. California today is 13th in the Nation in rates of syphilis and third in the Nation in rates of gonorrhea. As a result, one in every five high school students there will contract a venereal disease before graduation.

A chart prepared by the Center for Disease Control indicates the rapidly growing numbers of reported cases nationwide since 1967 with comparable figures for California I regret that a look at these statistics indicates that California has almost 13 percent of the cases of syphilis in the Nation, and over 15 percent of the cases of gonorrhea.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that the table be set forth at this point in the RECORD.

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

VENEREAL DISEASE CASES AND CASE RATES, PER 100,000 POPULATION

Syphilis							Syphilis						
All stages			Primary and secondary		Gonorrhea		All stages			Primary and secondary		Gonorrhea	
Cases	Rates		Cases	Rates	Cases	Rates	Cases	Rates		Cases	Rates	Cases	Rates
United States:							California:						
1967.....	103,546	53.2	21,090	10.8	375,606	193.0	1967.....	11,557	62.4	1,666	9.0	49,547	267.4
1968.....	98,195	49.9	20,182	10.3	431,380	219.2	1968.....	10,515	56.0	1,543	8.2	63,783	339.4
1969.....	96,679	48.1	18,679	9.3	494,227	245.9	1969.....	9,835	52.2	1,654	8.8	77,372	410.7
1970.....	87,934	43.8	20,186	10.0	573,200	285.2	1970.....	10,298	54.0	2,009	10.5	95,334	500.3
1971.....	94,383	46.5	23,336	11.5	624,371	307.5	1971.....	12,264	62.7	2,751	14.1	97,850	500.3

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, if the trend revealed in this table continues, venereal disease will infect more Californians yearly than virtually all other communicable diseases combined. At present, only the common cold has a higher incidence of infection.

Cases of venereal disease are for the most part concentrated in large cities. A chart based on statistics compiled by the American Social Health Association shows the rate of cases per 100,000 population in some of the major cities of California. While the national average is a distressing 10 per 100,000 for syphilis and 285.2 for gonorrhea, the rate of disease in some of our California cities is far greater.

I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

REPORTED VENEREAL DISEASE CASE RATES FOR CALIFORNIA CITIES, 1970

(Per 100,000)

City	Syphilis	Gonorrhea
San Mateo, Calif.....	2.3	265.1
San Bernardino.....	2.9	231.1
San Jose.....	3.0	280.0
Martinez.....	3.9	448.1
Long Beach.....	4.4	552.0
Riverside.....	4.4	201.6
Sacramento.....	5.7	459.1
Stockton.....	5.9	377.4
Ventura.....	5.9	111.3
San Diego.....	6.0	240.7
Visalia.....	6.1	130.4
Santa Ana.....	6.2	287.7
Vallejo.....	6.3	258.0
Bakersfield.....	7.9	323.0
Oakland.....	9.1	533.7
Santa Barbara.....	9.8	216.1
Fresno.....	10.6	302.9
Pasadena.....	11.9	1015.1
Los Angeles.....	14.3	589.0
Salinas.....	14.5	268.7
Berkeley.....	18.1	1490.5
San Francisco.....	56.5	2499.1

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, still far more horrible than these statistics is the fact that they represent only the reported cases of venereal disease. It is estimated that four cases are treated for every case reported to public health authorities; and this figure covers only those individuals who recognize the symptoms of the disease and seek treatment.

It has been estimated that as many as 4 million individuals contracted venereal disease last year and that one-half a million have cases of syphilis which have never been diagnosed.

One aspect of this epidemic that is particularly tragic is that the victims for the most part are young adults and teenagers. More than half the reported cases represent individuals under 25 years of age. The incidence of the disease knows no social or economic bounds; it is all

pervasive striking families of all economic and social groups indiscriminately.

The Venereal Disease Task Force of the California State Board of Public Health reports that if not found and treated, one in 25 persons infected with syphilis will become crippled or incapacitated; one in 200 will become blind; one in 13 will develop syphilitic heart disease; and one in 44 will develop paresis or syphilitic insanity. The personal toll in human suffering from gonorrhea includes urethritis, prostatitis, pelvic inflammatory disease, sterility, eye infections of new born children and at times even death. This is the personal tragedy.

The other side of the story is the effect it has on the taxpaying public. To the taxpayer it means millions and millions of tax dollars spent each year just to treat the latent cases of this disease. Millions more dollars are required to provide hospital and institutional care for those incapacitated by the disease. Yet lack of effective treatment now will only cause us to have to spend even more in the future to resolve a problem that we failed to cope with today.

To date, the cost to the taxpayer within the last two decades alone for syphilitic induced paralysis in tax-supported institutions has been more than a billion dollars nationally and \$100 million in California. The California taxpayer must contribute close to \$2½ million to care for the syphilitic blind. In addition, a conservative estimate for the treatment costs of acute gonorrhea in California is between \$5 and \$7 million annually, and these treatment costs are expected to triple by 1978. Finally, 1 year costs for the treatment of VD by public agencies is \$11 million.

#### MEANS OF AVERTING THE CONTINUING INCREASE IN THE VD RATE

There are four major aspects of a program to control venereal disease. These are prevention, education, treatment, and research.

##### PREVENTION

At the basis of any preventive system is the effectiveness of the casefinding mechanism. The spread of the disease is caused to a large extent by those who are totally unaware that they are infected. Casefinding can be greatly simplified by the cooperation of the patient in notifying those whom he may have infected or been infected by.

##### EDUCATION

Closely related to prevention as a means of controlling VD is a strong educational program. This program should be aimed at those who are already infected, so they can recognize the symptoms and the necessity of seeking prompt medical treatment to prevent serious medical complications personally and to prevent the spread of the disease to others.

It should also be aimed at youth generally who represent too great a proportion of those suffering from venereal disease today. Only 30 to 40 percent of the school systems in the United States are estimated to have some venereal disease education. Much needs to be done in terms of educating teachers on how to present the material effectively as well

as in developing means of self instruction for the students.

The need for public health-oriented education in venereal disease is not limited to the public; it is also needed by the medical community. New knowledge of the diagnosis and treatment methods of venereal diseases needs to be brought to the attention of the physicians. Paraprofessionals need to be trained in diagnostic and counseling procedures.

##### TREATMENT

Modern medicine has triumphed in finding effective treatment for venereal diseases. Syphilis can be successfully treated with penicillin and other antibiotics if treatment is begun in the early stages of the disease. Gonorrhea, however, has become more and more resistant to penicillin, raising the specter of an uncontrollable epidemic unless more effective preventive measures are taken and a new treatment developed.

One of the problems involved in effective treatment is the inaccessibility of appropriate medical care. The California Venereal Disease Task Force in its 1971 report stressed the importance of accessible VD treatment programs. The task force recommended that every county in California provide convenient treatment clinics for venereal disease and suggested they could be operated either by the local health department, by private physicians, or by the State health department, and that services be provided at no cost to the patient. It further recommended a strong orientation toward patient convenience with the facilities open to all and at hours when the patient population can most easily get to the clinic. Many clinics are closed in the evenings or on weekends when it would be most convenient for the individuals most susceptible to venereal disease to seek medical treatment. The task force recommended all-day and all-night clinics in major metropolitan areas, and further recommended that every effort be made to streamline clinic procedures to provide the population with a quick, practical method of examination to avoid discouragingly long periods of waiting for medical attention.

The very effective programs of California's free clinics in reaching out to young people and in gaining their trust was cited by the task force along with a recommendation that local health departments cooperate with these free clinics in providing them with appropriate guidance, training, and equipment to carry out venereal disease programs.

##### RESEARCH

Although venereal disease can be controlled through prevention, education, and treatment, much of the success of utilizing these three approaches is lessened by the difficulties of finding every infected individual, by the increasing resistance of gonorrhea to penicillin, and by the lack of a convenient preventive approach. Diagnostic tests need to be improved. One particularly difficult problem with gonorrhea is that it is asymptomatic in the female, defying self-diagnosis as well as professional diagnosis. Blood tests are imprecise at times in the case of syphilis. Thus, there is

need for new medical techniques and developments to detect and treat venereal diseases. With the proportions of the incidence of venereal disease, research and available funds must be devoted to the development of a vaccine.

Venereal disease cannot be eradicated through medical efforts alone, however. It will take the full social, governmental, and educational resources of the Nation.

##### NEED FOR NATIONAL VD EFFORT

In the decade of the 1950's, the Nation established an effective program to fight venereal disease. However, we were deluded by our success. Because the incidence of disease dropped substantially we diverted our resources and our attention to other matters. The result was a loss of the gains we had made and a restoration in the 1960's of the incidence rates experienced in the 1940's. A concerted effort was made again to stop this tide, and we had a measure of success until the level of financial support stabilized in the mid-1960's without taking into account rising costs caused by inflation. The result has been the tragic figures I cited earlier.

Thus, past experience has shown that we cannot, we dare not, turn our backs on this serious health issue. We must again establish a strong campaign and commit ourselves to maintaining it—with increases to cover inflation in costs—at the level needed to be effective.

I believe the bill we are reporting will give us the tools to do this. For that reason, I was pleased to join with the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS) and the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), chairman and ranking minority member, respectively, of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, as well as with the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCHWEIKER), the chairman and the ranking minority member, respectively, of the Subcommittee on Health as well as with other members of that committee in introducing S. 3187, the proposed National Venereal Disease Prevention and Control Act, which is now incorporated in title II of S. 3442.

This title of the bill would provide several important steps toward the effective control and treatment of venereal disease. First, it will provide an authorization of appropriations of \$15 million annually for research, demonstration, or training programs in venereal disease prevention and control. To establish these programs technical assistance and grants would be made available to universities, hospitals, and other public or private nonprofit entities, such as free clinics.

Second, the bill would provide for the establishment of comprehensive State venereal disease diagnosis and treatment programs, for which formula grants in the amount of \$30 million annually would be authorized. I am delighted that the committee accepted my amendment to raise the authorization from \$25 to \$30 million each year. This allocation, with a minimum of \$75,000 per State, would be based upon the incidence of venereal disease in the State and its population; each State would be required to submit



a plan for the establishment and maintenance of adequate public health programs to counter venereal disease.

Third, it would provide project grants of \$30 million annually, to States and political subdivisions for venereal disease prevention and control programs which must include disease-surveillance activities, including reporting, screening case finding and followup activities; and professional and public venereal disease education activities.

An issue to which I and other members of the committee gave a great deal of attention is that of preserving the confidentiality of patient records. Clinics are faced with the very difficult alternative, in effectively eradicating venereal disease, of discouraging infected patients from seeking treatment if they rigorously follow local regulations and report each individual by name to the local health authorities, or of encouraging these individuals and their friends to seek treatment with the assurance that their names will not be placed on a ledger book and their right to privacy will be respected, although this generally means failing to comply with many State public health laws.

We determined that the rights of the individual to confidential treatment were paramount and adopted language which would protect this right. The bill provides that, State laws to the contrary notwithstanding, any information obtained by personnel of a treatment facility shall be held confidential and shall not be divulged without the individual patient's consent except as may be necessary to provide him service. The bill specifies, however, the information may be disclosed in summary, statistical, or other form for clinical and research purposes in a way which does not identify individual patients, either directly or indirectly.

I believe the provisions of this bill will enable our State and local health authorities, in coordination with the medical community and an educated citizenry, to organize an effective campaign to eradicate these destructive diseases. Our failure to act in past years has resulted each time in a sharp upturn in the incidence of these diseases. We must not make the same mistake again. The introduction of the proposed National Venereal Disease Prevention and Control Act in both Houses of Congress with strong bipartisan support, and now the adoption of the provisions of that bill in the Senate is an indication of the determination of the legislative branch of Government to halt the incidence of venereal disease now and prevent its reoccurrence in the future.

#### ADMINISTRATION REQUESTS

At the time the committee was considering S. 3442, the administration presented a legislative request for increased authorities for appropriations for both section 314(e) of the Public Health Service Act special project grants for comprehensive health services and for section 1001(c) project grants and contracts for family planning services. The committee acquiesced in the administration's request in each case and included increased authorizations in this bill.

The authorized appropriations for 314(e) grants was increased to the level requested by the administration—\$179 million—with the caveat that these funds should not be utilized for communicable disease control or vaccination assistance programs except where such programs are a subpart of other activities primarily concerned with the provision of health services for other purposes. For the past several years, Congress has authorized specific amounts for these purposes under the authorities of section 317 of the Public Health Services Act. However, the administration has refused to utilize these funds and instead has utilized the 314(e) authorities—at a minimal level—for control of communicable diseases. The result has been a serious underfunding of communicable disease programs and a reduction in the level of support of other important health programs having national significance.

#### PROJECT GRANTS AND CONTRACTS FOR FAMILY PLANNING SERVICES

In response to the administration's request for increased appropriations authorizations of \$21.5 million for project grants and contracts for family planning services, the committee adopted my amendment to increase authorities for this purpose by \$37.5 million, from the currently authorized level of \$90 million to \$127,300,000 for fiscal year 1973.

The Special Subcommittee on Human Resources, which I am privileged to chair, held a full day of hearings—April 17, 1972—on the administration's suggested increase and received testimony from the administration, from representatives of organizations coordinating family planning service programs on a nationwide basis as well as directors of programs in specific communities in Illinois and Ohio. These hearings demonstrated that the administration's suggested \$21.5 million increase for PHS Act title X authority project grants was offset almost entirely by an \$18 million reduction below fiscal year 1972 spending for Social Security Act title V—maternal child health project—grants—minus \$9 million—and OEO family planning projects—minus \$9 million. Information provided at those hearings presented convincing documentation of the need for and HEW's ability to utilize effectively the amount included in the committee bill.

The committee determined that the administration request for an increase of \$21.5 million to a total authorization of \$111.5 million was insufficient to keep the Federal programs on target to meet the announced Federal goal of providing family planning services by 1975 to the approximately 6.5 million women wanting them but not able to afford them. In order to reach this goal—established in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's 5-year plan for family planning services and population research—submitted on October 12, 1971—it is estimated that the number of women reached must increase each year by approximately 800,000. Specifically, the administration's requested increase would have authorized sufficient funds to provide services to only an additional 500,-

000 women rather than the 763,000 projected in the 5-year plan.

The \$127,300,000 authorization which the committee has adopted instead will enable the administration to reach this goal. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare estimates the Federal share of providing family planning services to each individual at approximately \$60. The additional \$15.8 million added to the administration's request by the committee bill will enable family planning service programs to provide services to an additional 263,000 women.

#### CONCLUSION

Mr. President, I believe the provisions of S. 3442 are vitally important to providing the means of protecting the American public from the threat of communicable diseases and particularly venereal diseases. I was gratified to join with Senator WILLIAMS, and Senator JAVITS, the chairman and the ranking minority member of the committee, as well as with Senator KENNEDY and Senator SCHWEIKER, the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Health, all of whom provided significant leadership in development of the bill in committee, and with Senators DOMINICK, EAGLETON, HUGHES, MONDALE, PELL, RANDOLPH, and STEVENSON in sponsoring this legislation and perfecting it in committee.

I urge the full support of the Senate for this badly needed legislation.

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today it stand in adjournment until 10 a.m. tomorrow.

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

(Under a subsequent order the Senate will convene at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.)

#### ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE UNFINISHED BUSINESS FOLLOWING MORNING BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, following the recognition of the two leaders under the standing order, there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business of not to exceed 30 minutes, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes, at the conclusion of which the Chair lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

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

#### CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

#### FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1972

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARTKE). Pursuant to the previous order, the Chair lays before the Senate the

unfinished business, which the clerk will state.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3390) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

#### REPORTS ON RIVER BASIN COMMISSIONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying reports, was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I am pleased to transmit herewith the annual reports of the five river basin commissions established under the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965. These reports are from commissions that have been set up in the Pacific Northwest River Basins, the Souris-Red-Rainy River Basins, the Great Lakes Basin, the New England River Basins, and the Ohio River Basin and reflect the accomplishments of each commission during Fiscal Year 1971.

The primary responsibility of each commission is to develop plans for the best use of its water and related land resources, and to recommend priorities for implementing its plans. These commissions, though comprised of State and Federal members, are established at the initiative of the Governors of the States involved within the commission areas. They are unique in that they are neither wholly Federal nor State, but rather jointly financed partnerships working to develop the resources of their respective regions.

The commissions provide an opportunity for all interested persons, especially the residents of the river basins, to contribute to water resource planning. This has become particularly important in recent years because the wise use of our natural heritage is a critical public concern.

The substantial number of programs which these commissions have already begun will help to meet both existing and emerging problems of water and land use within their regions. They are also making studies that will promote

effective solutions, with full recognition of the need both to preserve and to enhance the environment.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, June 12, 1972.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### QUORUM CALL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### 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 a bill (H.R. 14149) to authorize appropriations for the Peace Corps, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker has affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 659. An act to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the General Education Provisions Act (creating a National Foundation for Post-secondary Education and a National Institute of Education), the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, and related Acts, and for other purposes;

S. 3607. An act to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 9096. An act to amend chapter 19 of title 38 of the United States Code, to extend coverage under servicemen's group life insurance to cadets and midshipmen at the service academies of the Armed Forces.

The enrolled bills were subsequently signed by the President pro tempore.

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H.R. 14149) to authorize appropriations for the Peace Corps, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1972

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (S. 3390) to amend

the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, the basic purpose of S. 3390 is to authorize the appropriation of \$1.65 billion for some military assistance and related programs for the 1973 fiscal year. It would also authorize additional economic assistance to Bangladesh. General economic assistance programs were authorized for 2 years in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1971. The specific amounts recommended by the committee for the various programs in this bill are as follows:

First. Grant military assistance, \$600 million.

Second. Foreign military credit sales, \$400 million, \$300 million of the \$550 million credit ceiling approved is earmarked for Israel.

Third. Supporting assistance, \$650 million, of which \$50 million is earmarked for Israel.

Fourth. Assistance to Bangladesh, \$50 million.

The total recommended by the committee is a reduction of \$551 million in the Executive branch request of \$2.251 billion.

I wish to make it clear, however, that the \$1.65 billion in military assistance in this bill is only about one-third of the total military assistance package proposed for the next fiscal year. It does not include, for example, over \$2 billion in military aid for South Vietnam, Laos, and the Korean forces in Vietnam; ship loans of \$39.6 million; \$450 million in excess military equipment at acquisition cost; or most of the costs of supporting the 47 U.S. military missions abroad. When Government cash sales and commercial sales are included, the estimated total flow of arms and supplies abroad in the coming fiscal year adds up to \$7.6 billion, more than four and one-half times the appropriations to be authorized by this bill.

Mr. President, I will not take the Senate's time to describe in detail the various military programs to be authorized by this bill since they are covered fully in the committee report. However, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following my remarks several tables giving country-by-country data on these and other elements in the foreign assistance program.

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

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. SPARKMAN. In addition to the authorizations I have listed, the bill contains a number of significant substantive provisions. Let me summarize them briefly:

First. It prohibits use of funds for maintenance of U.S. forces in South Vietnam after August 31, 1972, without condition, and participation of U.S. forces in hostilities in or over Indochina after reaching an agreement for a ceasefire, release of American prisoners of war, and an accounting for Americans missing in action.

Second. It requires that certain future agreements relating to overseas military installations or the storage of nuclear weapons abroad be submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent.



Third. It prohibits obligation or expenditure of funds to carry out military base agreements with Portugal and Bahrain until the agreements have been submitted to the Senate in treaty form.

Fourth. It imposes a \$275 million ceiling for fiscal year 1973 on U.S. obligations in, for, or on behalf of Cambodia, excluding the cost of U.S. air operations and South Vietnamese operations in Cambodia.

Fifth. It returns funding of military aid to Laos and South Vietnam to the regular foreign military assistance program beginning in fiscal year 1974.

Sixth. It requires specific authorization for the financing of foreign forces operating in Laos, Thailand, or North Vietnam.

Seventh. It prohibits U.S. Government military assistance or sales to the nations of South Asia.

Eighth. It prohibits transfer of Agency for International Development development assistance or disaster relief funds for use for military or supporting assistance purposes.

Ninth. It prohibits transfers of foreign assistance funds to other agencies except as reimbursement for services rendered.

Mr. President, the committee gave strong endorsement to the section of this bill designed to end our involvement in the war and secure the release of the prisoners which was initiated by the distinguished majority leader. Last year the Senate went on record three times in favor of complete withdrawal of all U.S. forces from Indochina within a time certain, conditioned only on the release of American prisoners of war. It approved the Mansfield amendment as an amendment to the Draft Extension Act by a vote of 61 to 28, as an amendment to the Defense Authorization Act by a vote of 57 to 38, and as a provision in the foreign assistance bill. The House of Representatives was never permitted to have a straight up-or-down vote last year on the proposal.

This new provision, if enacted, for the first time provides a legislative mandate that without preconditions assures the total extrication of all U.S. military forces from South Vietnam by August 31, 1972. The participation of U.S. forces in the air and naval action in Indochina could continue from outside South Vietnam until agreement had been reached between the United States and enemy forces for a cease-fire, which would be followed by release of U.S. prisoners and an accounting for the U.S. missing that are known to the enemy. The cease-fire would involve only United States and enemy forces; it would not be subject to veto by the South Vietnamese. The Mansfield amendment, for the first time, treats as separate questions the withdrawal of U.S. ground forces from South Vietnam and the participation of U.S. forces in air and naval warfare.

As of May 20, 1972, the war in Indochina has cost our Nation 55,934 dead, 303,031 wounded, and incalculable sums of tax dollars. But the costs of the war cannot be measured in blood and money alone. They represent only a small meas-

urable part of the overall cost. There is no way to calculate in mathematical terms the damage this war has caused to our society, our democratic institutions, our sense of values as human beings, or the tragic consequences for the people of Indochina whose land has been the cockpit of conflict for over a quarter century.

Perhaps the war will continue indefinitely after U.S. forces leave. No one can foresee the final military or political outcome in the area. But a substantial number of the members of the committee are convinced that the continued presence of our forces works to prevent the operation of natural political factors that might result in a settlement between the parties and assures the continued imprisonment of captured Americans. There is much evidence that the overwhelming sentiment of the American people is for total withdrawal as soon as possible. The committee believes that enactment of the Mansfield amendment will end the stalemate, effect the return of our fighting men, the return of our prisoners, and, hopefully, set the stage for the rebuilding process that is needed for the American spirit.

I wish to describe briefly two other significant provisions in this bill which were initiated by the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE). Section 13 provides that 30 days after enactment no funds shall be obligated or expended to carry out the agreements with Portugal and Bahrain, relating to United States base rights in the Azores and Bahrain respectively, until the agreements have been submitted to the Senate as a treaty for its advice and consent.

Although I have reservations personally about this provision, a majority of the members of the Committee on Foreign Relations believes that the two executive agreements raise important foreign policy questions and should be subject to the advice and consent of the Senate.

The second provision relating to executive agreements, also initiated by Senator CASE, would prohibit the obligation or expenditure of funds to carry out any agreement, entered into after this bill becomes law, between the United States and a foreign government which:

First, provides for the establishment of a military installation in that country at which U.S. combat units are to be assigned to duty;

Second, revises or extends any such agreement; or

Third, provides for the storage of nuclear weapons or the renewal of existing agreements relating to storage of nuclear weapons, unless the Senate has given its advice and consent to the agreement involved. This provision is intended to apply generally the principle involved in section 13, which relates only to the Azores and Bahrain agreements.

Both of these areas involve highly sensitive foreign policy questions which can entangle our country in obligations and commitments that ultimately lead to war. During 1969 and 1970 the Subcommittee on U.S. Security Agreements and Commitments Abroad, chaired by Senator SYMINGTON, made an exhaustive study

of the foreign policy implications of U.S. military installations abroad. The report of that subcommittee stressed the sensitive nature of the bases problem. It said:

Overseas bases, the presence of elements of United States Armed Forces, joint planning, joint exercises, or extensive military assistance programs represent to host governments more valid assurances of United States commitment than any treaty or agreement. Furthermore, any or all of the above instances of United States military presence all but guarantee some involvement by the United States in the internal affairs of the host government.

As to the storage of nuclear weapons abroad, the subcommittee reached these conclusions:

The stationing of nuclear weapons in foreign countries represents a special kind of commitment between the United States and the host country.

... we should recognize the political implications involved in placing nuclear weapons in other countries, along with the need for continuous re-examination of such a policy.

The provision approved by the committee is prospective only. It does not effect current agreements relating to foreign bases or the storage of nuclear weapons. However, it will require submission to the Senate of any agreements to renew or revise existing agreements.

Congress cannot compel the executive branch to submit base rights, nuclear storage or other such agreements with foreign governments as treaties. But Congress does not have to provide the money to carry them out. This provision, a proper exercise of Congress' power of the purse, will help to restore the Senate's constitutional role in the making of foreign policy.

Mr. President, every foreign aid bill is controversial. This one is no exception. The committee has reduced the amounts requested by the administration to a more realistic level and has added significant policy provisions. These two actions resulted in a bill which was recommended to the Senate by the committee members by a vote of 11 to 3. This large majority of the committee members believes that the programs to be authorized in this bill and the policy changes recommended, are in the national interest.

I hope that the Senate will make some changes that I shall join in presenting and in supporting and that such an improved bill will be approved.

#### EXHIBIT 1

TABLE I.—Military and related assistance and arms sales, fiscal year 1973—executive branch estimates

	Amount
Military assistance grants.....	\$819,700,000
Foreign military credit sales.....	629,000,000
Excess defense articles.....	<sup>1</sup> 245,000,000
Ship loans.....	39,600,000
Security supporting assistance .....	879,418,000
Foreign military cash sales (DOD) .....	2,200,000,000
Commercial sales.....	722,598,000
Military assistance, DOD funded .....	2,055,000,000

Total military and related assistance and sales .....

<sup>1</sup> Valued at one-third acquisition cost.

TABLE II.—SECURITY ASSISTANCE—SUMMARY OF PROGRAMS, BY AREA AND COUNTRY, FOR FISCAL YEAR 1973  
(In thousands of dollars)

	Total assistance	Grant military	Foreign military credit sales	Security support-ing assistance	Contin-gency fund and other
<b>East Asia and Pacific:</b>					
Cambodia	299,985	224,985		75,000	
China	69,968	14,968	55,000		
Indonesia	29,933	29,933			
Korea	259,982	234,982	25,000		
Laos	49,800			49,800	
Malaysia	181	181			
Philippines	21,968	21,968			
Thailand	85,554	59,954		25,600	
Vietnam	585,000			585,000	
Regional	21,275	375	12,500	8,400	
<b>Total, East Asia</b>	<b>1,423,646</b>	<b>587,346</b>	<b>92,500</b>	<b>743,800</b>	
<b>Near East and South Asia:</b>					
Afghanistan	215	215			
Ceylon	15	15			
Greece	72,966	14,966	58,000		
India	234	234			
Iran	492	492			
Israel	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	50,000	
Jordan	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	40,000	
Lebanon	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )		
Nepal	29	29			
Pakistan	243	243			
Saudi Arabia	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )		
Turkey	114,963	99,963	15,000		
Regional	99	99			
<b>Total, Near East and South Asia</b>	<b>694,960</b>	<b>161,960</b>	<b>443,000</b>	<b>90,000</b>	
<b>Africa:</b>					
Ethiopia	12,799	12,799			
Ghana	55	55			
Liberia	517	517			
Mali	50	50			
Morocco	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )		
Senegal	25	25			
Tunisia	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )			
Zaire	3,955	1,455	3,500		
Regional	93	93			
<b>Total, Africa</b>	<b>37,483</b>	<b>18,983</b>	<b>18,500</b>		
<b>Latin America:</b>					
Argentina	15,550	1,550	15,000		
Bolivia	8,873	4,873	4,000		
Brazil	15,988	1,988	15,000		
Chile	6,114	1,114	5,000		
Colombia	10,778	1,778	10,000		
Dominican Republic	1,435	1,435			
Ecuador	1,000	1,000			
El Salvador	805	805			
Guatemala	3,736	1,736	2,000		
Honduras	734	734			
Mexico	2,087	1,87	2,000		
Nicaragua	1,045	1,045			
Panama	527	527			
Paraguay	791	791			
Peru	5,820	1,820	5,000		
Uruguay	3,460	1,460	2,000		
Venezuela	15,870	870	15,000		
Regional	687	687			
<b>Total, Latin America</b>	<b>95,300</b>	<b>20,300</b>	<b>75,000</b>		
<b>Europe:</b>					
Austria	24	24			
Malta	9,500		9,500		
Portugal	991	991			
Spain	12,987	9,987	3,000		
Regional	109	109			
<b>Total, Europe</b>	<b>23,611</b>	<b>11,111</b>	<b>12,500</b>		
<b>Nonregional costs:</b>					
Administrative expenses	24,775	20,000		4,775	
Contingency requirements	30,300				30,300
U.N. forces, Cyprus (UNFICYP)	4,800			4,800	
Other	23,400			23,400	
<b>Total, nonregional</b>	<b>83,275</b>	<b>20,000</b>	<b>28,200</b>	<b>35,075</b>	
<b>Total obligational authority</b>	<b>2,358,275</b>	<b>819,700</b>	<b>629,000</b>	<b>874,500</b>	<b>35,075</b>
<b>Less:</b>					
Recoupments/recoveries	-60,132	-30,000		-29,832	-300
Reimbursements	-6,545	-4,700		-1,845	
Transfers	-3,832	-5,000		1,177	
Net private credit	-102,000		-102,000		
<b>Net obligational authority</b>	<b>2,185,775</b>	<b>780,000</b>	<b>527,000</b>	<b>844,000</b>	<b>34,775</b>

<sup>1</sup> U.S. and overseas training only.<sup>2</sup> U.S. training only.<sup>3</sup> Classified

TABLE III.—MILITARY GRANT ASSISTANCE

(In thousands of dollars)

Countries	Fiscal year 1971	Estimated, fiscal year 1972	Proposed, fiscal year 1973
<b>East Asia and Pacific:</b>			
Burma	50		
Cambodia	182,967	179,719	209,541
China	20,012	10,931	7,642
Indonesia	16,822	18,000	28,745
Korea	288,233	150,000	215,710
Malaysia	228	134	181
Philippines	16,999	14,043	20,780
Thailand			59,954
Regional program	92	79	375
<b>Regional total</b>	<b>525,403</b>	<b>372,906</b>	<b>542,928</b>
<b>Near East and South Asia:</b>			
Afghanistan	204	250	215
Ceylon	3,000		15
Greece	19,999	9,883	9,554
India	167	300	234
Iran	2,310	935	1,492
Israel		( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )
Jordan	30,164	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )
Lebanon	5,071	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )
Nepal	12	26	29
Pakistan	174	85	243
Saudi Arabia	672	510	( <sup>1</sup> )
Turkey	99,616	60,000	88,611
Regional program	19	19	99
<b>Regional total</b>	<b>161,408</b>	<b>110,228</b>	<b>142,952</b>
<b>Europe:</b>			
Austria		13	24
Portugal	1,035	1,010	905
Spain	25,001	11,190	9,261
Regional program	99	171	109
<b>Regional total</b>	<b>26,135</b>	<b>12,384</b>	<b>10,299</b>
<b>Africa:</b>			
Ethiopia	12,031	9,000	12,139
Ghana	53	48	55
Liberia	513	316	499
Mali	1	52	50
Morocco	804	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )
Nigeria	213	107	
Senegal		25	25
Tunisia	4,481	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )
Zaire	429	457	455
Regional program	48	100	93
<b>Regional total</b>	<b>18,573</b>	<b>12,807</b>	<b>17,975</b>
<b>Latin America:</b>			
Argentina	532	798	1,550
Bolivia	1,774	3,352	4,873
Brazil	929	895	1,988
Chile	754	856	1,114
Colombia	924	738	1,778
Dominican Republic	1,258	828	1,435
Ecuador	441	527	1,000
El Salvador	413	302	805
Guatemala	2,613	1,449	1,736
Honduras	579	550	734
Mexico	90	117	1,87
Nicaragua	887	761	1,045
Panama	541	462	527
Paraguay	951	834	791
Peru	558	879	1,820
Uruguay	1,186	767	1,460
Venezuela	986	722	1,870
Regional program	295	231	687
<b>Regional total</b>	<b>15,711</b>	<b>15,068</b>	<b>20,300</b>
<b>General costs</b>			
Excess defense articles reserve	22,382	21,607	85,246
<b>Worldwide total (TOA)</b>	<b>788,012</b>	<b>545,000</b>	<b>819,700</b>

<sup>1</sup> United States and overseas training only.<sup>2</sup> United States training only.<sup>3</sup> Classified.



TABLE IV.—FOREIGN MILITARY CREDIT SALES PROGRAM

[In thousands of dollars]

Countries	FMS credit sales			Countries	FMS credit sales		
	Fiscal year 1971	Estimated, fiscal year 1972	Proposed, fiscal year 1973		Fiscal year 1971	Estimated, fiscal year 1972	Proposed, fiscal year 1973
East Asia and Pacific:				Africa:			
China.....	41,000	45,000	55,000	Morocco.....	(1)	(1)	(1)
Korea.....	15,000	15,000	25,000	Zaire.....	13,200	2,000	3,500
Malaysia.....	2,200			Regional total.....	28,200	17,000	18,500
Regional program.....		8,000	12,500				
Regional total.....	58,200	58,000	92,500	Latin America:			
Near East and South Asia:				Argentina.....	16,000	15,000	15,000
Greece.....	18,000	45,000	55,000	Bolivia.....			4,000
Israel.....	(1)	(1)	(1)	Brazil.....	9,400	20,000	15,000
Jordan.....	(1)	(1)	(1)	Chile.....	5,000	5,000	5,000
Lebanon.....	(1)	(1)	(1)	Colombia.....	5,000	6,000	10,000
Saudi Arabia.....	(1)	(1)	(1)	Guatemala.....	4,000		2,000
Turkey.....		15,000	15,000	Mexico.....			2,000
Regional program.....			3,000	Peru.....			5,000
Regional total.....	606,200	402,000	443,000	Uruguay.....	4,000	2,000	2,000
				Venezuela.....	7,400	10,000	15,000
				Regional program.....		5,000	
				Regional total.....	50,800	63,000	75,000
				General costs.....			
				Excess defense articles reserve.....			
				Worldwide total (TOA).....	743,400	550,000	629,000

1 Classified.

TABLE V.—SECURITY SUPPORTING ASSISTANCE—SUMMARY OF PROGRAMS BY AREA AND COUNTRY, FISCAL YEARS 1971, 1972, AND 1973

[In thousands of dollars]

	Fiscal year 1971 actual supporting assistance	Fiscal year 1972 estimated supporting assistance	Fiscal year 1973 proposed supporting assistance		Fiscal year 1971 actual supporting assistance	Fiscal year 1972 estimated supporting assistance	Fiscal year 1973 proposed supporting assistance
Summary, all programs.....	572,971	483,100	874,500	Southern Africa regional.....	220	300	
Asia, total.....	510,318	564,400	833,800	Europe, total.....			12,500
Cambodia.....	70,000	37,100	75,000	Malta.....			9,500
Israel.....		50,000	50,000	Spain.....			3,000
Jordan.....	5,000	30,000	40,000	Latin America, total.....	2,827		
Laos.....	41,450	47,000	49,800	Guatemala.....	45		
Thailand.....	16,996	15,000	25,600	Haiti.....	2,782		
Vietnam 1.....	376,656	385,000	585,000	Nonregional programs.....	41,443	15,000	28,200
East Asia regional programs.....	216	300	8,400	U.N. force in Cyprus.....	4,800	2,400	4,800
Africa, total.....	18,383	3,700		U.N. relief and Works Agency.....	13,300		
Nigeria.....	18,163	3,400		Program support and interregional activities.....	23,343	12,600	23,400

1 Excludes administrative and program support costs resulting from the expanded Vietnam program.

TABLE VI.—EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES PROGRAM

(Dollars in thousands) 1

Country/region	Actual fiscal year 1971	Undelivered balance, 1971	Estimate, fiscal year 1972	Estimate fiscal year June 30, 1973	Country/region	Actual fiscal year 1971	Undelivered balance, 1971	Estimate, fiscal year 1972	Estimate fiscal year June 30, 1973
East Asia and Pacific:					Africa:				
Burma.....		\$13			Ethiopia.....	355	258	1,000	1,000
Cambodia.....	\$7,075	3,941	\$15,000	\$15,500	Liberia.....	40	38	500	500
China.....	21,454	14,039	44,500	46,500	Tunisia.....	1,052	1,175	(2)	(2)
Indonesia.....	987	689	3,500	4,500	Zaire.....				
Korea.....	16,375	7,232	30,000	33,600	Total, Africa.....	1,455	1,471	3,500	3,500
Laos.....			2,500	2,000					
Philippines.....	394	208	3,000	3,000	Latin America:				
Thailand.....			4,500	4,500	Bolivia.....	196	69	800	500
Vietnam.....	NA	NA	NA	53,400	Chile.....				200
Total, East Asia and Pacific.....	46,285	26,122	103,000	163,000	Colombia.....	256	35		100
Near East and South Asia:					Dominican Republic.....	34	4	100	100
Greece.....	20,557	14,727	25,500	25,500	Ecuador.....	52	51		300
Iran.....	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	El Salvador.....	32			100
Jordan.....	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)	Guatemala.....	232	144	300	200
Saudi Arabia.....					Honduras.....	112	56		100
Turkey.....	38,514	23,216	40,000	40,000	Nicaragua.....	154	107	100	100
Total, Near East and South Asia.....	59,379	37,946	68,000	68,000	Panama.....			200	100
Europe:					Paraguay.....	905	762	300	200
Portugal.....			2,000	2,000	Uruguay.....	518	310	700	500
Spain.....	125	2,206	6,000	6,000	Total, Latin America.....	2,491	1,538	2,500	2,500
Total, Europe.....	125	2,206	8,000	8,000	DOD undistributed.....	8,665	8,665		
					Worldwide total.....	118,400	77,948	185,000	245,000

1 In legal value, i.e., 3/4 acquisition value.

2 Classified.

TABLE VII.—MILITARY SALES DATA, FMS-DEVELOPED VERSUS LESS DEVELOPED COUNTRIES

[In thousands of dollars]

Distribution	Fiscal year—					Fiscal year, estimated—		
	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971	1967 through 1971	1972	1973
Developed countries: <sup>1</sup>								
FMS cash.....	707,554	572,657	1,000,685	668,787	1,003,202	3,952,885	2,023,700	1,845,000
FMS credit.....	246,400	130,021	104,260	.....	13,211	493,892	22,000	45,000
DOD direct.....	46,742	37,000	75,000	.....	.....	158,742	.....	.....
DOD guarantee.....	199,658	93,021	29,260	.....	13,211	335,150	.....	.....
Total.....	953,954	702,678	1,104,945	668,787	1,016,413	4,446,777	2,045,700	1,890,000
Less developed countries:								
FMS cash.....	70,692	169,575	104,497	133,641	307,777	786,182	238,400	336,800
FMS credit.....	76,843	133,312	176,900	70,000	730,201	1,187,256	528,000	584,000
DOD direct.....	41,445	67,307	150,900	70,000	687,833	1,017,485	.....	.....
DOD guarantee.....	35,398	66,005	26,000	.....	42,368	169,771	.....	.....
Total.....	147,535	302,887	281,397	203,641	1,037,978	1,973,438	766,400	920,800
International organizations:								
FMS cash.....	30,107	19,931	23,033	41,501	18,460	133,032	17,900	18,200
FMS credit, DOD direct.....	.....	52	.....	.....	.....	52	.....	.....
Total.....	30,107	19,983	23,033	41,501	18,460	133,084	17,900	18,200
Worldwide:								
FMS cash.....	808,353	762,163	1,128,215	843,929	1,329,439	4,872,099	2,280,000	2,200,000
FMS credit.....	323,243	263,385	281,160	70,000	743,412	1,681,200	550,000	629,000
DOD direct.....	88,187	104,359	225,900	70,000	687,833	1,176,279	.....	.....
DOD guarantee.....	235,056	159,026	55,260	.....	55,579	504,921	.....	.....
Total.....	1,131,596	1,025,548	1,409,375	913,929	2,072,851	6,553,299	2,830,000	2,829,000

<sup>1</sup> As listed by Executive order for interest equalization tax purposes.

TABLE VIII.—MILITARY AND ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE DATA, FISCAL YEAR 1973 PROGRAM REGIONAL SUMMARY

[In thousands of dollars]

	Security programs							
	Military assistance grants	Foreign military credit sales	Excess defense articles <sup>1</sup>	Military service funded	Ship loans <sup>1</sup>	Total military	AID supporting assistance	Total security
Summary, all programs.....	819,700	629,000	245,000	2,055,000	39,600	3,798,300	879,418	4,667,718
LA.....	2,300	75,000	2,500	.....	900	98,700	.....	98,700
AFR.....	17,975	18,500	3,500	.....	.....	39,975	.....	39,975
EUR.....	10,299	.....	8,000	.....	18,200	36,499	12,500	48,999
NESA.....	142,952	443,000	68,000	.....	11,000	664,952	90,000	754,952
EA and PAC.....	542,928	92,500	163,000	2,055,000	9,500	2,862,928	743,800	3,606,728
Other.....	85,246	.....	.....	.....	.....	85,246	28,200	113,446
Administrative and other expenses, State.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	4,918	4,918
Developed and humanitarian economic programs								
Agency for International Development								
	Development/humanitarian assistance <sup>2</sup>	Contingency fund and international narcotics control <sup>3</sup>	AID development and humanitarian total	Peace Corps	Public Law 480	International financial institutions <sup>4</sup>	Total economic	Total military and economic, fiscal year—
								1973 1972
Summary, all programs.....	1,598,976	72,800	1,671,776	72,200	1,099,789	920,000	3,763,765	8,431,483 7,439,099
LA.....	389,416	.....	389,416	18,913	106,559	.....	514,888	613,588 528,870
AFR.....	173,209	.....	173,209	23,149	134,310	.....	330,668	370,643 352,838
EUR.....	.....	.....	.....	10	850	.....	860	49,859 78,247
NESA.....	347,204	15,000	362,204	7,400	390,976	.....	760,580	1,515,532 1,292,250
EA and PAC.....	188,857	2,200	191,057	12,352	445,494	.....	648,903	4,255,631 4,036,862
Other.....	500,290	55,600	555,890	10,376	21,600	920,000	1,507,866	1,621,312 1,145,470
Administrative and other expenses, State.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	4,918 4,462

Footnotes on page S 9206.

MILITARY AND ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE DATA, FISCAL YEAR 1973 PROGRAM BY COUNTRY

[In thousands of dollars]

	Security programs							
	Military programs					Total military	AID supporting assistance	Total security
	Military assistance grants	Foreign military credit sales	Excess defense articles	Military service funded	Ship loans <sup>1</sup>			
Latin America.....	20,300	75,000	2,500	.....	900	98,700	.....	98,700
Argentina.....	550	15,000	.....	.....	.....	15,550	.....	15,550
Bolivia.....	4,873	4,000	500	.....	.....	9,373	.....	9,373
Brazil.....	988	15,000	.....	.....	.....	15,988	.....	15,988



## (In thousands of dollars)

Footnotes at end of table.

	Economic programs						Total military and economic fiscal year 1973	Total military and economic fiscal year 1972
	Agency for International Development			Other programs				
	Development/ humanitarian assistance	International narcotics control	Total	Peace Corps	Public Law 480	Total economic		
Latin America	389,416		389,416	18,913	106,559	514,888	613,588	528,970
Argentina							15,550	16,047
Bolivia	18,214		18,214		9,700	27,914	37,287	50,051
Brazil	8,300		8,300	2,625	21,870	32,795	48,783	38,073
Chile	850		850	4,418	4,860	6,128	13,342	13,384
Colombia	78,600		78,600	1,898	21,730	102,228	113,106	122,061
Costa Rica	1,060		1,060	765	1,026	2,851	3,336	
Dominican Republic	11,600		11,600	500	17,705	29,805	31,340	27,115
Ecuador	14,543		14,543	1,135	4,889	20,567	21,867	11,364
El Salvador	14,150		14,150	483	900	15,533	16,438	10,869
Guatemala	24,350		24,350	765	2,637	27,752	31,688	18,607
Guyana	10,100		10,100		1,780	11,880	11,880	14,072
Haiti	6,000		6,000		1,251	7,251	4,211	
Honduras	18,242		18,242	964	972	20,178	21,012	7,689
Inter-American programs	16,880		16,880			16,880	16,880	14,691
Jamaica	10,849		10,849	838	450	12,137	12,137	6,202
Mexico							2,087	750
Nicaragua	7,500		7,500	516	328	8,344	9,489	14,070
Panama	22,295		22,295		1,080	23,375	24,002	17,581
Paraguay	2,934		2,934		7,712	10,646	11,215	11,645
Peru	13,747		13,747	1,766	8,460	23,973	29,793	38,315
ROCAP	27,700		27,700	203	153	28,056	28,056	13,417
Trinidad and Tobago					90	90	90	90
Uruguay	24,500		24,500	92	3,540	28,132	32,092	5,387
Venezuela	500		500	1,580		2,080	17,950	18,198
Caribbean regional	20,350		20,350	1,012	426	21,788	11,342	11,342
Economic regional programs	31,992		31,992	2,934		34,927	34,927	35,002
Regional military costs							687	5,231
Near East and South Asia	347,204	15,000	362,204	7,400	390,976	760,580	1,515,532	1,292,250

## MILITARY AND ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE DATA, FISCAL YEAR 1973 PROGRAM BY COUNTRY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Economic programs						Total military and economic fiscal year 1973	Total military and economic fiscal year 1972
	Agency for International Development			Other programs				
	Development/humanitarian assistance	International narcotics control	Total	Peace Corps	Public Law 480	Total economic		
Afghanistan	6,720		6,720	1,499	24,100	32,319	32,534	58,293
Ceylon					14,157	14,157	14,172	20,130
Cyprus					3,960	3,960	3,960	3,960
Greece							95,954	81,350
India	99,590		99,590	3,211	172,330	275,131	275,365	197,220
Iran				1,300	1,044	2,344	2,836	7,325
Israel					45,342	45,342	95,342	105,342
Jordan	1,200		1,200		3,042	4,242	44,242	48,592
Lebanon					5,305	5,305	5,305	14,505
Nepal	1,883		1,883	1,191	630	3,704	3,733	4,208
Pakistan	79,800		79,800		105,358	185,158	185,401	160,615
Saudi Arabia								
Southern Yemen					90	90	90	90
Syria					216	216	216	216
Turkey	43,000	15,000	58,000		13,014	71,014	219,725	199,440
Yemen					1,026	1,026	1,026	1,026
Economic regional programs/CENTO	5,011		5,011	199	1,362	6,572	6,572	6,689
Regional military costs <sup>1</sup>							419,059	383,249
Unallocated	110,000		110,000			100,000	110,000	
Security programs								
	Military programs							
	Military assistance grants	Foreign military credit sales	Excess defense articles <sup>1</sup>	Military service funded	Ship loans <sup>1</sup>	Total military	AID supporting assistance	Total security
East Asia and Pacific	542,928	92,500	163,000	2,055,000	9,500	2,862,928	743,800	3,606,728
Burma								
Cambodia	209,541		15,500			225,041	75,000	300,041
China (Taiwan)	7,642	55,000	46,500			109,142		109,142
Hong Kong								
Indonesia	28,745		4,500			33,245		33,245
Korea	215,710	25,000	33,600	133,500	5,700	413,510		413,510
Laos			2,000	360,000		362,000	49,800	411,800
Malaysia	181					181		181
Philippines	20,780		3,000		3,800	27,580		27,580
Singapore								
Thailand	59,954		4,500			64,454	25,600	90,054
Vietnam			53,400	1,561,500		1,614,900	585,000	2,199,900
Western Samoa								
Economic regional programs							8,400	8,400
Regional military costs	375	12,500				12,875		12,875
Africa	17,975	18,500	3,500			39,975		39,975
Botswana								
Burundi								
Cameroon								
Central African Republic								
Chad								
Congo (Brazzaville)								
Dahomey								
Ethiopia	12,139		1,000			13,139		13,139
Gabon								
Gambia								
Ghana	55					55		55
Guinea								
Ivory Coast								
Kenya								
Lesotho								
Liberia	499		500			999		999
Malagasy								
Malawi								
Mali	50					50		50
Mauritania								
Mauritius								
Morocco	( <sup>1</sup> )	( <sup>1</sup> )						
Niger								
Nigeria								
Rwanda								
Senegal	25					25		25
Seychelles								
Sierra Leone								
Somali Republic								
Sudan								
Swaziland								
Tanzania								
Togo								
Tunisia	( <sup>1</sup> )		( <sup>1</sup> )					
Uganda								
Upper Volta								
Zaire	455	3,500				3,955		3,955
Zambia								
Economic regional programs:								
Central West Africa								
East Africa								
Southern Africa								
Africa regional								
Regional military costs <sup>1</sup>	4,752	15,000	2,000			21,752		21,752
Self-help projects								
Europe	10,299		8,000		18,200	36,499	12,500	48,999



## MILITARY AND ECONOMIC ASSISTANCE DATA, FISCAL YEAR 1973 PROGRAM BY COUNTRY—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

	Security programs							AID supporting assistance	Total security
	Military programs				Ship loans <sup>1</sup>	Total military			
	Military assistance grants	Foreign military credit sales	Excess defense articles <sup>1</sup>	Military service funded					
Austria.....	24					24		24	
Iceland.....									
Italy.....					2,600	2,600		2,600	
Malta.....							9,500	9,500	
Portugal.....	995		2,000			2,995		2,995	
Spain.....	9,261		6,000		15,600	30,861	3,000	33,861	
United Kingdom.....									
Regional military costs.....	109					109		109	
Economic programs									
	Agency for International Development			Other programs		Total economic	Total military and economic fiscal year 1973	Total military and economic fiscal year 1972	
	Development/humanitarian assistance	International narcotics control	Total	Peace Corps	Public Law 480				
East Asia and Pacific.....	188,857	2,200	191,057	12,352	445,494	648,903	4,255,631	4,036,862	
Burma.....					621	621	621	621	
Cambodia.....					30,018	30,018	330,059	246,437	
China (Taiwan).....							109,142	100,762	
Hong Kong.....					126	126	126	126	
Indonesia.....	123,200		123,200		87,920	211,120	244,365	239,967	
Korea.....	28,600		28,600	2,194	142,500	173,294	586,804	585,369	
Laos.....	870	700	1,570		3,429	4,999	416,799	294,996	
Malaysia.....				2,908	958	3,866	4,047	4,214	
Philippines.....	20,565		20,565	1,971	33,800	56,336	83,916	83,629	
Singapore.....					45	45	45	670	
Thailand.....	2,145	1,000	3,145	1,568	15,657	20,370	110,424	105,599	
Vietnam.....	346	500	846		130,420	131,266	2,331,166	2,352,412	
Western Samoa.....				525		525	525	449	
Economic regional programs.....	13,131		13,131	3,186		16,317	24,717	13,532	
Regional military costs.....							12,875	8,079	
Africa.....	173,209		173,209	23,149	134,310	330,668	370,643	352,838	
Botswana.....	( <sup>2</sup> )		( <sup>2</sup> )	692	9,450	10,142	10,142	10,042	
Burundi.....	( <sup>2</sup> )		( <sup>2</sup> )		920	920	920	920	
Cameroon.....	( <sup>2</sup> )		( <sup>2</sup> )	700	380	1,080	1,080	979	
Central African Republic.....	( <sup>2</sup> )		( <sup>2</sup> )		210	210	210	210	
Chad.....	( <sup>2</sup> )		( <sup>2</sup> )	481	110	591	591	522	
Congo (Brazzaville).....					1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800	
Dahomey.....	( <sup>2</sup> )		( <sup>2</sup> )	449	390	839	839	775	
Ethiopia.....	16,550		16,550	1,304	1,134	18,988	32,127	32,099	
Gabon.....	( <sup>2</sup> )		( <sup>2</sup> )						
Gambia.....	( <sup>2</sup> )		( <sup>2</sup> )	383	980	1,363	1,363	1,307	
Ghana.....	32,370		32,370	2,345	13,260	47,975	48,030	30,896	
Guinea.....	( <sup>2</sup> )		( <sup>2</sup> )		4,970	4,970	4,970	4,984	
Ivory Coast.....	( <sup>2</sup> )		( <sup>2</sup> )	826	1,350	2,176	2,176	2,057	
Kenya.....	2,835		2,835	2,351	810	5,996	5,996	5,343	
Lesotho.....	( <sup>2</sup> )		( <sup>2</sup> )	299	1,773	2,072	2,072	1,606	
Liberia.....	3,709		3,709	2,444	2,390	3,543	9,542	10,408	
Malagasy.....	( <sup>2</sup> )		( <sup>2</sup> )		510	510	510	510	
Malawi.....	( <sup>2</sup> )		( <sup>2</sup> )	475	180	655	655	656	
Mali.....	( <sup>2</sup> )		( <sup>2</sup> )	240	1,580	1,820	1,870	2,418	
Mauritania.....	( <sup>2</sup> )		( <sup>2</sup> )		1,170	1,170	1,170	1,170	
Mauritius.....	( <sup>2</sup> )		( <sup>2</sup> )	155	1,305	1,460	1,460	1,602	
Morocco.....	17,055		17,055	1,056	42,000	60,111	60,111	49,299	
Niger.....	( <sup>2</sup> )		( <sup>2</sup> )	629	1,575	2,204	2,204	2,119	
Nigeria.....	23,870		23,870		630	24,500	24,500	25,797	
Rwanda.....	( <sup>2</sup> )		( <sup>2</sup> )		360	360	360	360	
Senegal.....	( <sup>2</sup> )		( <sup>2</sup> )	721	1,683	2,404	2,429	2,910	
Seychelles.....	( <sup>2</sup> )		( <sup>2</sup> )		60	60	60	60	
Sierra Leone.....	( <sup>2</sup> )		( <sup>2</sup> )	1,683	1,740	3,423	3,423	3,281	
Somali Republic.....					450	450	450	450	
Sudan.....	( <sup>2</sup> )		( <sup>2</sup> )		180	180	180	45	
Swaziland.....	( <sup>2</sup> )		( <sup>2</sup> )	479		479	479	410	
Tanzania.....	6,400		6,400		1,370	7,700	7,770	3,270	
Togo.....	( <sup>2</sup> )		( <sup>2</sup> )	704	550	1,254	1,254	1,153	
Tunisia.....	3,150		3,150	723	32,140	36,013	36,013	46,969	
Uganda.....	2,530		2,530	441	180	31,51	3,151	5,913	
Upper Volta.....	( <sup>2</sup> )		( <sup>2</sup> )	508	3,200	3,708	3,708	3,635	
Zaire.....	6,950		6,950	1,012	3,200	11,162	15,117	7,903	
Zambia.....	( <sup>2</sup> )		( <sup>2</sup> )		320	320	320	320	
Economic regional programs:									
Central West Africa.....	24,085		24,085			24,085	24,085	29,900	
East Africa.....	1,600		1,600			1,600	1,600	5,805	
Southern Africa.....	8,200		8,200			8,200	8,200	14,435	
Africa regional.....	21,855		21,855	2,049		23,904	23,604	16,988	
Regional military costs <sup>3</sup> .....							21,752	19,802	
Self-help projects.....	2,050		2,050				2,050	1,700	
Europe.....				10	850	860	49,859	78,247	
Austria.....							24	13	
Iceland.....						650	650	800	
Italy.....							2,600		
Malta.....						10	9,710	9,709	
Portugal.....						210	2,905	35,177	
Spain.....							33,861	32,374	
United Kingdom.....								3	
Regional military costs.....							109	171	

<sup>1</sup> In legal value—at 1/3 average class acquisition costs.<sup>2</sup> Includes AID administrative expenses.<sup>3</sup> Includes contingency fund and international narcotics control funds.<sup>4</sup> Includes International Development Association, Inter-American Development Bank and Asian Development Bank.<sup>5</sup> Classified.<sup>6</sup> Self-Help funds only.<sup>7</sup> Includes classified countries.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In terms of the amount, how does this bill compare with last year's?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I have the figures here.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This bill provides more than what was appropriated last year for security assistance; does it not?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. Last year there was appropriated \$1.480 billion. This bill carries an amount of \$1.650 billion.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The only point I wished to make is that while the authorized amount is below the request of the administration, it is substantially more than what was appropriated last year.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. Last year a total of \$1.680 billion was appropriated for the programs carried in this bill. The amount provided in this bill is \$1.7 billion.

These figures include relief money to Bangladesh. But for security assistance programs only last year we had \$1.480 billion appropriated. This year it is \$1.650 billion. So the amount this year is \$170 million more for these programs.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The only point I wished to emphasize was that while it appears that this bill provides an amount substantially below the amount requested, it is substantially above the amount actually appropriated for the same purpose last year.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is true. Of course, the Senator knows that so often the appropriation is less than the authorization. I do not have the authorization figure, but I am sure the Senator knows that the appropriation again could be below the authorization.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the able Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator would agree, would he not, that hundreds of millions of dollars for foreign aid are not included in this bill?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. That was pointed out.

Mr. SYMINGTON. For example, Laos.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes. I gave the figures on those different amounts in my statement.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, as I said, every foreign aid bill is controversial. This one is no exception. The committee has reduced the amounts requested by the administration to a more realistic level and has added significant policy provisions. These two actions resulted in a bill which was recommended to the Senate by the committee members by a vote of 11 to 3. This large majority of the committee members believes that the programs to be authorized in this bill and the policy changes recommended are in the national interest.

I hope the Senate will approve the bill. It says in the statement I have that I should say I hope that the Senate will approve of the committee's recommendations. As a matter of fact, as I stated a few minutes ago, I do have reservations with reference to some of the matters in

the bill. In fact, some of them I would not have voted for had I been present. I was not present when the bill was marked up, and it will be my purpose to support some amendments making modifications to the bill as approved by the committee. I explained this to the chairman when he asked me if I would manage the bill. I told him that I had objections to parts of the bill and that I would support amendments to make modifications.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a comment?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate very much that the distinguished Senator from Alabama consented to manage the bill. He says he has reservations to part of it. I have a lot more reservations about this bill than does the Senator from Alabama. Therefore, it was a great favor to me, and I think to the bill, for the Senator from Alabama to manage the bill. This is an area in which I think we have spent entirely too much money. Therefore, I am very unsympathetic to the bill. I felt it would be much better for the bill and for the committee if the next ranking member of the committee were to handle it. I appreciate his agreeing to take on this burden.

The Senator has said he has some reservations about some items. I am sure one involves the Export-Import Bank, relating to an amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE). I can understand how the Senator from Alabama, who is chairman of the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, feels about this because he has a special legislative responsibility for the Export-Import Bank. Just as a matter of clarification—and I supported that item in the committee—I do not believe it is intended as a restriction on the Export-Import Bank as such. The thrust of the Case amendment on the Azores and Bahrain is to require that 30 days after enactment no funds shall be obligated or expended to carry out the agreements with Portugal and Bahrain concerning these bases until the agreements have been submitted to the Senate as treaties for its advice and consent. The executive agreements as they now stand involve substantial amounts, both grants and concessional loans—and an Export-Import Bank loan is a concessional loan. It is below what the market price is. I am quite sure I could support the Export-Import Bank loans as such. The only question is, should these matters be approved by the Senate? The committee was not saying these loans should not be made; I am not making that kind of judgment. They were saying if we were going to make this kind of agreement, either with Bahrain or with Portugal, that they should be submitted to the Senate for its advice and consent. That was all, or at least that was all I had in mind as one Member of the Senate.

Putting the merits of the agreement aside, I think that the agreement itself, which has long-term implications involving either a great deal of money or the stationing of troops, sailors, or military people, should be subject to the advice and consent of the Senate. I just wanted to make my position clear on that. In

other words, our committee, and I as chairman, are not seeking to infringe on the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs over the affairs of the Export-Import Bank. The bank's involvement was only incidental in the committee's consideration of the Case amendment. I do not want to challenge the jurisdiction of the banking committee over the Export-Import Bank. But it seems to me we are all, as Senators, regardless of our committee jurisdictions, interested in the fundamental issue raised by the Case amendment. Again, I appreciate the efforts of the Senator from Alabama in connection with this bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am glad that the Senator has made that statement. As he knows, I did have some reluctance in managing the bill because of some things in it to which I do object. That Senator knows I wrote him a letter, as chairman of the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, objecting to the effect of this particular amendment on the Export-Import Bank.

The Export-Import Bank, of course, makes loans to assist American exporters and American business people to do business overseas wherever it may be. It does have the effect of helping us in our balance of payments, and I may say, too, I felt rather strongly that since we had enacted general legislation providing for the operations of the Export-Import Bank, and since there was nothing involved in dealing with Portugal that could not be used in any foreign country in which it could operate, that while I realize it does have foreign policy implications, so does an operation in any country. Therefore, I felt that this was a matter that should have been left to the consideration of our committee, rather than the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. With all deference—

Mr. SPARKMAN. And I wrote the chairman a letter to that effect.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator did, and I appreciate that. But in addition to this loan—and it is not just an ordinary loan to help American exporters—there is involved a military base that we have occupied for many years, since World War II. I have been there. It has a wonderful officers' club and a beautiful climate, and it is a lovely place. My only thought is, can we afford the continued support of these types of bases?

In addition to the loan of the Export-Import Bank there are a series of grants, about \$10 million, I believe, all of which is a consideration to Portugal for giving us the base.

It means we will keep 2,000 or 3,000 or 4,000 officials and their families there, with the cost an additional drain upon our Government's resources. This was the aspect I was interested in, and not in the Export-Import Bank as such.

If Portugal, like any other country, can appeal to the Export-Import Bank to get this kind of loan, I would have nothing to say about it, but I do not think Portugal could get such a loan from the Export-Import Bank just on commercial grounds. It amounts to \$400 mil-



lion, as I understand the agreement. The Bank has turned down a lot of these loans on political grounds, as I believe in the case of Chile.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me talk about the case of Chile for a moment. As the Senator knows, that was a situation that was studied very carefully. They did not turn it down on the basis of the political climate in Chile; they turned it down because Chile had actually expropriated American businesses which, at that time, had not been compensated for their losses. Under the law, the Export-Import Bank is charged with the responsibility of making certain—as certain as they can, reasonably certain—that the loans will be repaid. As I recall, and I gather this only from newspaper accounts that came out at the time, the decision was based upon the fact that they could not consider with certainty that any loans made there would be repaid, and that was the reason for the refusal.

Let me say this: It is true that I pointed out to the chairman the matter of the Export-Import Bank, but I did that purely on the basis of what I considered an invasion—I do not know whether I should use that harsh a term or not—or the taking over, to some extent, of jurisdiction of a matter that is wholly within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs—that is, the Export-Import Bank. Goodness knows, I am sure the Export-Import Bank makes loans for the purpose of aiding American businessmen to export or to do contract work for countries other than Portugal.

I did not intend to discuss this now, but later on, I understand, and in fact I am sure, there will be an amendment offered to strike that entire section from the bill, and at that time undoubtedly there will be a full discussion of all these matters.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes. I must apologize to the Senator; I did not mean to go into all of the various aspects of the issue. I just wanted to make it clear that I, for one, did not intend, and I do not think the committee intended, to invade the jurisdiction of another committee, because it was the foreign policy aspects, especially the continued maintenance and occupation of military bases on foreign soil, that inspired the committee to recommend the case amendment to the Senate. The Senators will have to agree that those matters are not within the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No, I have not contended that.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yet the Senator has objected.

Mr. SPARKMAN. The only thing I mentioned was the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I would hope, if the Senator is going to offer the amendment, that it would be confined solely, then, to the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No, I did not say that it would be the only item deleted.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The rest of it will be subject to the case limit, if that is all that bothers the Senator.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No, I say the only thing I had taken up by letter with the chairman was this one thing.

No, as a matter of fact, I think section 13 is unwise as a part of this measure, and it would be my purpose to support an amendment, and in fact I assume to join in sponsoring it, that would seek to strike the entire section.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator is not saying it is just the Export-Import Bank?

Mr. SPARKMAN. No, not at all.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Is he also opposed to it on other grounds?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am. I am merely saying the only part I took up with the chairman by letter was the Export-Import Bank, because I felt that was an invasion of the jurisdiction of our committee.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I appreciate that. I did not mean to bother the Senator. I only wish to say one word about Chile. About the same time that they turned down the request at the Export-Import Bank, they sold Chile, as I recall it, about \$5 million worth of military equipment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not believe the Export-Import Bank did.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No; the Defense Department did.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I was speaking of the responsibility of the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. At the time, they did not say outright, "We will not give it to you." They just declined to move and delayed the decision on the Export-Import Bank. At that time the settlement of the American costs was still up in the air. That matter is still pending and has not been determined.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I hope it will be worked out.

I am not antagonistic to doing business with any of those countries. As a matter of fact, I think the chairman knows that I made the point in committee that we ought to be greatly interested at all times in helping particularly the Latin American countries.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. With the exception of Canada, I believe they are our best trading partners.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, will the able Senator yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. The Senator kindly let me know about his opposition to these two treaty specifications in the Case amendment. I think he mentioned there were some other amendments he also planned to offer.

Mr. SPARKMAN. No, not that I planned to offer. I said that I would join in sponsoring an amendment to strike section 13 from the bill.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Then that is the only one?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is the only one I have in mind to join in sponsoring. I would not say that there would not be others I would support. I do not know. I am not aware of what amendments might be offered.

I did say to the chairman, when he asked me if I would handle the bill for the committee, that I was reluctant to do so; and I told him that I do have objections to parts of it. He told me, as he said here, that he had more objections to the bill than I had. I certainly believe that we all have a duty to see that legislation that the majority of the committee votes out is presented fairly and objectively to the Members of the Senate, in order that they can make up their minds.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thought the Senator said there would be further amendments.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I said I had reservations.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Does the able Senator plan to offer further amendments?

Mr. SPARKMAN. So far as I know now, that will be the only amendment that I will join in sponsoring. If there should be a separate amendment relating to the Export-Import Bank—and I would not think there would be, certainly not if the amendment to strike section 13 prevails, because that is where the Export-Import Bank is affected—I would support that amendment.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I know of no such planned amendment.

One further question: Does the able Senator think there will be voting on any amendments today?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I refer that question to the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, so far as the Senator from Montana is concerned, he would hope that there would be votes on amendments today. I would hope that there would be a time limitation on any or all amendments. But, in all frankness, with three votes coming up on treaties, I am not at all certain that there will be votes today; and very likely we ought to devote the first day to as much debate as possible.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SPARKMAN. So far as I am concerned—I believe the Senator knows this—I never take much time in handling a bill, any more than I think may be necessary. I believe in a fair presentation of all matters, but I believe we ought to act as expeditiously as we can. I would have no objection to voting on any of the amendments at any time they may be offered. I do not control that. Time has not been fixed. As a matter of fact, I thought it would be better to have some general discussion before we tried to work that out.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I am trying to adjust my schedule, because we are marking up bills in other committees.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I refer those matters to the majority leader. If I can assist, I believe the able Senator knows that I will.

Mr. SYMINGTON. I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, if, when, and as these amendments are presented, I hope to discuss them more and to explain my position. I do find it a little embarrassing to be presenting a bill with which I do not agree in large part.

But, as I have said, the will of the majority of the committee is entitled to be presented to the Senate.

I suppose that if I had been present when the bill was reported, I would have voted to report it to the Senate floor, even though it contained provisions with which I did not agree. It is almost impossible to find a bill with which one agrees a hundred percent. At its best, legislation is always a compromise.

I believe that there are important features of this bill that ought to be considered and ought to be acted on. That is the reason why I agreed, upon the urgent request of the chairman, to undertake the management of the bill on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Alabama has made a very able presentation of the bill.

As it is now, the bill before the Senate for action contains a great many changes which I am sure the administration would not like to have in a bill which would pass both Houses and be sent to the President. I am quite sure that the administration would disapprove of the nine special provisions which are included in this bill and probably would disapprove of all the reductions in the amounts of the appropriations.

I disagreed with many of the amendments which were put in this bill in the committee room; but I felt, as I think most of the committee did, that time was of the essence. We are getting on toward the end of our fiscal year. We are going to have two big occasions going on down in Miami this summer, provided the first one gets through in time to have the second one take place. I do not know about that, because I am not used to that kind of entertainment. But time is of the essence, and we want to get the decision of Congress as soon as we can.

So when a proposal was made for an amendment, instead of wrangling for hours about that proposal—and if it appeared that there might be a 7-to-6 vote or a 9-to-4 vote, or something of that kind in the committee—we simply said, "The Senate itself has to pass on this. Whatever we do here, someone will move to change it on the floor. So why not save time and send it to the Senate floor to be acted upon?" That is what we have done with many of the amendments attached to this bill. I insist that it has saved a great deal of time for Congress.

For example, we had this bill last week on which we had three executive sessions set for Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday. We completed the bill on Wednesday and saved 2 days' time.

I might say that we are becoming very time conscious in this committee. We know that a great many amendments—possibly 12 or 15 amendments—will be offered to the pending legislation. I know—and I think the other members of the committee who are in the Chamber know—that the policy of the Committee on Foreign Relations now, which has been interpreted in some quarters as representing disagreement or hostility, really represents cooperation in trying to save time in enacting legislation. Certainly, there is no real hostility within the com-

mittee that I have seen. I think our chairman has done an excellent job. I felt that I had to disagree with him once in a while. But, on the whole, the country owes him a great deal for the work which he has done as chairman of the committee, just as the country owes a great deal to Senators MANSFIELD, SPARKMAN, and the other members of the committee.

We have this legislation before us. It could have been delayed for 2 or 3 weeks more. It was not. Out of it I have faith to believe a good bill will come, a bill that will go to the President that certainly will not contain all the provisions he would like. I do not think it will, anyway, but then it will not have all the provisions in it that the chairman of the committee would like, or that I would like to see in it—I am pretty sure of that.

Furthermore, it will go to conference with the House, and when it comes out of the conference, it will not be exactly what the House would have liked or what the Senate would have liked; but it will be a good consensus of opinions as to what we should include in the bill. That will be due to our making proper use of the legislative processes. I think this is a splendid example, regardless of how pleased or displeased that any of us individually may be with it, that when it finally goes down to the White House it will represent a good example of how the legislative processes can be used and should be used.

Mr. President, I have nothing more to say now, and I believe that I will not have much more to say later.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I should like to make a few remarks based largely on what the distinguished Senator from Vermont has just said.

I have been a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations since January of 1951. I have been very proud to be a member of that committee. I have enjoyed its work. I have felt rather strongly about some of the things that have been said about the committee's being torn apart, the bitterness, the strife, and so forth.

I am very glad that the able Senator from Vermont has made the remarks he has.

The Committee on Foreign Relations works together harmoniously. We may differ and we do differ from time to time with some of the provisions, suggestions, and so forth which are offered by members of the committee. But, that is what a committee is for, to sift out all of the ideas and suggestions, so that we may come as nearly to a consensus of the views expressed by the majority and the minority as possible. Nevertheless, it represents what the majority of the committee believe should be reported to the floor of the Senate. I should think it would be rather seldom that every provision in a bill would please every member of the committee.

I was not at the meeting when this bill was voted out. I do not know how the chairman voted. I am just informed that he voted against reporting it. Nevertheless, I am sure there were members that did vote to report the bill out who held reservations, just as the Senator from Vermont did. But, I know many

times that we will be divided on a bill, or will have a difficult time to get the correct wording of a bill so that it will express all the opinions we want to express. Many times members will say, "Well, we have done the best we can here and we believe that this should be presented to the Senate as a whole and let them express themselves on it."

That is the way the regular legislative process works. That is the way it should be.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is true with reference to this bill.

Mr. AIKEN. I was simply trying to make clear that there is no wrangling going on in the committee—

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is right.

Mr. AIKEN. Nor is there any hostility within the committee. We are not trying to downgrade the chairman when we differ with him on something he proposes. We are merely trying to get legislation enacted as it should be enacted when we send a bill to the Senate for action, and then to the conference committee for further action, instead of taking day after day to wrangle over it in the committee itself. It is just good commonsense. It has already proved to be a timesaver in our legislative work.

I am satisfied with the operation of the committee, even though I have been in the minority sometimes. We have not had too many record votes, in fact. In many a proposal made, we have simply said, "Let us get this matter to the floor of the Senate right away on a voice vote, where it will have to go anyway."

If there is a narrow vote in the committee, we can be dead sure that the Senate will go all through it again on the floor and, possibly, if the Senate approves what the majority of the committee wanted, then we will take it to the conference committee and meet with the House. I think, under the leadership of the chairman, we have done good legislating this year, even though I may not approve or agree with everything that is proposed.

Mr. SPARKMAN. May I ask the distinguished Senator: Is it not true, as he pointed out, that we do not have any wrangling, as many press reports would have the people believe—

Mr. AIKEN. No.

Mr. SPARKMAN. We do not tear at each other—

Mr. AIKEN. Not at all.

Mr. SPARKMAN. May I ask the Senator: Is it not also true, and has it not been his experience, as I feel it has been mine and I daresay that of the distinguished majority leader as well, that our committee has acted on as nearly a non-partisan basis as any committee could.

Mr. AIKEN. That is right. It has.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I cannot recall, off-hand, any measure that ever came up in the committee and was acted on in purely partisan fashion.

Mr. AIKEN. I might say that the Republican executive branch of Government owes a vote of appreciation to the senior Democratic Senator from Alabama for the manner in which he has dealt so objectively and fairly with proposals which have come before us. I



know that he does not agree with all the things that come up from the White House. When he thinks a proposal is for the good of the country, he supports that proposal, but if he thinks it is not for the good of the country, then he opposes it. That is as it should be.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I appreciate what the Senator has just said.

Mr. AIKEN. I might also say that—

Mr. SPARKMAN. I try to act that way. By the way, I happened to think: Are all Senators getting a copy of the computerized study which has just been made by the University of South Dakota?

Mr. AIKEN. Yes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I find that very interesting. I was interested in comparing my voting record. I notice one line there on "Nixon"—I do not know how they measure it, but I presume it is based on measures which the President presents—and I notice that I have a 75-percent record of voting with him, based on that study.

I have teased some of my Republican friends, sometimes, by telling them that I have supported President Nixon much more than some of them have. I have not measured all of these items in the study, but I do find that rather interesting because, just as the Senator said, I always try to pick out and make sure in my own mind what is good for the Nation and also for Alabama, and vote that way.

Mr. AIKEN. I do not believe that the Senator from Alabama votes out of admiration for the President every time, but when he thinks it is in the interest of our country.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I do not consider that. I did not consider that when we had a Democratic President. Of course, I have always said that I believe I resolved my doubts in favor of the administration.

#### THE MANSFIELD AMENDMENT TO END AMERICAN MILITARY INVOLVEMENT IN INDOCHINA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Foreign Relations Committee has approved an amendment which I offered to the pending legislation that is designed to speed the end of American military involvement in Indochina. This is the same amendment I originally offered to S. 3526, the foreign relations authorization bill when it was on the floor. As I stated when I introduced that amendment:

It will place no conditions on the continuation of the removal of U.S. ground forces from South Vietnam; in fact, it will require their total extrication by August 31, 1972. It will separately require an agreement for the return of all POWs and recoverable MIAs and a cease-fire only—and I repeat the word "only"—between U.S. forces and those arrayed against our forces—that is, the National Liberation Front and its allies, as a condition for the complete withdrawal of U.S. forces from the hostilities in and over Indochina.

Section 12 of the present bill contains the amendment. When it was offered earlier this month, I stated then that it was intended to underscore what is the apparent policy of the administration; namely, the total extrication of all U.S. troops from South Vietnam. To meet that objective, this provision, as it appears in the bill now before the Senate, would require the absolute removal of all Ameri-

can military personnel from South Vietnam by August 31, 1972. There are no preconditions. There are no ifs, ands, or buts. Every last serviceman on the ground in Vietnam will be out by August 31, whether he plays a combat or a supporting role.

The second section of section 12 is a separate and distinct proposition. When enacted, it will require the termination of all American participation in the hostilities in, over and around Indochina subject only to the following conditions which follow in sequence and are a part of the whole:

First. That a cease-fire be agreed upon between the United States and the National Liberation Front and those allied with them;

Second. That the release of American POW's has been provided for by agreement; and

Third. That provision has also been made for the release of recoverable American MIA's.

What is envisioned by this second subsection is the complete cessation of American participation and involvement in hostilities in the air and on the sea, as well as on the land and, not only in South Vietnam, but in all the countries of Indochina.

It is most important that these conditions upon which rests the total termination of our involvement be understood in the order in which they are set forth. A cease-fire, a release of American POW's, an accounting for the MIA's—these are the elements. It is for a definite purpose that they appear in this sequence. The cease-fire between the United States alone and the NLF and those allied with them must first be agreed upon as the umbrella under which the POW and MIA issues will be resolved.

The most significant aspect, to repeat, is to reach first the agreement for the cease-fire—a cease-fire negotiated by the United States and the NLF and its allies without veto power granted to any other source or government. Once this most essential step is taken and a cease-fire is agreed to, efforts to meet the remaining conditions can be undertaken immediately. It is that first step—the agreement or the umbrella, so to speak—that is the most critical step. With it will come the beginning of the end, the close of a chapter that should not have been opened in the first place.

Mr. President, in the committee there was some difference in interpretation concerning the intent of the second part of the amendment. I hope that this statement will clear up any uncertainty. While the last of our forces on the ground in South Vietnam are being withdrawn under the requirement of subsection (a), negotiations would proceed between the United States and the National Liberation Front and its allies for an agreement for a cease-fire, which would end the hostilities insofar as our forces were involved and provide for the release of American prisoners and an accounting for those missing in action.

No one can predict when a political settlement can be reached between the peoples of Indochina or the killing of brother by brother brought to an end. There has been a cease-fire in Korea for

19 years—and a state of hostilities still exists. But we got the American prisoners back after a cease-fire was agreed to. We cannot expect to get the prisoners back until our part in the killing stops. To suggest otherwise is callously unfair to these men and their relatives. My amendment couples the two problems in such a way that the release of the prisoners will be related to the agreement for a cease-fire.

Mr. President, I offer this in explanation of the amendment. Before voting, the Senate should be fully apprised of the intent of this provision insofar as an agreement for a cease-fire is involved and its effect upon the return of the POW's and the accounting for the MIA's. It is on the basis of the verified cease-fire agreement and the followup POW and MIA arrangements that it is hoped we will be able to lay to rest once and for all this Nation's direct involvement in any capacity in the hostilities in Indochina.

Mr. President, American military participation in this war has gone on officially for 11 years now. And it has cost us up to May 27, 1972, 55,954 dead Americans. It has cost us 303,066 wounded Americans. It has cost us overall in total casualties 359,020 Americans. The toll for the unfortunate people of Indochina, North and South, is incalculable.

The public wants, not more speeches, but the termination of the involvement in this travesty. Insofar as it rests with the Senate to contribute constitutionally to that end, the amendment in my opinion points the way to action.

#### QUORUM CALL

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEVENSON). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, June 12, 1972, he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 659. An act to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965, the Vocational Education Act of 1963, the General Education Provisions Act (creating a National Provision for Postsecondary Education and a National Institute of Education), the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Public Law 874, Eighty-first Congress, and related Acts, and for other purposes; and

S. 3607. An act to authorize appropriations to the Atomic Energy Commission in accordance with section 261 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and for other purposes.

#### RECESS TO 2:15 P.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 2:15 p.m. today.

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

Thereupon, at 1:22 p.m., the Senate took a recess until 2:15 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. STAFFORD).

#### QUORUM CALL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STAFFORD). The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION—THE INTERNATIONAL PLANT PROTECTION CONVENTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2:30 having arrived, the Senate, under previous order, will go into executive session to vote on the treaties Nos. 20, 21, and 22 on the Executive Calendar. The resolutions of ratification having already been reported, the question is: Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification on Calendar No. 20, Executive D, 84th Congress, second session. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD of West Virginia. I announce that the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. GAMBRELL), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS) are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. GAMBRELL), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL) would each vote "yea."

Mr. SCOTT. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), the Senator from New York (Mr. BUCKLEY), and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. JORDAN) are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK) is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON) is absent to attend the funeral of a friend.

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. GRIFFIN), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT), the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. WEICKER) are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 74, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 201 Ex.]

#### YEAS—74

Aiken	Eagleton	Montoya
Allen	Eastland	Muskie
Allott	Ellender	Nelson
Anderson	Ervin	Packwood
Bayh	Fannin	Pastore
Beall	Fong	Pearson
Bennett	Gurney	Percy
Bentsen	Hartke	Proxmire
Bible	Hatfield	Randolph
Boggs	Hollings	Roth
Brook	Hruska	Saxbe
Brooke	Hughes	Schweiker
Burdick	Inouye	Scott
Byrd	Jackson	Smith
Harry F., Jr.	Jordan, N.C.	Sparkman
Byrd, Robert C.	Kennedy	Spong
Cannon	Long	Stafford
Case	Magnuson	Stennis
Chiles	Mansfield	Stevens
Church	Mathias	Stevenson
Cooper	McGee	Symington
Cotton	McIntyre	Talmadge
Cranston	Metcalf	Thurmond
Curtis	Miller	Tunney
Dole	Mondale	Young

#### NAYS—0

#### NOT VOTING—26

Baker	Griffin	Moss
Bellmon	Hansen	Mundt
Buckley	Harris	Pell
Cook	Hart	Ribicoff
Dominick	Humphrey	Taft
Fulbright	Javits	Tower
Gambrell	Jordan, Idaho	Weicker
Goldwater	McClellan	Williams
Gravel	McGovern	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, after discussing the matter with the manager of the bill, the ranking Republican member of the committee, and the leadership on the other side, I ask unanimous consent that each of the next two votes be concluded in a 10-minute period, rather than the usual 15.

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

#### CONVENTION TO PREVENT AND PUNISH ACTS OF TERRORISM

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification on Executive D (92d Congress, 1st Session), a convention to prevent and punish acts of terrorism, having already been reported, the question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification?

On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. GAMBRELL), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS) are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Georgia (Mr. GAMBRELL), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF) would each vote "yea."

Mr. SCOTT. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), the Senator from New York (Mr. BUCKLEY), and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. JORDAN) are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK) is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON) is absent to attend the funeral of a friend.

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. GRIFFIN), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT), the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. WEICKER) are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT) and the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 74, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 202 Ex.]

#### YEAS—74

Aiken	Eagleton	Montoya
Allen	Eastland	Muskie
Allott	Ellender	Nelson
Anderson	Ervin	Packwood
Bayh	Fannin	Pastore
Beall	Fong	Pearson
Bennett	Fulbright	Percy
Bentsen	Gurney	Proxmire
Bible	Hartke	Randolph
Boggs	Hatfield	Roth
Brook	Hollings	Saxbe
Brooke	Hruska	Schweiker
Burdick	Hughes	Scott
Byrd	Jackson	Smith
Harry F., Jr.	Jordan, N.C.	Sparkman
Byrd, Robert C.	Kennedy	Spong
Cannon	Long	Stafford
Case	Magnuson	Stennis
Chiles	Mansfield	Stevens
Church	Mathias	Stevenson
Cooper	McGee	Symington
Cotton	McIntyre	Talmadge
Cranston	Metcalf	Thurmond
Curtis	Miller	Tunney
Dole	Mondale	Young

#### NAYS—0

#### NOT VOTING—26

Baker	Cook	Goldwater
Bellmon	Dominick	Gravel
Buckley	Gambrell	Griffin



Hansen	Jordan, Idaho	Ribicoff
Harris	McClellan	Taft
Hart	McGovern	Tower
Humphrey	Moss	Weicker
Inouye	Mundt	Williams
Javits	Pell	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

#### TREATY WITH HONDURAS ON THE SWAN ISLANDS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to vote on Executive H, 2d session, 92d Congress, the treaty with Honduras on the Swan Islands.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification? On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. GAMBRELL), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. McCLELLAN), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. McGOVERN), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS) are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. GAMBRELL), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), and the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL) would each vote "yea."

Mr. SCOTT. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), the Senator from New York (Mr. BUCKLEY), and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. JORDAN) are absent on official business.

The Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK) is absent by leave of the Senate on official business.

The Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON) is absent to attend the funeral of a friend.

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MUNDT) are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Colorado (Mr. DOMINICK), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. GRIFFIN), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT), the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. WEICKER) are necessarily absent.

If present and voting, the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT), and the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER) would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 74, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 203 Ex.]

YEAS—74

Aiken	Eagleton	Montoya
Allen	Eastland	Muskie
Allott	Ellender	Nelson
Anderson	Ervin	Packwood
Bayh	Fannin	Pastore
Beall	Fong	Pearson
Bennett	Fulbright	Percy
Bentsen	Gurney	Proxmire
Bible	Hartke	Randolph
Boggs	Hatfield	Roth
Brock	Hollings	Saxbe
Brooke	Hruska	Schweiker
Burdick	Hughes	Scott
Byrd	Jackson	Smith
Harry F., Jr.	Jordan, N.C.	Sparkman
Byrd, Robert C.	Kennedy	Spong
Cannon	Long	Stafford
Case	Magnuson	Stennis
Chiles	Mansfield	Stevens
Church	Mathias	Stevenson
Cooper	McGee	Symington
Cotton	McIntyre	Talmadge
Cranston	Metcalf	Thurmond
Curtis	Miller	Tunney
Dole	Mondale	Young

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—26

Baker	Hansen	Moss
Bellmon	Harris	Mundt
Buckley	Hart	Pell
Cook	Humphrey	Ribicoff
Dominick	Inouye	Taft
Gambrell	Javits	Tower
Goldwater	Jordan, Idaho	Weicker
Gravel	McClellan	Williams
Griffin	McGovern	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

#### LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STAFFORD). The Senator from Montana will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Has an order been entered into for the convening of the Senate tomorrow?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I thank the Presiding Officer.

#### ORDER FOR CONVENING OF THE SENATE ON WEDNESDAY, THURSDAY, AND FRIDAY OF THIS WEEK AT 10 A.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, when the Senate meets on Wednesday, Thursday and Friday of this week, it convene at 10 a.m.

#### NOTICE OF LONG AND POSSIBLY SATURDAY SESSIONS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the Senate should bear in mind that only a little over 2 weeks are left before the Democratic National Convention and that the Senate has a lot of appropriation bills still to consider.

There is a possibility—a possibility, I

reiterate—that beginning this week, we may start to meet on Saturdays.

Thus, I believe the Senate should be on notice that we intend to come in early and stay fairly late, and operate on a two-track schedule beginning tomorrow, with possibly meeting on Saturdays depending on the situation which exists as the week comes to a close.

#### SENATE RESOLUTION 318—RELATING TO A SUBPENA DUCES TECUM DIRECTED TO THE FINANCIAL CLERK OR HIS AGENT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

S. Res. 318, relating to a subpoena duces tecum directed to the Financial Clerk or his agent.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, this resolution is in its usual form as presented in a case of this sort.

The resolution was considered and agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 318

Resolution relating to a subpoena duces tecum directed to the Financial Clerk or his agent

Whereas a subpoena duces tecum issued on application of the United States of America addressed to the Financial Clerk or his agent, United States Senate Disbursing Office, and served upon the Financial Clerk, directs him to appear in the city of the District of Columbia, before the Criminal Branch of the Superior Court of the District of Columbia on the nineteenth day of June 1972, at 9:00 o'clock ante meridian, and to bring with him certain records in the possession and under the control of the Senate: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That by the privilege of the Senate no evidence of a documentary character under the control and in the possession of the Senate can, by the mandate of process of the ordinary courts of justice, be taken from such control or possession but by its permission; be it further

*Resolved*, That when it appears by the order of the court or of the judge thereof, or of any legal officer charged with the administration of the orders of such court or judge, that documentary evidence in the possession and under the control of the Senate is needed for use in any court of justice, before any judge, legal officer, or grand jury, for the promotion of justice, the Senate will take such order thereon as will promote the ends of justice consistently with the privileges and rights of the Senate; be it further

*Resolved*, That William A. Ridgely, Financial Clerk of the Senate, or his designee, be authorized to appear at the place and before the court named in the subpoena duces tecum before mentioned, but shall not take with him any papers or documents on file in his office or under his control or in the possession of the Financial Clerk of the Senate; be it further

*Resolved*, That when said court determines upon the materiality and the relevancy of the records called for in the subpoena duces tecum to the proceeding before the court, the said court, through any of its officers or agents, shall have full permission to attend with all proper parties to the proceeding at a place under the orders and control of the Senate, to take at such place copies of such records in possession or control of said Financial Clerk as the court has found to be material and relevant, and to take at such place such evidence of witnesses in respect to such records as the courts or other proper officer thereof shall desire, except that (1) the possession of such records by the said Financial Clerk shall not be disturbed and such records shall not be removed from their file or custody under said Financial Clerk, and (2) no minutes or transcripts of any executive session or any evidence of witnesses with respect thereto may be disclosed or copied; be it further

*Resolved*, That subject to the limitations hereinbefore stated, said Financial Clerk is authorized to supply certified copies of such records as the court has found to be material and relevant to the proceeding before the court; and be it further

*Resolved*, That a copy of these resolutions be transmitted to the said court as a respectful answer to the subpoena aforementioned.

#### DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INTER-STATE AGREEMENTS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I submit a report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9580) to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to enter into agreements with the Commonwealth of Virginia and the State of Maryland concerning the fees for the operation of certain motor vehicles.

I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. STAFFORD). Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report, as follows:

#### CONFERENCE REPORT (S. REPT. NO. 92-846)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9580) to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to enter into agreements with the Commonwealth of Virginia and the State of Maryland concerning the fees for the operation of certain motor vehicles, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the text of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment insert the following:

That the Commissioner of the District of Columbia may enter into an interstate agreement with the Commonwealth of Virginia or with the State of Maryland, or with both, which shall stipulate that any person—

(1) who operates in the District of Columbia and in the State which is a party to the agreement a single unit motor vehicle which has three or more axles and which is designed to unload itself;

(2) who has registered that motor vehicle in the District of Columbia or in that State; and

(3) who but for the agreement is required to pay the fee for an annual hauling permit prescribed by the fifth paragraph under the heading "General Expenses" in the first section of the Act of July 11, 1919 (D.C. Code, sec. 5-316), and a similar fee imposed on the motor vehicle by that State;

shall not be required to pay a fee described in paragraph (3) which is imposed by a jurisdiction other than the jurisdiction in which the motor vehicle is registered. If the Commissioner enters into an interstate agreement under this Act, he may adjust the annual hauling permit fees of the District of Columbia referred to in paragraph (3) so that the total amount of fees (including registration and inspection fees) required for the operation in the District of Columbia and in each State which is a party to such agreement of the vehicles referred to in paragraph (1) shall be uniform.

SEC. 2. The Commissioner of the District of Columbia may enter into an interstate agreement with the Commonwealth of Virginia or with the State of Maryland, or with both, pursuant to which the parties to such agreement may assist each other in the enforcement of its laws relating to traffic (including parking violations).

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the title of the bill and agree to the same.

THOMAS F. EAGLETON,  
DANIEL K. INOUE,  
CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, Jr.,

*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

JOHN L. McMILLAN,  
EARLE CABELL,  
W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY, Jr.,  
ANCHER NELSEN,  
JOEL T. BROTHILL,

*Managers on the Part of the House.*

#### JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9580) to authorize the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to enter into agreements with the Commonwealth of Virginia and the State of Maryland concerning the fees for the operation of certain motor vehicles, submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The text of both the House bill and the Senate amendment was identical except with respect to two provisions. The House bill and the Senate amendment authorized the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to enter into an interstate agreement with the Commonwealth of Virginia and the State of Maryland relating to the operation of a single unit motor vehicle, having three or more axles, and designed to unload itself. The Senate amendment required the Commissioner to obtain the approval of the District of Columbia Council. The House bill did not require such approval. The Conference substitute eliminates the requirement of such approval.

The Senate amendment contained a provision which authorized the Commissioner of the District of Columbia, with the approval of the District of Columbia Council, to enter into an interstate agreement with the Commonwealth of Virginia or with the State of Maryland, or both, pursuant to which the parties to such agreement may assist each other in the enforcement of its laws relating to traffic (including parking violations). The House bill contained no such provision. The Conference substitute contains the language of the Senate provision other than the requirement of approval by the District of Columbia Council.

The conferees wish to emphasize that the authority given to the Commissioner of the District of Columbia to enter into interstate agreements under the Conference substitute is discretionary. The word "may" was used advisedly so as to indicate that it is solely in the discretion of the Commissioner to decide whether he enters into the interstate agreements.

It is the belief of the conferees that the Commissioner should enter into the interstate agreement relating to the operation of a single unit motor vehicle, having three or more axles, and designed to unload itself only if, at the same time, he enters into the interstate agreement authorized by the Conference substitute relating to the provision of mutual assistance in the enforcement of laws relating to traffic (including parking violations). In the opinion of the conferees, if such action is taken, it should result in a revenue gain to the District of Columbia rather than a net revenue loss.

The conferees accepted, as a conforming amendment, the Senate amendment to the title of the House bill.

THOMAS F. EAGLETON,  
DANIEL K. INOUE,  
CHARLES MCC. MATHIAS, Jr.,  
*Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

JOHN L. McMILLAN,  
EARLE CABELL,  
W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY, Jr.,  
ANCHER NELSEN,  
JOEL T. BROTHILL,  
*Managers on the Part of the House.*

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, I am pleased to yield to the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maryland is recognized.

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Missouri, the chairman of the District of Columbia Committee, for yielding to me for just a very brief comment on the conference report.

One of the greatest burdens on the life of the average citizen today is the political boundaries which divide great metropolitan areas and which obstruct desirable reforms in the ordinary ways of doing business—sometimes to the extent that it is impossible even to find cooperative means of allowing people in their daily pursuits to trade across these political boundaries.

I think by this act we are achieving a useful purpose. We are making it possible to keep up to date. We are making it possible to be more efficient and more economical in our operations. We are making it possible to deal with metropolitan areas as large communities.

The conference report is really aimed at doing just that in the Washington metropolitan area, authorizing a joining together for certain purposes of the communities of Virginia, Maryland, and the District of Columbia—separate political entities which in metropolitan Washington actually form one area socially, economically and commercially, and one community.

I am happy to support the conference report, and I am pleased that the chairman of the committee brought the conference report to the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report. (Putting the question.)

The conference report was agreed to.



## QUORUM CALL

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

## FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1972

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (S. 3390) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes.

## AMENDMENT NO. 1221

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the pending measure and ask that it be read.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

On page 6, it is proposed to delete lines 24 and 25.

On page 7, it is proposed to delete lines 1 through 9.

The language proposed to be stricken is as follows:

(3) In section 513, relating to military assistance authorizations for Thailand—

(A) insert in the section caption immediately after "Thailand", a comma and the following: "Laos, and South Vietnam"; and

(B) add at the end thereof the following new sentence: "After June 30, 1973, no military assistance shall be furnished by the United States to Laos or South Vietnam directly or through any other foreign country unless that assistance is authorized under this Act or the Foreign Military Sales Act."

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I now call up my amendment for formal consideration; but first, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Mississippi will state it.

Mr. STENNIS. Is there any time limitation on amendments?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no pending time limitation.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, for the time being, I shall content myself, without going into a formal discussion of the amendment with so few Senators present, by stating the purpose of the amendment. I shall give a broad outline of the nature of my amendment, what it proposes, and what will be the situation if it is adopted.

The amendment relates to the military assistance bill, which we have had before us for many years as a matter of policy, in which we appropriated funds for military assistance to the various friendly nations of the world. That measure had been handled as a policy matter by the Committee on Foreign Relations.

However, in 1966, when the war in Vietnam took on such large proportions, it got to the point where the amount of money we were spending in support of the army of South Vietnam and in support of the South Korean Army that

was in South Vietnam, and for related matters in Laos and Cambodia, became so great that it was no longer military aid in the sense that that term is used, but really became aid for allies in the war in which we were then becoming the principal participant. Under those circumstances, it was agreed between the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Armed Services that there would be a transfer of jurisdiction to the Committee on Armed Services, to use a simple word, in the handling of funds for Indochina.

I remember that former Secretary of Defense McNamara testified that the matter was so involved because of the day-to-day and month-to-month changes in the war situation that the handling of funds could not be delineated or taken care of under the system we were using for spending in the military assistance program. He said he needed something that was more geared to war, which is what we were engaged in.

So it was determined then that we would authorize so much of the money each year to be spent for the nonmilitary operations of the South Vietnamese Army, the Korean Army in South Vietnam, and of other countries, but that we would permit a certain amount of the money that would be appropriated for military forces in that area to be spent on our allied forces in that area. So that is the way it has been handled ever since.

When I became chairman of the Armed Services Committee in 1969, the authorization request was \$2.5 billion for that purpose. We went into that and reduced it, as I recall, to \$2.25 billion. We have been going into it each year, including the current budget we are considering. We have it all out on the table, and we started a mockup of it. Then they came with this request for more money. So we have had to stop that part of the mockup and take up this additional request.

The bill would provide that after fiscal 1973 this jurisdiction would transfer back to the Foreign Relations Committee. I have no objection to its going back to the Foreign Relations Committee. In fact, it is a headache for us, and will be for anyone, as long as this war is going on. I think, in the name of commonsense and logic, we will have to use the present system, as I see it, until this war can be terminated in some way.

So my amendment merely strikes this provision in the proposed bill and will let the arrangement I have just described continue as it is now until there is a settlement or an end or a disposition of the present situation in that part of the world, which we hope will be soon.

I think that explains the amendment's primary purpose.

I am willing to make an agreement now for controlled time on this amendment. I think the issue is highly important, but I think it is fairly simple to understand. The facts are not complicated—not very much, anyway—and I would agree to a limitation of time, if the leader wants to propose it, to an hour on each side.

## UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if I may respond to the distinguished Senator, I have discussed this matter with him and with the Republican leader and with other Senators, and I therefore propose that there be a time limitation on the amendment offered by Mr. STENNIS, the time to begin running tomorrow at 10:30 a.m., lasting for 2 hours, to be equally divided between the distinguished Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) and the distinguished Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), and that the vote on the amendment occur at 12:30 p.m. tomorrow.

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for a question, I understood the tentative time agreeable was that the debate would start at 12:45 or 12:30, and 2 hours would run it until 2:30, and we would have a rollover vote then.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. The Senator is correct, and I would have discussed the proposed time change with him had I had an opportunity to do so, but inasmuch as he had the floor, and he mentioned the possibility of a time agreement, I thought I would suggest this in view of the fact that it would allow us to have the vote at 12:30 rather than at 2:45. But if the Senator would prefer for the vote to come at the latter time, we will shift the time accordingly.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. 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. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I revise my unanimous-consent request to read as follows: that the time on the amendment begin running tomorrow at 11 o'clock a.m. and run until 12:30 p.m., to be equally divided between the distinguished Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) and the distinguished Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT); that beginning at 2 o'clock p.m. tomorrow, the time again be controlled on the amendment, divided between the distinguished Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS) and the distinguished Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT); and that a vote occur on the amendment at 2:45 p.m. tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request?

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—that is entirely agreeable to the Senator from Mississippi. I hope we can have a good attendance here so Senators can get the facts. I thank the Senator for his leadership in arranging at this time for this planned-for vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the unanimous-consent request? Without objection, the request is agreed to.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I thank the distinguished Senator from Mississippi. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. 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. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask that the well be cleared.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The well will be cleared.

#### TIME LIMITATION ON CONSIDERATION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at such time as H.R. 15259, the bill making appropriations for the District of Columbia, is called up and made the pending business, there be a time limitation thereon of 2 hours, the time to be equally divided between the distinguished Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE) and the distinguished Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD); that time on any amendment, debatable motion, or appeal in relation thereto be limited to 30 minutes, the time to be equally divided between the mover of such and the distinguished manager of the bill, the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUE), unless the manager of the bill supports such, in which case, time in opposition thereto be under the control of the distinguished Republican leader or his designee.

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

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, provided further that Senators in control of the time on the bill may yield therefrom to any Senator on any amendment, debatable motion, or appeal.

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

#### TIME LIMITATION ON VOTES ON THREE TREATIES

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on each of the three votes with respect to the treaties tomorrow, there be a time limitation of 10 minutes for each rollcall vote, with the warning bell to be sounded midway.

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

#### ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE HUD APPROPRIATION BILL ON WEDNESDAY

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, on Wednesday, June 14, 1972, at 3 p.m. the unfinished business be laid aside temporarily and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 15093, making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and that the unfinished business remain in a temporarily laid-aside status

until H.R. 15093 is disposed of, or until the close of business on Wednesday, whichever is the earlier.

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

#### ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 9092 AND STATE-JUSTICE APPROPRIATION BILL ON THURSDAY

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, June 15, 1972, at 3 p.m., the unfinished business be laid aside temporarily and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 9092, to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the Government, and that upon disposition of H.R. 9092, the Senate proceed to the consideration of H.R. 14989, making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and related agencies, and that the unfinished business remain in a temporarily laid-aside status until disposition of H.R. 9092 and H.R. 14989, or until the close of business on Thursday, whichever is the earlier.

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

#### ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF RESOLUTION DEALING WITH QUESTIONS RELATED TO SECRET DOCUMENTS ON FRIDAY

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 1 p.m. on Friday next, June 16, 1972, if the unfinished business has not been acted on by that time, it be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Resolution 299, to establish a select committee to study questions related to secret and confidential Government documents, and that the unfinished business remain in a temporarily laid-aside status until the final disposition of Senate Resolution 299, or the close of business on Friday next, whichever is the earlier.

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

#### QUORUM CALL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS BILL WEDNESDAY

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, upon the disposition of H.R. 15093, the unfinished business remain in a temporarily laid-aside status; that

the Senate proceed at that time to the consideration of H.R. 15259, a bill making appropriations for the District of Columbia; and that the unfinished business remain in a temporarily laid-aside status until the appropriations bill for the District of Columbia is disposed of or until the close of business on Wednesday, which is earlier.

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

#### QUORUM CALL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD). Without objection, it is so ordered.

(At this point Mr. STAFFORD took the chair as Presiding Officer.)

#### ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT TO 10:30 A.M.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.

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

#### ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR HARRIS, FOR ROUTINE BUSINESS, AND FOR THE UNFINISHED BUSINESS TO BE LAID BEFORE THE SENATE TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the two leaders have been recognized under the standing order on tomorrow, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. HARRIS) be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, after which there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business not to extend beyond 11 a.m. with statements limited therein to 3 minutes, at the conclusion of which the Presiding Officer lay before the Senate the unfinished business.

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

#### PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate will convene tomorrow at 10:30 a.m. After the two leaders have been recognized under the standing order, the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, after which there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, not to extend beyond 11 a.m., with statements limited therein to 3 minutes.

At 11 a.m. the Chair will lay before the Senate the unfinished business, S. 3390. The pending question at that time will be on agreement to the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Missis-



issippi (Mr. STENNIS), amendment No. 1221. There is a time limitation on that amendment. Debate will continue thereon until 12:30 p.m.

At 2 p.m. tomorrow, the controlled time on that amendment will be resumed, with a yea-and-nay vote to occur on the amendment at 2:45 p.m.

Beginning at 3 p.m. tomorrow, the Senate will go into executive session and the Senate will proceed to vote on the following treaties:

Executive A (92d Congress, second session), a Convention on the Taking of Evidence Abroad in Civil or Commercial Matters, Executive Calendar No. 23.

Executive F (92d Congress, second session), a Treaty of Extradition with Argentina, Executive Calendar No. 24.

Executive E (92d Congress, second session), a Partial Revision of the Radio Regulations Relating to Space Telecommunications, Executive Calendar No. 25.

The rollcall votes on each of the three treaties will be limited to 10 minutes. As I have already indicated, there will, therefore, be four back-to-back rollcall votes beginning at 2:45.

Mr. President, may we have the well cleared while the program for tomorrow is being given?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The well will be cleared.

The Senator may proceed.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. To repeat, Mr. President, there will be four rollcall votes tomorrow, back-to-back, beginning at 2:45 p.m.

Following the four rollcall votes, the Senate will resume consideration of the unfinished business, and it is expected that amendments will be called up on which there will be rollcall votes.

Therefore, tomorrow there will be not only at least four yea and nay votes, but also it is quite possible the Senate will be in session until a reasonably late hour and there may be additional rollcall votes on amendments tomorrow after 3:30 p.m.

On Wednesday, following a period for the transaction of routine morning business the Senate will resume its consideration of amendments to the unfinished business, S. 3390. At the hour of 3 p.m., the Senate will proceed to operate on a second track, with the bill making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, H.R. 15093, being called up and made the pending business. Undoubtedly there will be rollcall votes on that bill.

After that bill has been disposed of on Wednesday, the Senate will proceed to consider the bill making appropriations for the District of Columbia, H.R. 15259. Undoubtedly there will be at least one rollcall vote on the final passage of that bill on Wednesday afternoon, the Senate staying in until a reasonably late hour.

Then, on Thursday the Senate will resume consideration of the unfinished business. At the hour of 3 p.m., Thursday the Senate will lay aside the unfinished business and proceed to a second track, with H.R. 9092, an act to provide an equitable system for fixing and adjusting the rates of pay for prevailing rate employees of the Government, as the business before the Senate.

After that bill has been disposed of on Thursday, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of H.R. 14989, an act making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce. There will be a rollcall vote—or rollcall votes—on that bill during Thursday afternoon. The Senate will likely be in late in order to complete the bill.

On Friday, the Senate will resume its consideration of the unfinished business, S. 3390. At 1 p.m. on Friday, the Senate will proceed to consider—in terms of the second track—Senate Resolution 299, a resolution to establish a select committee to study questions related to secret and confidential Government documents.

Senators are reminded that the Senate will begin operating on a two-track system on Wednesday of this week. The Senate will be in session until a reasonably late hour tomorrow, and certainly on Wednesday and on Thursday and Friday. There will be rollcall votes tomorrow, Wednesday, and Thursday, and, in all probability, on Friday.

The majority leader has indicated earlier today, and I repeat now, that Senators may be alerted to the possibility of a session on Saturday of this week.

I might add the postscript that the possibility for Saturday sessions will increase as we move toward that date of June 30. At the close of business on June 30, the Senate will adjourn through the Fourth of July holiday and the Democratic Convention.

Much remains to be done. Several bills are on the Calendar and more will be added daily. In order to transact as much business as can be transacted prior to the close of business on June 30, the Senate will have to be in session for long days and possibly on Saturdays. Senators may wish to arrange their schedules accordingly while there is yet time.

#### QUORUM CALL

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

#### ADJOURNMENT TO 10:30 A.M.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move in accordance with the previous order that the Senate stand in adjournment until 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and at 4:26 p.m. the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 13, 1972, at 10:30 a.m.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 12, 1972:

#### DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Thomas E. Kauper, of Michigan, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Richard W. McLaren, resigned.

A William Olson, Jr., of California, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Robert C. Mardian, resigned.

Harlington Wood, Jr., of Illinois, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Louis Patrick Gray III, resigned.

#### IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named Reserve officers to be permanent commissioned officers in the regular Coast Guard in the grades indicated:

#### Lieutenant commander

George F. Martin

#### Lieutenant

Gordon T. Kampert      George T. Jones  
Terry D. Beacham      Robert F. Powers  
Thomas O. Preston      Vernon K. Carlson

The following-licensed officer of the U.S. merchant marine to be a permanent commissioned officer in the regular Coast Guard in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade):

Thomas H. Walsh

The following-named officer to be a permanent commissioned warrant officer in the Coast Guard in the grade of chief warrant officer, W2, having been found fit for duty while on the temporary disability retired list:

Paul J. Balzer

#### U.S. AIR FORCE

The following officers for appointment as Reserve commissioned officers in the U.S. Air Force to the grade indicated, under the provisions of sections 8218, 8351, 8363, and 8392, title 10 of the United States Code:

#### To Be Brigadier General

Col. Robert S. Corbett, Sr., xxx-xx-xxxx FG, South Carolina Air National Guard.

Col. Cleveland J. Perkins, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx xxx-xx-xxxx FG, Georgia Air National Guard.

#### 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.

#### Lieutenant colonel to colonel

#### LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

Abbott, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Abrams, Carl R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Acker, Jack E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Adcock, Walter M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Agnew, Malcolm J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Ainslie, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Albers, Edgar H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Albert, John G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Alderson, Jerry D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Alexander, Thomas D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Allhouse, Herman D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Altomose, Lawrence J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Andersen, Arne, xxx-xx-xxxx  
Andersen, Howard J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Anderson, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Anderson, Charles W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Anderson, Earl W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Anderson, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Anderson, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Arantz, Carl F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Archer, Earl J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Armstrong, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Arneson, Milton A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Arnold, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Arnold, Tom M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Asire, Donald H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Atkinson, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Atkinson, Richard H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Axelsen, Max M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Babcock, Dan E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Back, Doyle R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Backes, Ralph G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Bahr, Lester M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Bailey, Frank D., xxx-xx-xxxx

Baker, Alfred C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Banister, Arthur W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Barnes, Frank G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Barnes, Willard A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Barnett, Charles W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Barrett, Francis E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Barrow, Sterling E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Becker, Marion C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Beebe, Frederick A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Benagh, Thomas M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Bennett, Mortimer F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Bennett, George F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Berg, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Berg, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Berge, Truman K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Bergerot, Paul A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Bernier, Benjamin P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Besam, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Billington, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Billups, Rufus L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Binder, Edwin M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Blackwell, Ralph C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Blake, Thomas F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Blankinship, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Blauw, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Bocquin, Victor E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Bodager, Bill W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Bonner, M. M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Bonney, Charles A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Bottom, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Bowen, Myron A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Bowman, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Brady, Eugene L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Branan, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Briggs, Charles C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Brockett, David H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Brooke, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Brooksher, Dan A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Brower, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Brown, Richard S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Brown, Robert S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Brown, William, xxx-xx-xxxx  
Brundage, Lew D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Brunette, William T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Brunhart, Roy C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Buck, Vincent K., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Burns, Richard F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Burns, Robert, xxx-xx-xxxx  
Bush, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Bushong, Richard B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Butcher, James T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Butler, Barry R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Buzbee, Jack A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Calafato, Eugene F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Cameron, William G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Campbell, Edward J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Canham, Harry G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Carnell, Ben H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Carr, Charles C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Carroll, Norman F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Carter, Wallace H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Cash, Melvin G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Castanedo, Wesley J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Catlin, Howard R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Cecil, Charles P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Chadeayne, Robert F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Chambers, William H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Chaney, R. L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Chealander, Jerry L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Chenault, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Cheney, Laverne L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Cleveland, Charles G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Cline, Wilmer F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Cobb, Tommy, xxx-xx-xxxx  
Coffee, Harold B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Coleman, David B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Coleman, William T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Collens, John W., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
Conner, Jerry E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Contestable, Frank W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Cook, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Cook, William, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Cordingly, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Corgill, James N., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Cornette, Earl M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Cotters, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Cottle, Joe I., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Couture, Albert R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Cox, Frank E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Cox, Hannibal M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Craigwell, Ernest, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx

Crane, Jean M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Crawford, Thom M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Crech, Wilbur L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Cristiani, Augustine B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Cronin, John H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Crouch, Robert K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Culen, Frank A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Cvitanovich, Anthony, xxx-xx-xxxx  
Dahl, Perry J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Daniel, Walter F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Davis, Donald M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Davis, Forrest L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Davis, Homer A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Davis, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Davis, Sidney L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Davis, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Demuro, Theodore F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Delaney, Harry C. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Detling, Harold C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Detour, Jack L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Dettmer, Franz H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Dickson, Enos J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Dillard, William N., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Dinwiddie, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Disanto, Alexander J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Dixey, Joseph R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Dodds, Joseph B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Dodge, Clyde L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Doerty, Walter L. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Dollard, John T. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Dooley, George W. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Dougherty, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Douglas, Jackie R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Dowling, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Drake, Norman S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Dugan, Obadiah A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Dunagan, Lewis H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Dunn, Henry J. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Dunn, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Dupras, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Eaton, Norman D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Edwards, Thomas P. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Eisemann, Ewald F. W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Elder, Wayne T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Ellis, Atlee R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Emery, Morley L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Ennis, Robert B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Erich, Theodore E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Essing, Earl B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Estes, Charles E. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Evans, Donald L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Evans, Frank T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Eydenberg, Monte Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Falls, Johnie W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Farlow, Allan W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Farmer, Howard L. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Faughn, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Faulk, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Fay, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Feltham, Kenneth W. F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Feuerriegel, Karl T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Fiden, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Finlay, John S. III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
Finnegan, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Finney, Arthur T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Fippen, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Fischer, Harold E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Flannery, Darrell N., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Flood, Donald L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Ford, Donald F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Ford, Thomas S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Foss, Warren, xxx-xx-xxxx  
Franklin, Bobby G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Frederick, Calvin L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Friedrich, Paul S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Furlong, Raymond B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Gallagher, Kenneth H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Gardina, Verne D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Gatewood, Jack E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Gearhart, James J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
George, William G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Gibbs, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Gibson, Boyd E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Gillard, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Gillette, Jack W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Ginn, William H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Girard, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Goodwin, Jack E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Graham, Harry O., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Grande, Walter, xxx-xx-xxxx  
Grant, Carl W., xxx-xx-xxxx

Greenleaf, Abbott C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Griffin, Laverne H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Griffith, Robert B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Groves, Everett G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Guthrie, Joseph A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Guyton, Daniel, xxx-xx-xxxx  
Guzak, Frank S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Hagauer, Richard W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Hagen, Carl J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Halliwell, George R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Hamilton, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Hamlin, Ross E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Harden, Ernest R., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
Harrawood, Donald E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Harrington, John H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Harris, Arthur F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Harris, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Harris, Louis M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Harston, David G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Hart, Harlow D., Sr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Hartinger, James V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Hartung, Don M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Hauer, Thomas L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Haught, James S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Haupt, Raymond L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Heany, Harold M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Heard, Robert J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Hebert, William F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Hegerle, Matthew J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Hendrix, George D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Henry, Joseph R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Henry, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Herr, Leonard C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Hezlep, William H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Hilding, Edward, xxx-xx-xxxx  
Hinds, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Hoag, Earl A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Hobbs, Donald W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Hodges, Walter G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Hoffman, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Holcombe, Bondy H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Holt, Carl H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Hoopes, Rex M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Hoover, Jack D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Horning, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Howe, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Howell, Phillip R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Howerton, Glenn F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Hudson, Will M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Hunter, Jack W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Hustad, Eugene E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Huxley, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Hyre, Charles C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Ironmonger, John G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Jamison, Lewis M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Jeff, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Jeffreys, Alfred R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Jenista, Charles O., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Jenne, Theron L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Johnson, Edward R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Johnson, George H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Johnson, Norman J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Johnson, Robert E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Jones, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Jones, Whitcomb O., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Joseph, Charles W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Joska, James S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Kachel, Stanley A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Kaler, Charles S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Kasdan, Neil, xxx-xx-xxxx  
Katz, Norman F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Kavanaugh, Dudley G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Kees, Elwood A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Kellam, Dale L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Keller, Richard M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Kellogg, Burton M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Kelly, John L., II, xxx-xx-xxxx  
Keltz, Bruce G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Kennedy, Edward W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Kevan, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Killion, Thomas J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Killpack, Larry M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Kingdon, Reubin L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Klein, Donald D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Kleinman, Robert B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Knowles, William S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Knudson, Charles B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Koch, Olin F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Kratt, Jacob, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Kuehn, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
Kuritzky, Clarence S., xxx-xx-xxxx



Labeau, Howard L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ladou, Edward M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lambert, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lamont, Maximilian, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Landess, Malcolm L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Landis, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lang, Alfred E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Langdon, Leonard C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Larson, Gordon A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lewis, Clarence W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Liddicoet, William B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lillethun, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Linkous, Russell E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Little, Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Livernash, Joseph H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Long, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lowry, Joseph R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lynch, Donald T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Magnotti, Ralph A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Marden, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Marsh, Otto L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Marsh, Robert T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Martin, Abner B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Martin, Dexter E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Martinich, Louis, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Marzullo, Raymond J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mash, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mason, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mason, Thomas M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Matecko, George, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Matthews, Fred R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Maurer, Calvin R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McAdory, Louis M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McClung, Elbert L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McClure, Joseph A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McClure, Richard M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McClurkin, Sempel P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McCluskey, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McCormick, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McCrary, Leon W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McCullough, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McDonald, Edward M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McDonald, Ned D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McEwen, Milton E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McGoogan, Leon, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McGrath, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McKay, Gerald L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McKee, Thomas M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McMullen, Philip C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Davis, Forrest L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McVay, William D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McVicar, Daniel J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Meahl, Starling, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mercer, Harold E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mercer, Roger N., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Merritt, Walter A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Messerli, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Metzker, Donald J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Meurlin, Neil F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Miles, Kenneth P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Miles, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Miller, Donald E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Miller, John T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Miller, Noble A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mims, Forrest M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Minor, William T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Minter, Billy M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mitchell, Hugh, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mudica, Edward S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Monge, Raymond A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Montgomery, Clarence L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Montgomery, Jack E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Montrose, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Monts, Rufus M., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moore, Edward D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moore, Hilleary D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moore, Stephen E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Morris, Herbert R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moss, Raymond, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Muirhead, Cecil N., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mullen, Maurice L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mulligan, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mullins, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Murray, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Myers, Edward J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Myller, Allen L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nash, Merle W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Neal, Gordon G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Neale, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nelson, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nichols, Charles B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nolan, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nolen, Cregg P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Norby, Wayne A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Norris, Harold S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Norris, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 O'Brien, Russell C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 O'Leary, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Oliver, Charles W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Olshefski, Joseph F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 O'Neal, Howard F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Orr, Lemuel R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Owens, Harold B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pafe, Basil, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Paladino, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Palmer, Samuel S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Paluch, Walter P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Parker, Armand J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Parker, Charles W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Parrish, C. T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Parrish, Davis P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Partin, Benton K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Peel, Herschel D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Perselay, Gerald, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Petefish, Wilson M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Peterburs, Joseph A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Peterson, Carl D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Peterson, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Peyrot, Mario E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pfeiffer, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Phillips, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pickavance, William W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pickett, Donald E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pine, Walter W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pleasant, Bernice E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Poehlein, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pool, Lawrence W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Poor, Allen J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Poore, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Porter, Leroy C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Puspisil, Joseph L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Preciado, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Price, J. Alan, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Price, Joseph L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pride, Fleetwood, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pugh, Robert F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pugh, Wilbur R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pursley, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Quinn, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Robey, Duncan W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ramsey, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Randle, Allan C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rauscher, Merle R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rawers, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Redding, Harry W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Reed, Harley L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Reed, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Reeder, Herbert B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Reeder, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Reeves, Donald A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Reid, Robert R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Renfro, Walter R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rettig, William O., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rew, Thomas F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Reynolds, Doyle F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rice, William H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rice, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Roberts, Guy L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Roberts, Harley P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Roberts, Stanley L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Roberts, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Robinson, George A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Robison, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Roche, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rochester, Virgil M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rodenbach, William T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Roehling, Arthur J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rosanbalm, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Routt, Clyde B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rowe, Berry W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rubenstein, Morris B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ruddock, William O., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rumney, Richard G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rutherford, William W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Saavedra, Joaquin A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sadler, Thomas M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Salmeier, Dean E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sawyer, Julian D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sayre, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Scharmen, Merrill E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schlosser, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schmitt, Edward J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schmitt, John G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schneider, Carl G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schoeneman, Richard H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Scholtz, John C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schoning, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schurr, Harry W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schutt, Carlton E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Scurlock, Robert, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Senio, Walter P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Serangeli, Giuseppe, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sharp, Homer W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shaulis, Elwood M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shepherd, William F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sherrill, Guy J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Siglin, Paul F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Simpson, Edgar H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Simpson, Henry E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Slizeski, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Bobbie L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Edmund G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Eugene G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Harding E., Sr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Henry R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Russell H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, William F., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smittle, Ray T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Spalding, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sperry, Edward G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Spillers, Willum H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Spragins, Stewart V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stanley, Ellis E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stanley, Russell A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stansberry, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stark, John T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stefanik, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Steger, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Steiner, Harold A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stephens, Edward W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stokes, Quentin C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stone, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Strong, Curtis T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Strube, Delbert H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sullivan, Marvin B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sumner, Thomas M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sunderman, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Svendsen, Leroy W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Swindle, Norris R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sylvester, George H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Taylor, Chester D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Taylor, Harry W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Taylor, Julius H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Taylor, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Terrell, William B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tetric, Jacques K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thomas, Clyde M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Timmermans, Anthony J. G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Titus, Robert F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Totten, Jess R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Touby, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Treyz, Fred A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tuck, George R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Turner, Arthur R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Turner, Claude H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Turner, William S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tye, Joe B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vanbrussel, Peter B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vandellune, Gerrit R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vanderkarr, Donald I., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vandervoort, John M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vannoppen, Vern F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vanreenen, Neil D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Viall, Harold S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vonwiedenfeld, Paul W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vrastil, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wade, Charles H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wakefield, Victor R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Walker, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Walker, Henry L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wall, Orlando A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wallace, Jay R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wallace, John T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Walter, Alonzo J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Walter, John A., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ward, Morris J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wason, Charles P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Waters, Jack W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Weart, Douglas S., xxx-xx-xxxx

Weber, Louis W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Weedman, Freeman J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Weimer, Franklin E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Weinberg, Sidney, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wentsch, George M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Werner, Paul D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Westfall, Fredrick R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wheat, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 White, Donald S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 White, Ralph W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Whitlock, Thomas W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Williams, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wilson, Charles L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wilson, Talmadge A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wise, John Q., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Woford, Charles B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wolter, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wood, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Woods, Donald E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Word, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Workinger, William C. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Worrell, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wynne, Hugh, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Young, Braxton L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Zimmer, Arnold E., xxx-xx-xxxx

## CHAPLAINS

Denehy, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Drone, Raphael E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Haney, Paul S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Holler, Adlai C. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Israel, Kenneth R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, Mervin R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 King, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Monsen, Ralph E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Powell, Omer T., xxx-xx-xxxx

## DENTAL CORPS

Brest, Harold C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Fleming, Lamoyne H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gusselin, Carlton F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Greenwood, Vern R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Loper, Clifford E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Muns, Herman R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rhoades, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx

## MEDICAL CORPS

Amdall, Robert O., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Antonelli, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dean, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Haerle, Henry S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Haycraft, Rexford G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Holt, Clinton L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Houle, Dudley B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kent, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Livermore, David I., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McGuire, Terence F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McIver, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Michels, Max I., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Morrissey, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ohern, Thomas M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sparks, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stagg, Paul A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Taylor, Ellis R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vandebos, Kermit Q., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Williams, Marion J., xxx-xx-xxxx

## NURSE CORPS

Garrecht, Claire M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Goddard, Mary A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Masten Billye, xxx-xx-xxxx

## MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Frentress, Marvin I., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McHugh, Walter P., xxx-xx-xxxx

## VETERINARY CORPS

Collins, Warren E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shuler, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx

## BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES CORPS

Kislin, Benjamin, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moore, Carl B., 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, with dates of rank to be determined by the Secretary of the Air Force:

## TO BE MAJOR (MEDICAL)

Chong Vernon, xxx-xx-xxxx

## TO BE CAPTAIN (DENTAL)

Abrahamsen, Thomas C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gound, Tom G., xxx-xx-xxxx

## TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANT (DENTAL)

Korkosz, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx

The following Air Force officer for reappointment to the active list of the Regular Air Force, in the grade indicated, from sections 1210 and 1211, Title 10, United States Code:

## LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

## To be lieutenant colonel

Kleinhelter, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx

## IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3284 and 3305:

## MEDICAL CORPS

## To be colonel

Sherwood, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3284 and 3299:

## MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

## To be lieutenant colonel

Ferguson, Lindsay E., xxx-xx-xxxx

## ARMY PROMOTION LIST

## To be major

Blatter, Erwin W., II, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bradley, Lee M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Charpentier, Charles M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Clifford, Peter L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hensley, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Merrill, Bruce W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Miller, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nelson, Maynard L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pearsall, Max G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Peterson, Henry, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Roark, Billy R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Washington, Bernard, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Waterman, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx

## MEDICAL CORPS

## To be major

Turnbull, Gottlieb, xxx-xx-xxxx

## DENTAL CORPS

## To be major

Christman, Peter D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 High, Roy S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tsaknis, Peter J., xxx-xx-xxxx

## MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

## To be major

Kane, Thomas M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx

## ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

## To be major

Bigley, Angela R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mount, Dorothy M., xxx-xx-xxxx

## ARMY PROMOTION LIST

## To be captain

Acton, Michael R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Adams, Bertram E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Adams, Melville W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Agnew, Eugene W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Akers, Frank H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Akos, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Albright, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Aleva, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Alexander, Duane R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Alexander, George M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Alexander, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Alicut, Gregory L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Allen, Cary D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Allen, Jon J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Allen, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Allison, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Almojufia, Thomas N., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Amatulli, Richard P., xxx-xx-xxxx

Amick, David B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Anderson, Ben L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Anderson, Dale R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Anderson, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Anderson, Edward G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Anderson, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Anderson, Kenneth E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Anderson, Leslie H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Anderson, Louie H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Anderson, Melvyn L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Andrews, Edward L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Andrie, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Angel, Philip N., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Angeli, Raymond S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Antoine, Lawrence V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Anzalone, Russell J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Aquino, Paschal A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Arko, Anthony, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Armijo, Gabriel C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Armstrong, Curtis L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Arrants, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Arrowood, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Arthur, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ashbaugh, Brian W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ashby, Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ashjian, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Asiello, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Atchison, Jere L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Atkins, Edsel R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Atkinson, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Audibert, Reginald, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Augsburg, Grayson, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Aux, George W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Avant, Jack B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Azuma, Eric K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Backlin, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Baer, Barry S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Baer, Fred H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bailey, Bobby H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bailey, Charles M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Baird, Thomas F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Baker, Hugh M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Baker, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Baker, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bambini, Adrian P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Barbee, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Barber, Louis P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Barefoot, Allen, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Barnaby, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Barnes, Darvin E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Barnes, Fred W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Barnes, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Barrington, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Barry, Russell W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Barry, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Barry, William F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Battcher, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bauer, Stephen M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bausch, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bayer, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Beach, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Beard, Otis R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Behnke, Arthur R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Behnke, Douglas J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Belch, Peter P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bell, Hubert J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Belz, George D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Benefield, Johnie H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bengtson, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Benham, Philip O., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Benoit, Edmond J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bergeron, Alfred J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bergman, William K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bergson, Paul C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Berkey, Richard O., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Berkman, Davis S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bernard, Joseph P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Berry, Gerald J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Berry, Page E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Berry, Steven D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bertagnoli, Joseph, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Besecker, Franklin, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bhalia, Arun K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bifgen, William K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bijold, Gerald P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Billings, Darryl R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Blades, Jon W., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Blaine, Jerome M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Blanchard, Randall, xxx-xx-xxxx



Blanchard, Sherman, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Blanchette, Joel G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Blaylock, Norman R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bloyd, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bludau, Colin E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Blue, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Blumenfeld, Charles, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bock, William P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bodelson, Patrick J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bohuslar, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bolick, Miles A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bolt, Andrew W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bonifas, Arthur G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bonn, Larry L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Borek, Theodore B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bounds, Gary L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bowers, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bowser, Larry H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Boyd, John H., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Boyd, Michael F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Boyer, Harry R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Boyer, Robert F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brackett, Thomas R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Braze, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brede, Lawrence, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Breeden, Kenneth R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Breman, Stephen L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brennan, Michael W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brennan, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brickman, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bridges, Franklin G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brinker, Walter E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brisbane, Glen E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brittingham, Michael, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Britton, James, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Broadhurst, Carl E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brock, Thomas S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brodie, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Broscha, Donald E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brown, Clark C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brown, Danny L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brown, Donald F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brown, Floyd L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brown, Jerry A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brown, Joseph E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brown, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brown, Michael J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brown, Phillip L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brown, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brown, Robert M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brown, Wayne K., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bruegger, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brundage, Richard W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brunnhofer, Gilbert, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bryan, Peter K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bryant, John T., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bryson, Gene K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Buchan, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Buckley, Daniel J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Buczacki, John B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Budzyna, Fred K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Buftti, Anthony J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bumanglag, Carlos J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bundons, Albert R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Burbidge, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Burch, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Burdge, Lloyd H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Burres, Stephen W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Burton, Hugh A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Busch, Brian J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Busch, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bush, Charles D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Butler, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Butler, Penneth L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cabanillas, Claude, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cain, Joel M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Caine, Bruce T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Calek, Joseph R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Callahan, Francis R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Calloway, Charles T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cameron, Tom O., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Camia, Dante A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Campbell, Donald, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Campbell, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Campbell, Robert T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Campbell, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Campbell, Vernon A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Canar, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Canavan, Gene E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Canning, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Canon, Charles M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cantu, Herman R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cape, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Caples, Vernard L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Capozzi, Roy M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Capps, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cardona, Lannie D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Carlson, Kenneth G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Carlton, Darrel H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Carlton, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Carpenter, Ronald B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Carr, Jerry T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Carrow, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Carson, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Carter, Cleo, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Carter, Hubert C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Carter, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Carter, Willard T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Carter, William D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Caryl, Michael R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Carzoli, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Casalengo, Roger W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cascioli, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cassidy, George E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Catalano, Thomas S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Catron, Donald J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Catron, Edward P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cavanaugh, Michael, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cecere, Peter M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cecil, Gerald T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cermenaro, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Chafens, Roger L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Chambers, James V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Champi, Samuel F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Chapman, Abner B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Chapman, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Chappelle, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cheatham, Calvin W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cheatham, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Chernesky, George M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Chidichimo, Salvatore, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Childress, William, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Childs, Ernest, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Childs, Norman, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Christo, Dennis V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Clarlo, Fred H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Clapper, John W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Clare, Joseph F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Clark, Alfred T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Clark, Alton A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Clark, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Clark, Douglas M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Clark, Michael R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Clark, Patrick W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Clark, Wesley K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Clarke, John E., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Clegg, Douglas W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Clegg, Ronald W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Clements, Miles T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Clemmer, Donald E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Clyde, Gerard A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Coates, Charles F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cobb, Douglas H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cochrane, Charles B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cocks, Alan R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Coen, Kendall B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Coffey, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Coffman, Jimmy N., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Coggins, Gary M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cole, Carlos E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cole, Gary B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cole, William P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Coleman, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Colgan, Eugene D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Collier, Ronald O., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Collins, Carl L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Collins, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Collins, Roger W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Collmeyer, Michael, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Conderman, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Condon, John L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Conklin, Gary P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Conley, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Connally, Sharon C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Connell, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Conner, Albert Z., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Connolly, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Conoboy, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Conrad, Thomas F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Conroy, Thomas F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cook, Joseph L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Coolidge, John G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cooney, Norman R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cooper, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Coradini, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Corbin, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Corcoran, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cork, Stephen D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cornick, Thomas H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Corprew, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Correia, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cote, William D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cotsonas, Peter M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cotting, Peter L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Coupe, Dennis F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cowing, John S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cox, George R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cox, Ronald H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Coyle, Raymond A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Crabtree, Jack D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Craig, Kervin A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Craig, Terry L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Crane, Matthew J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cravens, James J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Crawford, Danny L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Crawford, David H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Creel, Joe C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cretella, Joseph G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Crimmins, Walter J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Crisanti, Lawrence, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Criss, Marshall W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Crittisinger, Clifford, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Crocker, George A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Crook, Dennis B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Crosby, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cross, Reese W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Crowell, David V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cruikshank, Ralph H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cudd, Dennis E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Culbreth, Larry M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cullem, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cullen, Peter, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cunkelman, George T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cunningham, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Curington, Calvin F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cushing, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dacus, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dalbey, Eugene B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dalfonzo, Joseph A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Daly, Lawrence T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Daly, Timothy E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Damron, Ronald K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Danek, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Danese, Richard, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Darden, Merger G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Darnell, Ronald H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Darone, Ronald D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Davis, Douglas V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Davis, Homer L., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Davis, Merrill W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Davis, Montague E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Davis, Richard N., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Davis, Thaddeus J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dawson, Lester P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dawson, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Day, Lawrence W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dean, Alvin B., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dean, Byron K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dean, Wilbert M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Deberry, Thomas P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Debaise, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Defrain, Dennis A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dehaven, Thomas R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dehncke, Rae W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dejong, Robert V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Delaney, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Delgado, Richard, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Delp, Larry E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Demeo, Lawrence J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Deming, Michael D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dempsey, Daniel J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dennis, Kirby E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Denniston, Leroy W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Denson, Herbert A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dent, Norman M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Deponal, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Detreville, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Devaughn, Kermit L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Devlin, Donald Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx

Devoe, Smith A. Jr.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Ferguson, Richard E.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Golden, John C., III,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Dickens, James A.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Ferguson, Walter N.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gomez, Miguel,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Dickson, Richard G.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Ferguson, William E.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gonzales, Joe C.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Difiore, Matthew F.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Fergusson, Thomas G.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Goodhart, Raymond R.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Divita, Joseph M.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Ferrard, Jerrold S.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Goodman, Michael J.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Dixon, Gerald E.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Ferrea, Albert J.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gordon, Maurice K.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Dixon, James H.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Feurer, Michael H.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gorka, Paul A.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Doby, Neal S.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Fields, Clifford L.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gorski, Richard V.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Dock, William F.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Fields, Thomas J., Jr.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gorton, Ashton E.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Dockery, Patrick H.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Fields, Timothy G.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Goss, Robert I.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Donnithorne, Larry,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Figgins, Charles E.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Grace, Thomas H.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Dorsey, Mercer M., Jr.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Fillipiak, Robert P.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Graham, Benjamin W.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Dort, Dean R.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Filson, James C.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Graham, James R.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Dortch, William R.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Filson, James W.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Graham, Lacy T.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Doty, Richard D.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Findlater, John W.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Graham, Richard J.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Dougherty, Russell,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Finley, Earl W.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Graham, Roger D.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Dowling, Ted K.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Finn, Brian C.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Grandel, Ronald D.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Downey, Carrol W.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Fisher, James F.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Grandison, Wilfred,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Downie, Terry C.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Fisher, William P.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Grandstaff, Terrance,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Doyle, James B.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Fitzgerald, Jerry E.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Grant, Arthur V., Jr.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Doyle, James T.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Fitzgerald, Kirk S.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Grant, Barclay F., Jr.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Dragoo, Robert E.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Fitzgerald, Thomas,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Grant, Russell P., Jr.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Drake, Van T.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Fitzpatrick, Joseph,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Grant, Wallace C.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Drayton, Marlon G.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Fix, Donald J.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Grass, Stephen A.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Drewes, Carl F., Jr.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Fleig, Franz W.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gravatt, Arthur T.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Driscoll, Eugene J.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Fleming, Allan F., Jr.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gray, John W., Jr.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Droke, Willard B.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Fleming, John J.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gray, Robert E.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Dubia, John A.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Flowers, James H.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Green, Gary L.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Dubuc, Norman T., Jr.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Forbes, Gary L., Sr.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Green, Richard S.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Duderstadt, Eugene,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Ford, Dean C.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Green, Robert A.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Duedall, Robert L.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Foreman, Richard N.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Greene, John F.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Duffie, Robert D.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Forester, Jesse P.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Greenwood, Robert M.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Duggleby, Robert W.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Formby, Ronnie R.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gregoire, Marvin G.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Dunavan, Robert C.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Foster, Douglas E.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gresdo, Dennis J.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Duncan, Franklin E.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Foster, Frank C., Jr.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gresham, Larry D.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Dunham, Fredrick R.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Foster, Michael R.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Grice, Kenneth R.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Dunn, Carroll H., Jr.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Fouche, David F.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Griesse, Ronald M.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Dunning, Jeffrey P.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Fournaris, Evan N.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Griffin, James G.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Durbin, Terrence E.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Fox, Richard W.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Griffin, Karl R.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Dyson, Gordon H.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Francisco, William,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Griffin, Linwood,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Earp, Edwin L.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Franklin, Jerry L.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Griggs, John E. III,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Easley, Ronald E.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Frazier, Billy W.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Grisham, William G.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Eason, Lewis C.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Frettas, William F.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Griswold, Wilburn C.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Eaton, Bruce R.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	French, John D.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gross, John E.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Eaton, Chester B., Jr.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	French, Terry R.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Grugle, Roger A.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Eberle, John C.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Frey, Douglas J.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gruner, Kenneth A.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Eckert, John H.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Fry, Jerry R.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Guerriero, Robert A.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Edmonds, Bobby A.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Fry, Michael D.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gundry, Richard C.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Edwards, Jerome G.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Fuller, John D.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gunn, Wilburn J.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Ehart, Stephen H.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Fuller, Michael B.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gustafson, James H.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Eichenberger, David,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Fullerton, Leroy R.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Guthrie, John C.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Eisenberg, Stephen,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Fulmer, Lemos L., Jr.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Guy, Earl P., III,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Eklund, Richard A.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Fulton, John S.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Haase, Thomas A.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Ekstrom, Paul J.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gabel, Kolman A.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Hackett, James K.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Elder, Robin L.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gagne, John P.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Hackett, John S.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Eller, Thomas H., Jr.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gagnon, Robert L.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Haines, David I.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Ellis, John D., Jr.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gallagher, Stephan M.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Hair, Walter S.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Ely, Cameron A.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Galligan, Francis B.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Hale, Clyde J.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Emerick, Robert G.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gang, William G.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Hale, Ronald C.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Emerson, Samuel C.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gardner, James R.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Hall, Jack L.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Emory, Sherwood L.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gartenberg, Joel M.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Hall, James W.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Eng, Harry F.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gatesy, John T.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Hall, Nelson R.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Engen, Gary O.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gaudet, Robert F.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Hall, Ronald F.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
English, Ronald W.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gavin, Donald G.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Halliday, Arthur J.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Epps, Jones N., Jr.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Geer, George W.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Halliday, Robert W.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Epps, Thomas W.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Genter, Billy V.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Hallums, James D.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Ericksen, Scott R.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gentzke, Frank S.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Hamilton, Gary E.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Ernst, Frederick G.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gerrie, Andrew A.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Hanau, Steven L.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Esmay, Jerry D.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gesick, Edward J., Jr.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Haney, Richard J.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Essig, Frederick H.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gesker, Joseph M., Jr.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Happe, Robert W.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Etheridge, John T.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Getz, John E.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Harblson, Larry J.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Eubanks, Bobbie R.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gibson, Claud L.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Hardee, Forest E.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Evans, Gordon E.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gibson, Donald A.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Hardister, James C.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Evans, Mickey S.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gibson, Emmitt E.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Hardy, John T., Jr.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Eversman, James F.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gibson, Ronald H.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Harley, George E.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Ewart, Thomas W.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Giddings, Warren P.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Harman, William R.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Ewing, Vernon C.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gilbertson, Clark D.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Harp, William J.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Faber, Morris R.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gilbertson, Michael,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Harper, Paul R., Jr.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Fairchild, Robert S.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gildersleeve, James,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Harper, Richard T.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Fairhead, Michael P.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Giles, Tommy H., III,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Harper, Sidney W., Jr.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Farewell, Thomas E.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gill, Paul C.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Harris, Boyd M.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Farrell, Henry R.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gill, Robert L.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Harris, Charles T.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Farris, William S.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gillenwater, Paul C.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Harris, Richard H.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Farrow, Russell K.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gillikin, Bruce D.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Harris, Robert F.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Farthing, Clifford,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gimbert, Jack H.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Harris, Robert F.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Faust, Edmond L., III,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gimlan, Allan D.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Harrison, Matthew C.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Fazen, Robert P.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Giordano, Matthew J.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Hart, John Jr.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Featherstone, Charles,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gipe, George W.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Hart, Robert B.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Felch, John E., Jr.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gipson, Arthur J.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Hartford, Thomas F.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Fellenz, Michael P.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gladfelter, Richard,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Hartley, Lonnie G.,	xxx-xx-xxxx
Fender, Charles K.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Gleason, James C.,	xxx-xx-xxxx	Hartline, Franklin,	xxx-xx-xxxx



Harvey, William T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Harvill, Daniel O., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Harville, Jerry L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Haslitt, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hasselback, David G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hassen, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hatch, Willard A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hathaway, Edward N., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hathorn, Fred C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hauck, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hawley, David B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hawthorne, James N., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hayes, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hayes, John R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hazer, Kaleen, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Heath, Donald C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Heath, Frederick G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hebert, Maurice G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hedges, William T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hedgpath, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Helmericks, Leonard, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hemphill, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hemsley, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Henderson, Aubrey E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Henderson, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Henderson, Jon C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hendricks, David P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hennessey, James T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hennessey, James B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Henry, Thomas F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hentz, James D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hepler, John F., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hermoyan, Edward J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Herndon, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Herrera, Juan F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Herrick, Christopher, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Heslin, John G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hesse, August H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Heuple, Jerry H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Heyman, Eugene F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hicks, Norman A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hicks, Robert R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hicks, Thomas M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hickson, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hill, Carl D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hill, Howard W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hill, Karl B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hiller, Charles B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hilts, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hines, Charles, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hines, Jimmy R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hink, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hinkle, Lawrence R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hirning, Ervin N., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hirsch, Patrick R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hixon, William F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hlista, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hmara, Jeffrey L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ho, Kenneth O., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hock, Frank M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hodes, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hoffman, John G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hogan, Cleo C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Holcomb, Larry D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Holder, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Holder, Leonard D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Holder, Neville, E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hollis, James B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hollowell, Paul C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Holmes, J. E., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Holmes, Miles W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Holverson, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hood, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hoose, Frederick R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hopkins, Frederick, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Horalek, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Horridge, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Horst, Kelso W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hotard, Ernest P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 House, Jerry L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Houser, Bruce J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Howard, Daniel L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Howard, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Howe, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Howe, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Howell, Briley W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Howell, Richard V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hoyman, William W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hrdlicka, Douglas L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hudgins, James W., Sr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hudson, Cornelius M., xxx-xx-xxxx

Hufy, James T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hufford, George V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hughes, William F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hutzli, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hulett, Glenn E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hull, Richard E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hulslander, Donald, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hunt, Lynn J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hunt, William O., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hurban, James, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hustead, Michael W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Huston, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hutchins, Andrew C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Huyck, Jere I., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hvizdos, Michael S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Imamura, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Imes, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ingalls, Allan S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ingham, Bruce E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Irby, Richard L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Isbell, Paul R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ivanjack, Walter F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jacobs, Jack H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jacobsen, Gary A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jakes, Robert A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jarvis, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jeanblanc, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jefferds, Fred, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jefferis, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jeffrey, Timothy E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jenkins, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jenkins, James G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jenkins, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jewett, Gary E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, Billy R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, Carleton T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, Charles W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, Edgar C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, Harold L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, Kenneth E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, Neil A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, Peter B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, Ralph E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, Raymond L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, Russel L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, Tom M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, Warren A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, Wesley L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnston, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnston, Ronald T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnstone, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jones, Charles D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jones, Dale G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jones, Gary A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jones, George B., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jones, George E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jones, Harry M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jones, Hugh J. M., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jones, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jones, James N., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jones, Lindon D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jones, Paul D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jones, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jones, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Josey, Grover A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kacerguis, Peter A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kaczowski, Dennis, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kakel, William W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kale, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kalgis, George J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kammerer, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kane, Edward P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kaplan, Michael P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Karlson, Henry C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Karney, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Karr, Kennard G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Katin, Jon D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Katz, Darrell W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kaul, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kavanaugh, Kenneth, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kawka, Louis R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kealy, James T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Keating, Patrick H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Keenan, James N., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Keeney, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kehe, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kehres, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Keith, Chester E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kelley, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kelley, Edward L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kelley, Richard T., xxx-xx-xxxx

Kelly, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kelly, Kenneth F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kelly, Ronald F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kelsey, John S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kemp, Jerry C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kennedy, George M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kennett, Michael B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kenyon, Norbert L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Keravuori, Jouni, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kerekes, Karoly, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kernea, Edward A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kerner, Herbert V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kerr, Laurence M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kesler, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Key, Thomas D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Killehua, Cecil W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Killberg, Eugene L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kimel, Michael H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kimery, Bruce F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kimmel, Carl E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 King, Gerald F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 King, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 King, Ladd M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kingham, Thomas B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kirby, Jefferson D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kirk, Howard C., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kirkey, Charles D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kirkpatrick, Lyman, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kittredge, Albert A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kitts, Charles W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kline, David T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kline, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kling, Lynn W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Klinger, Terry G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Knedler, Charles M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kneisler, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Knoll, David D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Knowles, Bruce R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Knox, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kokenes, Gerald P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kollenborn, Byron B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kone, Wilson V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Konkle, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kopecky, Kenneth W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kothan, Richard B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kotlik, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kovacs, Stephen Z., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Krantz, Kenneth A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kraus, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kriebel, James, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kropp, Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Krout, Homer L., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kubaswo, Wayne P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kuntzman, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kushnir, Ronald A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kvasnicka, Wayne L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Laclaire, Edward J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lafrance, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lahr, Wayne J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Laipple, Douglas K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lalicker, Elmer L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lam, Gordon R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lambeth, Carl L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lanasa, Francis M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lance, Harold V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Land, Henry P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lander, Joseph N., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Langendorf, Henry S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lanier, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lanpher, Patrick C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Laposta, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Larned, Daniel R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Laroche, John J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Larsen, Morrie E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Larson, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Larson, Roy L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Latham, George A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Laufer, George W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lawless, Bernard J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lawrence, John T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lawrie, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lawson, Douglas B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lazarus, Glenn A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Leach, Lanse M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Leassear, Leonard A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Leclaire, George H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lecuyer, Jack A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lee, Charles S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lee, James H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lee, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Leech, Lloyd L., III, xxx-xx-xxxx

Leekley, Edward H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Leibner, Kenneth R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Leinen, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lemaster, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lepore, Frank C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lesh, Newton D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lewis, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Libby, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Liggett, Lawrence G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lightfoot, Michael, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lightner, George M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ligon, Peyton F., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lincoln, Arthur F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Linder, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lindler, Curtiss M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lindsay, Jock C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lipscomb, Lewis M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Liss, Melvin O., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Littlefield, Neil P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Livechi, Samuel G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lloyd, Howard M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lockett, Carl L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lockwood, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lofthelm, Jon W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Logan, Robert B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lomonaco, Lawrence, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Long, Marion G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Long, Robert K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Longreear, Paul R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Loop, Curtis A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Loveall, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Loveland, Daniel J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lovison, Richard, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lowry, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lowry, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Loy, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lum, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lundeen, Randall R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Luymes, Alan H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lyons, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lyssy, Walter J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lytle, David K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Macaluso, Mario A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 MacDonald Glenn W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 MacKenzie, Stuart A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 MacKey, George D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Magee, Darryl D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Magnusson, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mainardi, Barry A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Maini, Paul B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Major, John L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Makowski, Eugene E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Malcolm, Jerry D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mancini, Thomas M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Manley, Mark J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Manlove, Richard W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mann, Morris M., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mann, Thomas R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mans, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Marcaccio, Joseph P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 March, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Marinovich, Branko, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mariska, Mark D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Marlow, Ronald J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Marold, George A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Marques, Steven J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Marquitz, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Marshall, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Martin, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Martin, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Martin, John J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Martina, Herman J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mashburn J. Harold, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Massott, Ronald A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Matthews, David F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Matthews, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Maughan, Franklin D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Maurice, Timothy P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mayew, Walter L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McAllister, Howard, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McArthur, Colin L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McCaa, Burwell B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McCall, Monty W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McCalla, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McCallum, James S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McCaslin, James K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McClellan, Dennis W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McClenahan, John S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McCleney, Dickie H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McClintock, Kenneth, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McCloskey, Robert, xxx-xx-xxxx

McCloud, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McCloy, Michael N., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McCoy, Frederick W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McCullough, David D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McDole, Kenneth L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McDonald, Carroll W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McDonald, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McDonnell, Michael G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McDonnell, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McDonough, William, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McDougal, Winn B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McFarren, Freddy E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McGarvey, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McGoogan, Franklin, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McGough, Gerard E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McGraw, Marvin E., Sr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McGregor, Peter J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McGuffie, James T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McGuire, Michael R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McHugh, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McIntosh, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McKay, Michael V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McKearn, Chauncy F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McKee, Stephen F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McKinney, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McKnight, John T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McLarty, William T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McLaughlin, Thomas, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McLendon, Walter H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McLeod, Glenn A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McMillan, Wesley J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McMonigle, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McPeak, William S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McRae, George E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McRae, Ralph D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McSwain, Gregory R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McWherter, Michael, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McWilliams, Brian M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McWilliams, Robert, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Meacham, Christopher, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Meager, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Measels, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Meccia, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Medlock, Randall B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Meek, Ronnie A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Meikle, James G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Meilgren, John J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mellor, John L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Melton, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Menig, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Menser, Kent D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mentell, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mesarch, Victor P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Metz, John M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Meurer, Frederick E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Meyer, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Meyer, Stephen P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Meyer, Thomas P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Myers, Fred L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mezs, Maris, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Michael, Danny R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Michener, Robert F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Michitsch, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Middleton, Douglas, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Middleton, George S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Middleton, Norris C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Miezells, Joseph A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mihata, Kevin K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Milkowski, Stanis, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Millard, Arthur F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Millard, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Miller, Arthur E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Miller, Bruce, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Miller, Derrell H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Miller, Henry S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Miller, Joe D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Miller, Martin W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Millikan, Erlend J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Minietta, Eugene D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mistler, J. Douglas, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mitcham, Eugene L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mitchell, Alan S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mitchell, Richard R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mitchell, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mlakar, Paul F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moen, Francis C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moffett, Donald L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mohr, Harry W. III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moll, Jeremiah C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Monday, Joseph A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Monteverde, Miguale, xxx-xx-xxxx

Montgomery, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Montgomery, Richard, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moody, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moon, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mooney, Jackie E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moore, Charles L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moore, Jack M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moore, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moore, Richard N., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moore, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moore, Russell I., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moran, Ancil F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Morgan, Douglas D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Morgan, Joe W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Morris, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Morris, Melvin L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Morris, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Morris, Rodney W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Morsch, Ronald L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Morton, Berry E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Morton, Curtis R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Morton, Joseph H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moss, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moss, Paul R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moushegian, Richard, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mueller, Mark A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Muir, George E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mullady, Brian P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mullans, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Muller, Kenneth L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mullins, Obie D., Sr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mullori, Dominick M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mulroy, Patrick D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mundy, Rodney D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Murf, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Murphy, Donald T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Murphy, Gary R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Murphy, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Murphy, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Murphy, Mortimer J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Murphy, Thomas L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Murray, Richard N., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Murty, Monty R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Muse, Frank R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Musiol, Joseph J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Muzzy, John K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Myers, Byron D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Naish, Lyle T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nason, Alan B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nass, Fred L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Neary, Patrick H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Neil, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nelson, Charles S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nelson, Phillip A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nelson, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nemes, Henry A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nemetz, Donald A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nesmith, Vardell E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ness, Robert L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Netting, John T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Neumann, Hans J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Newell, Clayton R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Newell, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Newell, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Newton, Edward C., IV, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nibelink, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nicholas, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nichols, Charlie V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nichols, Dale L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nichols, Rex A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nickerson, Robert F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nifmann, Patrick J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nilsen, Roy M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Noel, Lloyd A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nolan, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Normand, Anthony H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Norris, Jack K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Norris, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Norris, Michael R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Norton, George E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nottingham, Donald, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Novotney, Laurence, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nuccitelli, Robert, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Oakley, Frank B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 O'Brien, Alfred F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 O'Brien, Andrew J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 O'Connell, Courtenay, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 O'Connell, John J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 O'Connell, Paul V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 O'Connor, William G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Offer, Stuart J., xxx-xx-xxxx



Ogle, James T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ogles, Albert G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ogles, Thomas M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ogley, Gary A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 O'Hara, David B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ol, John, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Okeefe, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Okimoto, Alexander, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Oldham, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Oleary, Bartholomew, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Oliver, Edward L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Olson, David V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 O'Malley, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 O'Neill, Timothy R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ophus, James B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ordway, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Orenstein, Leo R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Orlovski, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 O'Rourke, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Oshel, Michael E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Oslin, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Otis, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Otis, Norman K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Otto, Thomas W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Oursler, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Owen, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Owen, Robert V., Sr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Owens, James E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Owens, Jerry C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Owens, John M., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Oxford, Cecil H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pack, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Paczak, Thomas M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Paduano, Ralph J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pailles, Jan V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Palmer, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Palmer, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pantaloni, Charles, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Paramore, Ronald L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pardew, James W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Parent, David S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Parker, Douglas C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Parker, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Parker, Joseph S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Parr, Arthur J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Parrish, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Parry, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Parsons, William X., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Paschall, Charles H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Patterson, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Paylor, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Payne, Mack W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Payne, Thomas H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pearson, Billy H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pearson, Le Dell, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Peat, Richard T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Peck, Daniel J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pedersen, Milton D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Peery, George G., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pelt, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Penning, Michael N., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Perez, Mario G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Perkins, Dennis L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Perkins, Rudy C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Perry, Eddie L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Perry, Judson E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Peters, Garry C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Petersberger, John, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Peterson, Jon M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Petrilli, Frank J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pevenstein, Jack E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pevey, Tommy P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pfeffer, Albert J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pfeiffe, William G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pfrimmer, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Phillips, Phil G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Phillips, Stephen N., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Plier, William S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pike, A. Nolan Lili, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Piker, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pilcher, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pilkington, Edgar L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pinkus, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pittman, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pitts, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pitzer, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pixton, Christopher, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pifasant, Justin K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Plumlee, Gordon K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Poage, Wayne L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Poe, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pomager, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pond, Richard G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Poole, George G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Poore, Randolph T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Porter, Charles W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Porter, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Potter, Leland W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Potter, Mark W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Powers, George F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Oliver, George W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Prather, William W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pratt, Frank G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Predmore, Keith E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Price, Dale R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Proctor, James H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Proctor, Stephen M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Proffitt, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pryor, Charles A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pummill, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Purcell, John Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Purcell, Lawrence L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Queen, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Quekemeyer, Henry B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Quick, Burnet R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Quinn, Dennis J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Quisenberry, James, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Raab, Carl F. IV, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Radosevich, Wilbert, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ragus, Leonard A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Randall, Amos, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rantala, John W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ratchye, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ratcliffe, Philander, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rathje, David F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ratts, Michael D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rawlerson, Franklin, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rawls, Jimmie D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ray, James D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Raymond, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Read, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Reading, David K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Reagan, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Reed, Charles L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Reed, Nathan K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Reed, Rodney P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rees, Raymond F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Reid, Theodore W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Reid, Walter H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Reilly, Bernard J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Reinkofer, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Remson, Arthur S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rennagel, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rhymers, Kurt L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ricca, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rice, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rice, Ray E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rice, Richard, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rich, Jimmie H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Richards, Wynn G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Richardson, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Richardson, Sterling, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rickert, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rickman, Travis R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Riggins, Hiram T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Riggins, Rubin J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Riley, John E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Riley, Philip D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rimer, James R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rinehart, Stephen C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ring, Dennis A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ritch, John B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ritter, John B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Riviello, Robert N., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rizzo, Samuel A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Robb, Douglas W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Robb, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Robblee, Paul A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Robertson, Bernard E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Robertson, Hugh B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Roberts, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Roberts, Jerry G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Roberts, Rodolfo, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Robertson, William, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Robeson, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Robie, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Robinson, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Robinson, Kenneth W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Robison, Cecil M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rodier, Michael W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rodrigues, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rogers, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rogerson, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Roggenkamp, Paul H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rohde, Paul A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Romand, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Romans, Rodger D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Romine, Philo M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Roming, Peter P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ronay, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rondiak, Peter F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rooney, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Root, Paul M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Roper, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Roper, Robert W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rose, Donald E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rose, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Roseborough, Morgan, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rosecrans, Rihcard, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rosser, Henry E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rossow, Allen F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rosten, Clyde D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rourke, Robert U., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ruderman, Gill H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ruf, William K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rush, Bobby G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Russell, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rutherford, Wilson, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rutledge, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ryland, Charles M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sack, Lawrence A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Salt, Terrence C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Salter, Stephan M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sanderson, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sandin, Ramon A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sands, Gerald A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sandstrom, Kenneth, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sanford, Gaylord B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sanford, Steven D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sas, Martin S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sasfy, Stephen M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sauls, Heyward C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Saunders, Mark B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sawyer, Philip A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Scales, Robert H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schatley, Glen H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schantz, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schlottman, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schmitt, Joseph A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schmus, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schneider, Gerald L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schopp, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schrader, Gregg M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schremp, Bruce H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schrimsher, Geoffrey, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schroeder, Thomas M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schroff, William F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schuck, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schulcz, Arthur A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schulz, Robert H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schwebach, James J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schweppe, Howard B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schwoerke, Roland J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Scureman, Mark A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Seawell, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sefrin, Paul R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Seger, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Seigle, Robert N., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Selgrist, Charles F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Selsor, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sendak, Theodore T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sette, Domenic R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sever, Kenneth C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Severino, Angelo A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Seymour, John A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shaffer, Gavin D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shamblen, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shannon, Edward J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shannon, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sharp, Gregory L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sharp, Marvin W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shaver, William G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shaw, Clarence R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shea, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sheer, Tracy B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sheffey, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sheldon, Donald J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sheldon, Douglas, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sheldon, Frederick, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shepard, James G., xxx-xx-xxxx

Shepard, Stephen E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shepherd, Arthur R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shepps, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sherrard, Roger D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sherry, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shiffer, Jon M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shipley, Bruce G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shipman, Ted L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shipp, Charles A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shook, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shriner, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shutty, Bernard J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sickinger, Thomas L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Silcox, Franklin H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Siler, Kenneth K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Silva, Thomas F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Simmons, Sammie D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Simon, Henry F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Simpson, Edwin W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Simpson, Kenneth W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Simpson, Larry D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sims, Benjamin A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sims, Douglas A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sims, Joe A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sisti, Francis J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Skelley, Richard B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Skirvin, Glen D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sloane, Medwyn D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smeeks, Frank C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smidt, Orville B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Carl T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Daniel M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Edgar A. P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Edgar L., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Edward B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Elvin T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Jeffrey H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, John E., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, John T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Larry G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Lawrence M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Mason E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Michael R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Raymond M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Richard W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Ronald G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Thomas G., Sr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Walter A., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Walter C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Snyder, Karl S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sodnicar, Frank M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sonstelif, Richard, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sorensen, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Souvenir, Stanley J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sovie, Donald E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Spanos, William, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sparks, William T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Spear, Wilbur R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Spinetto, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Spinks, Thomas M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Squillace, Ralph C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Staber, Daniel E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Staiti, Peter F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stanford, Larry R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stankovich, Robert, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stark, Michael E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Steel, Jon L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Steelman, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stefanowicz, Raymond S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Steffensen, Lynn A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stein, Harry A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Steiner, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stenstrom, Ronald L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stepaniak, Frederick, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stephens, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stephens, Jack R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sterling, Douglas F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Steuer, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Steve, Joseph A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stevens, Winfred A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stevenson, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Steward, Edward C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stewart, Gary M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stewart, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 St Germain, Henry J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 St. John, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stobie, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stocker, Ronald W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stockhaus, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stone, Edwin S., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Storrs, Rodric A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stout, Carl F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stowell, Walter O., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stowers, Charles T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stracensky, Gary C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Strange, Theodore E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Strapac, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Strassburg, Thomas, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stream, Joel, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Strokin, Victor J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stull, Terry G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sullivan, Daniel W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sullivan, Leon W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sullivan, Robert B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sullivan, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sullivan, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Suminski, Leonard T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Summerford, Ted W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Swain, Richard M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Swain, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sweeney, Thomas W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Swenson, Peter C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Szlachetka, Marion, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Szuska, Kenneth J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Taksar, Ronald J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tanijo, Wilfred M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tarowsky, Edward G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tarpley, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tausch, Egon R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tauscher, Elwood R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Taylor, Harry O., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Taylor, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Taylor, Michael E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Taylor, Richard H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Taylor, Wayne A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Templer, Thomas W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tennis, Andrew, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tepper, Elliott L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Terrell, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tessier, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thatcher, Leslie D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Theriault, Raymond, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Theroux, Thomas R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Therrell, Brock M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thiel, Roger A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thimblin, Michael D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thoden, Richard W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thomas, Charles L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thomas, Cleveland J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thomas, Clifford M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thomas, Evert S., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thomas, James A., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thomas, Maurice A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thomas, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thomason, Joel F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thompson, Berry H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thompson, Conley C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thompson, Grover F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thompson, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thompson, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thompson, Robert R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thompson, Roger G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thomson, Don D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thomson, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thornblom, Douglas, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thornhill, Frank W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thornton, Harold E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Throckmorton, Edward, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tillman, George R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tillson, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Timm, Timothy G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Timmes, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Todd, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tomoyasu, Wayne R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tonn, George W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Toohay, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Torbert, Ronald D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tracy, Stephen A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Traubel, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Trifadwell, David O., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Trimble, Joseph F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Trout, Marvin D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tualla, Larry G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tucker, David G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tucker, Larry W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tucker, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tupa, George L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Turbush, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Turi, Robert T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Turnbull, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Turner, Courtney K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Turner, Gary D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Turner, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tutton, James R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Upchurch, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Utter, George B., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vail, Richard H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vance, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vanhelsand, Marshall, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vanprodyn, Jan A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vansickle, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vaughn, Charles G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vedrani, Ronald W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vivian, James S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Voda, John J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vollman, Dennis F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vose, Leonard C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wade, Michael R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wagner, Anthony L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Waldo, Daniel W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Walker, Conley E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Walker, Darrell W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Walker, Marshall K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wallace, Norman W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wallhausen, Ernest, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Walls, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wallschlaeger, Charles, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Walsh, James D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Walsh, Richard M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Walsh, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Walthers, Alan E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Walton, Benny B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Walton, Willard, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Waltz, John B., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Warren, Dennis J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Warren, Larry D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Washburn, Dennis A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Watkins, John M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Watkins, Peter F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Watson, Sherman E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Waylonis, Kenneth A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Webster, George K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Webster, Patrick D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Weddle, Paul C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Weinberg, Paul, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Weis, Gerhard W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Weise, David G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Welch, Albert C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Welch, Douglas M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Welch, Emmett A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wells, Geoffrey F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Welsh, Leo F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Whelihan, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Whelthan, William P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Whiddon, Lester V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Whisker, Dennis W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Whitaker, Gary D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 White, Frank L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 White, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 White, Richard A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 White, Ronnie R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Whiteacre, Kenneth, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Whiteman, Steven H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Whitton, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wight, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wild, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wilkinson, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Willette, Larry J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Willhoite, Howard, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Williams, Charles J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Williams, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Williams, Duane E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Williams, Edwin A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Williams, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Williams, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Williams, Lewis R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Williams, Marion G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Williams, Robert B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Williams, Roger L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Williams, Stephen A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Williams, Wayne L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Williams, Welborn J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Williamson, Cline H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Williamson, Donald, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Williamson, Rex P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Willison, Gary S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Willmann, Lawrence, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wilmeth, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx



Wilson, Bruce M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wilson, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wilson, Daniel E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wilson, Gerald R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wilson, Haldon D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wilson, Harvey L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wilson, John W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wilson, Woodrow O. J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Winger, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Winterling, Grayson, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wisdom, Jerry L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wise, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wise, Lawrence F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wisneski, Larry E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wissinger, Dennis O., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Witczak, Chester W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wolfe, Jack W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wolfe, James B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wolfe, Walter M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Woltersdorf, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wood, Piers M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Woods, John G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Woodward, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wotkins, Anthony L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wright, Adrian R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wright, Cooper L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wright, Donald A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wright, Edgar, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wright, James E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wright, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wright, Walter G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wrightson, Samuel H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wyite, Alexander C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Yacovelli, Phillip, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Yanchar, Joseph J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Yates, Theodore W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Yenrick, Philip C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Youmans, Tommy B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Young, Earl W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Young, Roger A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Young, Thomas J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Yudesis, Benjamin M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Zakaluk, Stephen C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Zamory, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Zeller, Richard H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Zifrdt, John G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Zink, Gale R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx

## CHAPLAIN CORPS

## To be captain

Herbster, Kenneth J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Williams, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx

## WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS

## To be captain

Carney, Marilyn M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Davis, Rosemary L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Devlin, Barbara, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Evankovich, Genevieve, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jurgeovich, Nancy J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Malone, Willetta, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Seidemann, Constance, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Mary J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stripling, Maria J., xxx-xx-xxxx

## MEDICAL CORPS

## To be captain

Berliner, Daniel S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Carpenter, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cavanaugh, Daniel G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dalton, Bruce A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Davis, Geoffrey V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Doelle, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hartong, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Head, Harold D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kramer, Kenyon K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Krfutzmann, Robert, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Krupa, Lawrence T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Watson, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wessels, James V., xxx-xx-xxxx

## DENTAL CORPS

## To be captain

Ahlers, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Allen, Michael D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ficara, Anthony J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kuen, John B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Todd, Maylon J., xxx-xx-xxxx

## VETERINARY CORPS

## To be captain

Alishouse, Harvel F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Balk, Melvin W., xxx-xx-xxxx

Carlisle, Eddie L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Deen, Wallace A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Marrs, Glen E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McKinley, Edmund R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rafio, Charles P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ridder, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Scharding, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vogel, Lyle P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wood, Larry D., xxx-xx-xxxx

## MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

## To be captain

Anderson, Kenneth W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Anderson, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Arnt, Stephen W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Radgett, Arthur L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bailey, Ray H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Barker, Franklin T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bell, William H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Blackwell, Russell, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bodenbender, David, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bogue, Ronald A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Borzotra, Winslow F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Boyd, Willie H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brown, Bruce J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bunch, James S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Byrne, Terrence R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Caskey, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Catanzaro, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Chappell, George B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Charlton, William T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Christman, Laurence, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Church, Zaidos N., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cigal, Paul A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Clark, Philip E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Clegg, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Coldren, Lawrence E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Collins, Michael H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Collopy, Eugene A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cooper, Clarence C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Coventry, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Damato, James J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Davis, Richard C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Deponville, Robert, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dohany, Alexander L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Doty, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ferinde, John, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Foust, Jerome V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Fraser, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Galenes, Alexander, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gilkey, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Goodman, Roy B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Grigg, Donald E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hamilton, John, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hammond, Sterling D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Harding, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Harvey, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hinton, Samuel M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hohmann, James G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Holberton, Roger E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hooker, Scottie T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Horrell, Ronald L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Howard, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Howell, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hoxie, Ferman C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hunt, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Inazu, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jacobs, Gerald D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 James, Charles H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jenna, Russell W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, Barry J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jones, Thomas C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jordan, Charles F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Juchau, Simmeon V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Keel, Hugh N., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kinane, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Krupka, Thaddeus A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lackey, George R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Langhorne, Webster, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lea, Mebane T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lepiane, Robby J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lenz, Ernest J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lull, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lyon, Wendell K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lyons, Joseph F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Madkins, Lawrence H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Makarevich, Robert, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Maloney, Alfred S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Manning, Randolph, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Manoll, Robert, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Markey, Keith L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Markle, Brian C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McAdams, Spurgeon A., xxx-xx-xxxx

McAleer, Charles F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McMasters, Bernard, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Miles, Ronald D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Miller, Allan R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mohn, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moody, Hershell L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moon, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moore, Robert T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Morris, Arnold E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Morrison, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mote, Edgar F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nebill, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Obrien, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Odum, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ostrander, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Owen, John T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Palmer, Jesse E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Paxton, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Peake, James B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Peters, Curtis A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Piskun, Walter S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Plank, Gordon H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Quinn Frank X., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rawlings, James S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Redden, Jimmy D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Redmond, John III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Reed, Podge M. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Reid, Willis A. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ross, Edwin S. VI, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Salander, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Salko, Joseph E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sawallesh, Robert F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schmierer, Alan F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schneider, Richard, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Scott, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sierra, Albert J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Slifer, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Clarence W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smithee, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sorensen, Wayne E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stalker, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Steenken, Wehland G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stephens, Robert B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thomas, Buddy G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tonniges, Gary L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Turk, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Turman, Robert R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tysor, Kenneth E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Usry, Robert T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Valdes, Victor M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vatne, Clarence G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vaughn, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Washington, Curtis, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wheeler, Leigh F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Willis, Herman F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wilson, Edward B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wilson, Lynnford S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wilson, Torrence M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wisdom, Harry A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Workman, Dale H., xxx-xx-xxxx

## ARMY NURSE CORPS

## To be captain

Accardo, Wilbert J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Allanach, Bruce C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Anundson, William D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Arndt, Georgene E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ashley, Nancy R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Barsh, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Baysinger, Douglas, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bryan, Gareth D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Clark, Dorothy J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cochran, Ronald L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Copenhagen, Dianne, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Duke, Terrance M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ellis, Wayne E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Eubanks, Lonnie H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Firman, Terrence G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Fox, Judith L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Grenon, David K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Guida, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gurney, Peter L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hopkins, Roger N., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Howard, Duane L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hudock, John M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Huntington, Theodore, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hutchinson, Judith, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jones, James E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jones, Mary M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 King, Kenneth E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Knepper, Glenn B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kosik, Janet A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lackovich, Sophie M., xxx-xx-xxxx

Leavell, Ronald E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lebel, Leo A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Leonard, Lawrence C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Leonard, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Long, Jerry D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Maloney, Joseph P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McElwee, Thomas P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McEntire, Jackie J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Misener, Terry R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Murrin, Barbara J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 O'Connor, Stephen J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Olson, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pang, Sandra J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Patnode, Louis G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Queen, Henry J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Riedman, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sanford, Dan M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sapolis, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schanding, Donald W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Showman, Lonnie J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Slotter, Sandra L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stamper, Roy R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vartigian, Helen A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wagner, Jimmie R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wimett, Joan J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wimett, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Woldt, Gerald D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Zeiner, Sharon A., xxx-xx-xxxx

## ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

## To be captain

Bajema Sheldon L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Clausen, Juanita, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cronin, Martha A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ellsworth, Paul D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Harper, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Havlick, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hughes, Everett A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ingeman, Peter L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kersey, Douglas A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Malze, Roy S., II, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Olszewski, Valerie, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Palm, Leah, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sater, Derrol H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sweeney, Bonnie E., xxx-xx-xxxx

## IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284 and 3299:

## ARMY PROMOTION LIST

## To be major

Aamodt, Ludvig J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Abbuhl, Willmott, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Abel, Kenneth B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Abernathy, Eugene B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Abrahamson, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Adams, Charles M., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Adams, Hugh W. H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Adams, James W. R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Adams, Melvin M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Adamson, Henry K., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Adkins, Thomas J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Aidle, Thomas H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Akers, Jimmy D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Akin, Robert B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Aleksunas, Robert, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Alexander, Richard, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Alhouse, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Allanson, Will E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Allen, Jerry P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Allen, Richard H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Allen, Sydna B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Allen, Teddy G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Alley, Frank M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Allison, James K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Allred, Raymond S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Alt, Richard M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Altom, Gilbert J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Amend, William B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Amlong, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ammons, David C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Amos, John O., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Andre, David H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Andrew, John K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Andrews, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Angolia, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Appel, Cyril W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Appleton, Forrest W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Apruzzese, Vincent, xxx-xx-xxxx

Arndt, Terrence L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Arrisgado, Maurice, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Arrowood, Thomas B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Atkeson, Thomas L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Atwood, John B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ault, John W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Auyong Stephen K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bacon, Donald D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Badger, William W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Baer, William V., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bagdonas, Edward, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bahniuk, Edward M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bair, Arthur H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Baker, David G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Baker, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Balaguer, Melchor C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Balberde, Alexander, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Baldwin, Ronald C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Baldwin, Roy G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Balkovetz, Fred W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Banks, John W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Banning, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Barbe, Charles D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Barkett, John S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Barkley, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Barksdale, Lewis B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Barmore, Frederick, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Barnes, Jimmie E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Barnes, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Barnwell, Isalah E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Barnwell, Marion L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Barratt, Richard H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Barrett, Peter J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Barrett, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Barrett, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Barrett, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Barrington, David O., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Barros, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Barrow, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Barrus, Rollin L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Barton, Charles D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Basha, Robert T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Basham, Harold R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Batcheler, George E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Baugh, Raymond C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Baxter, Thomas R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Beach, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Beachem, Paul J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Beard, Louin L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Beasley, John D., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Beasley, Rodney S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Beaty, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Beaumont, Marion E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Beck, Buddy G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Beck, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Becker, Ronald C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Beckett, Jack A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Beckworth, Hancel A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Beech, Gary D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Behnke, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Beld, Thomas W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Belinsky, Howard M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Belisle, Aldorien E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Benagh, William E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bennett, Eugene W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bennett, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bennett, Roger M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Benson, Frederick S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bentley, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Berkley, Nathan R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Berman, Leo, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bernard, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Berta, Thomas L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bertils, Bertel R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Besson, Frank S., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Beurket, Raymond T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Beyer, Alfred H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Beyer, Harry C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Beyer, Lawrence F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Beyer, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Blas, William K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bibbins, George L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bice, Burton C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bihn, Marvin A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Birrane, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Biscomb, Gordon L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bishop, Edward L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bishop, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bishop, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Biskup, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Blakely, Clyde H., xxx-xx-xxxx

Blanchard, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Blankenship, Malcolm, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Blasco, Andrew P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bliss, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Boes, Richard W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bogenrife, Richard, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bohman, Jack E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Boles, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Boles, Wayne T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Boliaris, Daniel F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Boller, Richard R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bond, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bothe, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bopp, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Borgman, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Borgmann, Wayne A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Borlund, Thomas V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Borstorff, Allan R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bosking, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Boss, Jerry L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Boston, Louis J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Boulware, Jefferson, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bourque, Archille, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bowdan, Melvin R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bowers, Robert F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bowser, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Boyd, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Boyd, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Boyd, Thomas G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Boyd, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Boyd, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Boyle, Russell T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Boylston, Graves L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Boysen, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bradin, James W., IV, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bradley, Holley D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Braithwaite, David, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Branagan, Brian J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brandt, Harold H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brashear, Hollis N., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brasher, Thurman W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brass, Ronald W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bratisax, Roland J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Breedlove, Joe J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Breen, William W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brehaut, Joseph W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brem, Homer L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brenner, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bresette, Allen A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Breslin, Frederick, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brett, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brewer, Robert R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Briggs, Harold L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Broadhurst, Donald, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Broksieck, Don E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Broocke, Nathan I., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brooke, Arthur L., II, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brookshire, George, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brothwell, Richard, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brown, Donn W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brown, Joseph E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brown, Larry D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brown, Patty E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brown, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brown, Roy E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brown, Walter T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brownfield, Boyd J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Browning, David B. J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brugger, Karl A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brunelle, Pierre V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brunkow, Richard O., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bruschette, Jerome, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Buchanan, William, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Buckman, Leroy R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Buckner, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Buczek, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Buell, William C. V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Buffalo, Laurence, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bullard, Monte R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bunij, Edwin W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Buntyn, James R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Buono, Daniel P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Burba, Edwin H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Burchell, Larry E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Burdin, J. D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Burleson, Grady L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Burleson, Willard M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Burley, Earl B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Burns, Walter L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Burrell, Raymond E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Butts, Orville N., xxx-xx-xxxx



Butts, William T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Byars, Harold W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Byrd, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Byrd, Melvin L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cain, Morton G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cain, Moses A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cain, William H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Calhoun, George H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Callahan, Joel T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Campbell, George C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Campbell, J. Frank, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Campbell, James T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Campbell, Robert P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Campi, Francis V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cannon, Edwin E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cannon, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cantrell, Ralph D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Capps, Eugene S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Carbone, Anthony J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Carey, Norman C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Carlisle, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Carmichael, Rex, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Carmichael, Roderic, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Carrier, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Carroll, Edward J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Carter, Bobby J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Casey, Andrew M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Catlett, Charles, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Catron, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cavoli, Ivo J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cephas, Earle F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cercy, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Chalmers, Paul A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Chancellor, Robert, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Chandler, Edward V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Chandler, Fitzhugh, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Chapman, Thomas R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Chesher, Phillip B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cianciolo, August M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cini, Lyn G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Claiborn, Max R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Clark, Howard W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Clark, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Clarke, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Clary, William T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Clement, Joe M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Clifton, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Clough, William S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cloy, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Coker, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Colby, Nathaniel F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cole, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cole, Leslie W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Coleman, Charlie W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Conlon, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Connell, Frank M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Connolly, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Conway, Rody M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cook, Donald M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cook, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cooley, Russell E., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cooney, Terence P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cooper, William H., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Corby, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Corey, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Corliss, William D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cornell, Marcus C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Corns, Johnnie H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Corr, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cortelli, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cote, Paul R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cotrupi, Francis J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cotts, David G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Council, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Courts, Philip E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Coury, David G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Covington, Dwight H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Covington, Henry H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cox, Ronald D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Coyne, John F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Craig, Hal N., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Craig, Jack A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Craig, Joe F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Craig, Sam W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Craighead, Clyde V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cramer, Carl L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cramer, Ronald P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Crane, Kenneth C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Craven, Ronald E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Creasy, Calvin H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Creighton, Francis, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cremer, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cresci, Anthony B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Crofoot, George W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Crosby, Ben G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Crosby, Theodore F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Crouch, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Crowl, Ronald C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Crowley, Dennis J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Crowley, Ronald C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cubert, Burleigh M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Culp, Don F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cumming, Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Curran, Francis P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Curran, Joseph S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Currin, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Custer, Leslie L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cyr, Arthur R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dacey, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dahill, John B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dahlinger, Richard, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Daines, Guy E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dalhausser, Robert, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Daniel, Howard, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Danley, James M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Darby, Barney D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Darden, Earl, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dast, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Davenport, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 David, Ronald C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Davis, Alexander D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Davis, Bruce H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Davis, Carol D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Davis, Charley B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Davis, David H., II, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Davis, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Davis, George C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Davis, Kenneth M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Davis, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Davis, Ronald W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Davis, Roy J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Davis, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dawkins, Peter M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dawson, Lawrence C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Day, George E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Deasy, William T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Deatkine, Norvell B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Decesare, Armand G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Deely, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Deford, Maurice, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Degrant, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Deibel, Charles L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Delbuono, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Delirat, Stanley J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Delrusso, Louis J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dembinski, Mark L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Demetrovich, Frede, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Demont, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Demorest, Edward H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dendtler, Robert B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Denio, Jean H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dennis, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Denzler, Ancil L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Depace, Anthony J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Derocher, Robert F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Devereaux, Alfred B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dewey, Lawrence R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dexter, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 DeYoung, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dickerson, Jon R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dickson, Carroll Z., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Diehl, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dietrich, Regis P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 DiGiacinto, Joseph, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dill, Clark D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dillon, Alfred M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dillon, Oliver W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dishman, Benjamin E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dishner, Wilbert J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Doehle, Douglas A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Doherty, Terence, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Domal, Stanley J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Donaldson, Orlov D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Doran, William K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dorris, Albert F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dougherty, George J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Doukas, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Downey, Hal W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Downing, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Downs, George M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Doyle, Bernard K., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Doyle, Noel J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Drago, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Drenzek, Richard M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Drew, John B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Duchin, Ronald A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Duggan, Dennis M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dumas, George C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dunn, Earl N., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dunne, Rory W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dupont, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Durham, Thomas F., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dyer, Glenn H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dygert, George H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Eady, William D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Earley, Neal E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Eckelbarger, Donald, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Edmond, Holman, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Eggleston, Carl B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Eiche, Jon J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Eldredge, Richard B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Eldredge, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Elias, Paul J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ellerthorpe, Donald, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Elliott, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ellison, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Emery, Bruce W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Emery, James S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Emmerson, Arthur VI, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Endicott, Willard E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Enright, Joseph P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Eskridge, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Essex, Peter E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Esworthy, Bert, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Evans, Francis T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Evans, Jacky R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Evans, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Fagan, Allan P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Farill, Trent G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Farley, Dennis S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Farley, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Farnsworth, Fred L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Farrar, Raymond E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Farris, Jack B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Fay, Warren E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Felsher, Edwin H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ferguson, James C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ferguson, Norman N., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Fernandez, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Fernandez, Victor M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ferrick, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Fersch, Stephen J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Fields, Charles G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Fields, Harvey R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Filer, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Finch, James T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Fishcher, Richard W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Fischer, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Fish, Richard O., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Fisher, Don Ray, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Fisher, Luke C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Fitchett, Donald J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Fitzgerald, Robert, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Fitzgerald, William, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Fitzsimmons, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Fleming, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Flesher, Dale D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Fletcher, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Fletcher, Thomas H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Flitcraft, Stanley, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Flowers, Robert G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Fluke, Eugene C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Foote, Brian G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Forbes, Maynard C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ford, Harold L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Foster, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Foster, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Fournier, Albert L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Fowler, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Fowler, John G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Fox, Morton, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Fraase, William K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Frankoski, Joseph P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Franks, Frederick M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Franz, Jay C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Fraser, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Freeman, Bobby H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Freiler, John J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 French, Uri S., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Frey, Heino, J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Fried, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Frost, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Frye, Norman E., xxx-xx-xxxx

Fudge, Eugene E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Fuller, Dwight H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Funderburk, Raymond, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Funk, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gabel, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gaines, Roger Q., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Galbreath, Carlton, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Galford, William W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gallagher, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Garcia, Rafael G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Garcia, William J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gard, William B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gardner, Lawrence A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gaudreau, Ronald P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gay, Andrew M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gay, Raymond D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gayler, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gear, Edward Robert, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gebhardt, Raymond G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gegner, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gehler, Donald C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gehler, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 George, Alfred W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 George, James T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gerhardt, Igor D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gess, William D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Getz, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gibbs, Philip E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gilbertson, Clarence, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gilliam, Glen L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ginex, Thomas D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gladfelter, Terry T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gleason, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gomez, Vincent C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Good, William K., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Goodman, Donald W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Goodpasture, Albert, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gordon, Jack J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gordon, Raymond, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Goring, Richard H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gorman, Patrick H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gowen, Ralph D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gracey, Lloyd F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Grassl, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gravett, Ray A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gray, David T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gray, Harlen E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gray, Michael K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Greenberg, Paul L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Greene, Gerald R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Greene, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Greene, Robert P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Greene, Therman R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Greer, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Greeson, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gregg, Donald L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Griffin, Arthur R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Griffin, Gerald K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Griffin, Turner D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Griffith, Allen L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Griffith, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Griffith, Jerry R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Griffith, Warren E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Grigg, Vernon C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Griggs, Donald B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Grim, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Grimes, Charles T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gritz, James G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Grooms, Jimmy R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gross, Gerald D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Groth, Carl H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Groves, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Groshetsky, Philip, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Guild, William B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Guillory, Kenneth R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Guinn, Ollie R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gumpf, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gustafson, Carl S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Haaland, Carl J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Haddock, Raymond E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hadley, Harry A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hagerty, Harve J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hahn, James S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Haight, Barrett S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hair, Henry H., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hall, James R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hallauer, Donald W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hallman, Rodney G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hamby, Jerrell E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hamel, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx

Hamilton, Welton E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hancock, James B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hankins, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hanson, Charles K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hardin, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hardwick, Willis C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hardy, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Harleston, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Harmon, Charles P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Harmon, Donald G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Harmon, Wilburn H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Harnly, Richard W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Harrington, David B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Harris, Henry L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Harris, Lyman B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Harrison, George F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Harvey, Henry J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Haselton, Hunter G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Haskell, Charles T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Haskins, Franklin C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hastings, Clark W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hatch, Alden E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Havis, Joe D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hawranick, Theodore, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hawthorne, Raymond, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hayton, Samuel L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hazen, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hazlewood, Richard, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Healey, Roger, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Heath, Guy H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Heberle, Charles J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hedrick, Miles C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Helm, Craig G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Helbling, James J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Helton, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hendrix, Charles W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Henry, Charles W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hernandez, Victor M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Herr, Edward L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Herron, Roy H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hesgh, Russell J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hess, Ronald H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hesse, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hessler, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hewitt, Russell A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hibbs, Carroll M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hickey, William C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hicks, Gerald D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Higgins, Glenn E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hightower, Louis V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hill, Jimmy C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hillen, John F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hilliard, Maurice G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hilmes, Jerome B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hiltom, Thomas G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hinds, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hines, Frank E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hintze, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hisey, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hixon, Jerry F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hixson, Peter C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hoagland, Jackson J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hobar, Basic J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hodges, Benjamin F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hogan, Jerry H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hokanson, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Holcombe, Jerry V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hollingsworth, Victor, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Holloway, Havis, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Holloway, William B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Holman, Robert E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Holmes, Ernest L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hooker, George A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hopkins, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hornaday, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hornor, Jerry D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Horton, Franklin N., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Horton Lowrey P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Horton, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hotchkiss, Richard, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hougen, Harvey R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Houltry, Allyn C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Houston, Samuel B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Howard, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Howard, Joe, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Howard, Ronald D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Howell, Raymond K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hubert, Leo A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hudson, Larry G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hudson, William K., xxx-xx-xxxx

Huggin, Benjamin A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Huggins, Bobby R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hughes, Norman F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hughes, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hull, Arthur V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hull, Sammy K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Humphrey, Johnny M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hunley, Will S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hunnicutt, Roy D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hunt, James W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hunter, Harry D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Huntingdon, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hurst, Joseph W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hutcheson, Samuel Z., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hutnan, George P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hutson, Heyward G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hutton, Cuthbert P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hyers, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Imler, Estan F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Infante, Donald E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Inglett, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ingram, Donald D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Inman, Terence B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Irons, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Isaacson, Roy W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Isacco, Michael D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Isenberg, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ivey, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ivey, Claude T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ivey, Donald J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ivey, Herman V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ivey, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Iwal, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jackson, George B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jackson, Raymond L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jacob, Neal L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jacob, Gustave F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jacobson, Walter R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 James, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jankiewicz, Edward, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Janosko, Eugene S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jayne, Robert K., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jebavy, Ronald J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jennette, Larry F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jennings, Gerald E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jervell, Broder L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnsen, Frederick, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, Bruce C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, Darel S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, Floyd C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, Gaylon L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, George P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, Gonzales B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, Harold D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, Harold E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, James O., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, John P., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, Kenneth E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, Richard B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, Richard G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, Rudd H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson Stanley R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnston, Richard H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jolly, Donald H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jones, Donald W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jones, Gary W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jones, Julius E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jones, Robert P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jones, Roland A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jordan, George W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jordan, Josef C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Joyce, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Junier, Edward J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jurkovich, George J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kaiser, Samuel E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kaler, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kaley, Peter M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kanarowski, Stanley, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kane, John S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kane, Paul N., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kannarr, Harold E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kaplan, Kenneth, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Karegeannes, Harry, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Karl, Edward V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Karp, John C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Katsarsky, Leonard, xxx-xx-xxxx



Kawand, Kenneth I., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kaye, Francis, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kearns, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Keck, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Keefe, Paul F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Keefe, Gary L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Keefe, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Keighler, Howard V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Keim, Carl D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kellenberger, William, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kelly, Edward J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kelly, Peter J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kelly, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kendall, Donald S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kendrick, Richard P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kennedy, James M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kennedy, Thomas J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kenney, Laurence R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kenworthy, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kern, Jack R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kernan, Michael F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kerr, Paul J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Keyes, Billy G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kierstead, Dana S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kilgore, Jack E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Killam, John, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kimball, William D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kirby, Ernest R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kirshman, Ronald L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kittelberger, Kenneth, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kleb, George R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Klein, Alvin A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Klein, Frank J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Klein, Stephen, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kline, Gary L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Klys, Adam J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kneiss, Richard F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Knoop, Paul R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Knutson, Richard H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Koch, Gerald L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kockx, Duane F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kodama, Lester T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Koenig, Robert F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Koger, Ronald G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kolsch, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kolasheski, Richard, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kolin, Raymond A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Komer, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Koneval, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Koon, Carl B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Korf, Calvin L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kramer, Leo A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Krausz, George M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Krawciw, Nicholas S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kromer, William S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kronkatis, John, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Krupa, Stephen A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kubo, Arthur S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kuhn, William K., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kulmayer, Joseph L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kuschner, Andrew K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kushner, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lacy, Paul J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ladner, Donald A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 LaFrance, Richard B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lagas, Joseph V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lagasse, Louis R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lagutchik, Peter, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lajole, Ronald, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lamarche, Bertrand, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lamb, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Landgraf, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Landrum, Donald J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Langendorff, Herbert, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Langford, Ollie L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Largent, Raymond E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Larsen, Henry S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lasner, Edwin J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lasseter, Earle F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Latham, Tilden R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lavey, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Law, Sherrill G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lawrence, Ashton C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lawson, Owen D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Leclerc, Dick T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ledbetter, Homer M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lee, Gordon K., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lehmann, Clark T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lehrfeld, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Leitzon, Thomas R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lemons, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Leonard, Daniel R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Letchworth, Robert, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lewis, Homer, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lidy, Albert M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Liepins, George, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lightner, Thomas G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ligon, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lindsey, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lindstrom, Frank V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Linver, Sidney L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Little, William E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Livingston, George, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Livingston, Thomas, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Locklear, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lockwood, Edward D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lopez, Manuel, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lord, Frederick J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lorimier, Joseph M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Losey, Roy E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Love, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lovelace, George E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lozano, William, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lucas, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lucke, David B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Luedtke, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Luksik, Franklin D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lunt, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Luther, William A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lutz, Charles M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Luzietti, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lyght, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lyles, Billy A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lymburner, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lynn, Harry C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lynch, Eugene S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lynn, Ira I., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 MacDonald, Robert, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mackintosh, Hartley, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 MacLeod, Albert D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Macwillie, Donald, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Madden, Charles D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Madden, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Madigan, Eugene F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Madigan, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Maglin, Richard R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Magnussen, Mark H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Malave, Garcia S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Maloney, Mark L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Manderson, Ivor C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Manderville, Bernard, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Manganaro, S. Joseph, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mann, Hal G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Manzo, Fred V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mapp, Homer S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Markham, Don, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Markham, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Marks, Max G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Marley, Ronald W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Marlow, John B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Marnon, Donald J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Marsden, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Marsh, Byron D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Martin, Ford G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Martin, Richard H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Martin, Thomas L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mason, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Massey, James L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Matassarini, Leon C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Matchette, Claude R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mathis, Douglas, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Matthes, Donald T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Matthews, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Matzeder, Clarence, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mauk, Gerald F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Maxson, Ronald G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Maxwell, Michael W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mayers, John J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mays, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McCabe, Franklyn W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McCaig, Tom H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McCann, Thomas P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McCarthy, Frank T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McCarthy, Patrick F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McCarty, Billy W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McClung, Henry J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McCluskey, William, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McConnell, Gerald B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McConville, Frederick, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McCoy, Jerald W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McCracken, Henry E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McCrary, Richard F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McCullough, Overto, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McDonald, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McFadden, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McFadden, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McFadden, Phillip L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McGaw, Charles D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McGovern, Richard, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McGovern, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McGranahan, Kenneth, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McGrath, William B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McInerney, Bernard, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McKeon, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McKinnon, Graham, III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McKinzie, George J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McLaughlin, Edward, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McLaughlin, Godwin, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McLeod, Roger L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McManus, Ronald T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McMorris, Thomas F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McMullen, Clifford, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McNamara, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McNeerney, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McRorie, Raymond C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McShane, Donald L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McVey, Peter M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Meadows, Kenneth D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Medaris, John B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Meloy, John N., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mentor, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mercadante, Richard, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mercer, Richard R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mercer, Warren H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Merchant, Don L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Merchant, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Metcalf, Ronald C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Methvin, Joseph L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mickelson, Roger W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Miles, Elwyn C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Miles, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Miles, Peter D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Milley, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Millar, Roger M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Miller, Carl J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Miller, Joseph, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Miller, Retsae H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Miller, Sheron W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mills, Jerry C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Milton, Maurice D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mineo, Nicholas A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Miner, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Minnich, Lawrence E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Minor, Thomas F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mitchell, Charles C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mitchell, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mitchell, Richard G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moie, Donald W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moellering, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moffitt, Robert B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mohr, Carl E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moithen, Theodore J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Monroe, Dewitt T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Montgomery, Horace, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mooney, Robert E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mooney, Thomas R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moore, Bobby L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moore, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moore, George A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moore, Riley R., II, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moorhead, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moraski, Leon K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Morgan, George A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Morgan, Jerome M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Morris, Dannie B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Morris, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Morrison, Marvin E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Morrissey, Dennis J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Morton, James O., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Motley, James B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mountel, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mozey, William B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mullen, Cassius J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mullen, William J., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mullenix, Ronald O., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mullins, Raiford, F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mulvaney, Merle L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mulvey, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Mundz, Benjamin L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Murdock, Delon T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Murphy, Edward J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Murray, Charles M., xxx-xx-xxxx

Murray, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Murray, Lark R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Murray, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Murry, William V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Musil, Louis F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Myers, Walter K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nance, Nelson T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Naughton, Hugh V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Neal, John O., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nelson, Turner L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Netzloff, Edwin A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Newberry, Milton S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nichols, James M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nielsen, Kenneth G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nilsson, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nishimoto, Masami, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Noble, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Norman, Kenneth G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Norman, Steven R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Norris, Jimmy R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Norton, George T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Norton, Graham J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Norvell, Frank C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Novogratz, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nowak, Leonard G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nugent, Richard O., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nulk, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nunn, Lee R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 O'Brien, Francis D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 O'Bryan, Michael F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 O'Connor, Edward J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 O'Connor, Hugh T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Odell, Ersal D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Odom, Fredwin M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 O'Donohue, Paul J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 O'Donovan, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Offield, Nathan A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ogden, Gregory T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Oliver, Eugene L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Oliver, John B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Oliver, Robert T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Olson, Frederick N., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 O'Meara, Andrew P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ondecker, Lawrence, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 O'Neill, Kevin J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Oppenlander, Robert, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Orndorff, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 O'Rourke, Dulaney L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 O'Rourke, Thomas A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Orr, Paul F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Osteen, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ostermeier, William, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ostrowidzki, Joseph, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ota, Harry S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ott, John S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Owen, Benjamin P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Paar, Anthony R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pace, Prewitt L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pack, Tommy R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Paddock, Alfred H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Paquette, Roger K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Parchen, David H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Parker, Glynn E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Parker, Purvis L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Parker, Raymond L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Parker, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Parker, Wendell G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Parks, James D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Farman, Donald W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Parolini, George W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Paschall, Jim R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Passarella, Patrick, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pastrana-Silva, Luis, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Patrick, Harold L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Patterson, Harvey G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Patterson, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Patterson, Joseph M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pattison, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Patton, Garry L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pawlik, Eugene A., Sr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pearce, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Penrod, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Perkins, Jerry L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Perry, Charles C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Person, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Peterson, Humphrey, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Peterson, Ronald N., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Peyton, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pfabe, Richard K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pfister, Cloyd H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Phifer, Thomas K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Phillips, Don, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Phillips, Harold E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pierce, Dale W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pierre, Russell, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pietsch, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pihl, Donald S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pike, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pike, Verner N., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pinckney, Marion, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pishon, Nichols E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pistone, Ronald A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pitts, Walter E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Plasket, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Plassmeyer, Martin, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Platt, Edgar C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Plummer, George W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Poach, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Poe, Thurel J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pokorny, Anthony G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pollard, Gordon K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pollock, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pompa, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ponton, Hector R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Poole, Buddy J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Poole, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Porter, Kelly A. L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Posey, Dudley M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Posey, Frank D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Potts, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Powell, Jamo C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Powell, Roger G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Powers, Bryon L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Prahm, Byron F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pretto, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Prisk, Courtney E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pujol, Elwray, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Putnam, Sidney F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pyle, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Quattlebaum, Charlie, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Quinlan, Patrick J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rackley, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Raffaele, Eugene J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rafferty, Joseph V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rahm, Richard R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ramey, Harold M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ramsey, Raymond R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Randall, Thomas G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rapaport, Benjamin, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ratcliff, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Raunam, George J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Raupp, Edward R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rawlings, Charles S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ray, Harry D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ray, Paul H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rebholz, Edward S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Redding, Frank J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Reed, George B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rees, Warren K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Regel, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Reid, Loren D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Reinen, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Reinhard, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Reiser, Andre K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Reneau, Joseph S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Renfro, Ronald D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Resley, Patrick E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rexrode, Kenneth E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Reynolds, Willie R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rhen, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Richard, Virgil A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Richards, Arthur E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Richardson, Celeste, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Richardson, Odie B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Riggan, Raymond B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Riggs, Gary A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rill, Joseph H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Riordan, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rizzo, Peter J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Roberson, Clayton S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Roberts, Joel E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Roberts, Thomas D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Robinson, Charles A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Robinson, Edward C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Robinson, James C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Roche, William H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rodriguez, Joe A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Roeming, Frederic E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Roessler, Gilbert E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rogers, Frederick T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rogers, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rogers, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rogers, Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rogers, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Root, Duane B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Roppo, Leo J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rosamond, John B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rose, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ross, Lawrence C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rothblum, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rogeau, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rounseville, Richard, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Routt, Randall G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rowe, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rugenstein, Edgar H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Runke, Richard P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rushton, Pierce A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Russell, Thomas B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Russillo, Michael P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ryan, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ryburn, Glenn O., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ryker, George C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sadler, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Salley, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Salomon, Leon E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sambol, Donald G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sanaker, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sanders, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sanders, Clarence B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sanders, Paul B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sanders, Rabun C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sanner, Herman R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Santos, Melecio Z., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Santos, Melecio Z., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sargent, Terrence D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Satterwhite, James, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sauer, Jack L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Saul, Gordon E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Saunders, Otis H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sauvageot, Jean A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Scanlan, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schafer, Lawrence H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Scheiner, Herbert L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schiano, Louis J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schiermeier, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schlapak, Benjamin, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schleper, David P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schloesser, Robert, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schlossberg, Arnold, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schmacker, Bruce E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schmid, Karl F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schmid, Thomas W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schmidt, Peter B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schneebeck, Gene A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schooner, Murray J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schor, Stephen H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schott, Joseph D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schow, Robert A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schroder, Romayne E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schroeder, Louis J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schuette, Ronald W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schuetze, Raymond A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schwab, Don A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schwartz, Paul R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schwartz, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Scillian, Billie H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Scott, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Scott, John O., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Scott, Walter J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Scott, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Scovel, Dennis A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Seaver, Charles W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sechtman, Paul L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Seltz, John A., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Seybold, Thomas K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shackelford, William, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shaffer, Malcolm S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shain, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shanahan, Edward J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sharp, John B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sharp, Richard H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shaw, Terrence L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sheaffer, Phillip G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shelton, Hal T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shepard, George T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sherard, Phillip G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sherrell, Wilson J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shilling, Jack C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shouse, Delbert F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shriver, Louis M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shunk, Peter, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shunk, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Silva, Warren R., xxx-xx-xxxx



Simmons, Jerry W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Simpson, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Simpson, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sims, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sinclair, Bobby H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Singer, Lawrence A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Singleton, Richard, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sisson, Brooks H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sisterman, Lawrence, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sitten, John R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sivert, William D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Skidmore, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Skowronek, Richard, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Slagle, James V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Slater, Paul A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Slifer, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smart, Donald L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smart, Lee D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Allen D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Billy V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Byrd, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, David C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Duane N., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Edward C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Glenn A., II, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Harvey A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Jack C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Lee C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Robert B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Robert T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Sam G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Stanley L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Warren S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, William G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smitherman, Joe V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Snead, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Snell, Douglas H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Snell, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Snyder, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Socks, Hugh J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Solomon, Irwin E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Solomon, William V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sonnier, Robby J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Soriano, Feliciano, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sovine, Leroy K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sowell, Mark S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Spanjers, Leonard J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Spearman, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Spears, Tom C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Spekhardt, Michael, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Spence, James, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Spera, Francis P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Spinner, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Springfield, Bruce, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sprowls, Leigh E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Squire, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stadler, Gerald P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stalker, Paul R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stallings, Jimmie L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stamant, Joseph F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Standridge, Lanny, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stanley, Charles M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stanley, Frederick, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stansell, Ernest L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Starley, Vernon B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stead, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Steakley, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stebbins, Allen F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stebbins, Ronald S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Steedly, Ronald E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Steele, Merrill F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stein, Philip A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Steinhilper, Edgar, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stephens, Donald L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stephens, Glen C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stevens, Eulin L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stewart, Alexander, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stewart, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stiles, Howard J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stivison, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 St. John, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stokke, Edward T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Storey, Thomas P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stoy, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Straeb, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Streeter, William F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stroh, George C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stromberg, Peter L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stroud, Lamar A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stuart, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stults, Claude L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sturdivant, Thurman, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Subrown, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sullenberger, Louis, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sundt, Richard S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Suszynski, Joseph F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sutton, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sutton, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Svendsen, Don F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Swain, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Swan, Sinclair D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sweeney, Robert F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Swift, Frederick W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Swindells, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Swinson, Benjamin L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Szustak, Frank G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Takacs, Steve P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Talbott, Ralph, IV, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Talkington, Thomas, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tamer, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tannenbaum, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Taurke, Erwin A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Taylor, Harry, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Taylor, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Taylor, Paul W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Taylor, Ralph W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Taylor, William D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Teller, Albert A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Temple, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tennant, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tennis, Gayland L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Terry, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Terseck, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Theuer, Paul J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thibodeau, Charles, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thiessen, Derek J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thomas, Bruce A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thomas, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thomas, Golden L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thomas, Joel F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thomas, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thomas, Kenneth E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thomas, Marvin L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thomas, Phillip J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thomas, Ronald E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thomas, William S., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thompson, Billie F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thompson, James P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thompson, John T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thompson, Paul F., II, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thompson, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thompson, Thomas M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thompson, Vernon D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thornton, Tommy W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thudium, Christian, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tillar, Donaldson P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tipka, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tipping, Garold L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tipton, Carl W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tison, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tobin, Ernest H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Todaro, Joseph E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Todd, Alan R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tolcher, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tomberlin, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tomei, Giancarlo A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tomiczek, Paul W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tompson, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Toner, Richard M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Torretto, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Toskey, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Townley, Robert R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tozier, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Treacy, John T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tredinnick, Richard, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Trevino, Francisco, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tritz, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tucker, Everette L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tucker, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Turgeon, Gareth M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Turner, Edwin H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Turner, Rex M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Turner, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Turpin, Robert P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tyler, Erven S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Uhrich, Theodore W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ulzheimer, Robert, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Unger, Curtis G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Urciuoli, George R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Valandry, David D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Valimont, Benjamin, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vandevender, Edward, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vanhooser, David P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vanlandingham, Robert, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vanlobensels, James, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vansteenbergen, Albert, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vanzandt, Homer R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Varley, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Venden, Roger D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Venzke, Gene A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vermette, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vinett, Peter A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vogel, Glenn A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vogl, Raymond E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Volpe, Michael, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Waddell, Robert R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wagner, Edward H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wagner, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wainwright, Oliver, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wait, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Waite, Grimble J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wakelin, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Walker, Clifford M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Walker, Emmett L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wall, Kenneth L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wall, William J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wallace, Malcolm K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wallace, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Walsh, James E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Walsh, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Walters, Charles C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Walters, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Walton, Joseph A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Walton, Leroy, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Walton, Ronald A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Walton, Warren J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Warmath, Julius G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Warren, Warren J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Warvi, Martin M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wasson, James V., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Watson, Charles W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Watson, Kermith G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Watts, Thurman, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Weatherly, Emory D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Weaver, Carl A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Webb, Daniel J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Webb, Earl E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Webb, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Webb, Waldo R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Weber, Ralph P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Weber, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Weekley, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Weeks, Joseph P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Weeks, William J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Weiss, James J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Welch, Elliot J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Welch, Jack L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Welch, Richard D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Welker, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wells, Theodore D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Welsh, Richard W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wessel, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Westgard, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wheeler, Albin G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wheeler, Joseph W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wheeler, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wheeler, Rock C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 White, Willington E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 White, Zinerva, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Whitehead, Dorsey M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Whiteside, Jerry E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Whitmarsh, Donald B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Whorton, Billy L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wicker, Raymond K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wickstrom, Charles, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wieduwilt, Leslie R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wigner, Larry R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wilbanks, Ronald H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wiley, Larry N., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wilfong, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wilhite, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wilkerson, Edwin A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wilkinson, Coleman, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wilkinson, Tary D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Williams, Billy D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Williams, Donald B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Williams, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Williams, Jimmie L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Williams, Joe E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Williams, Joshua O., xxx-xx-xxxx

Williams, Phillip J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Williams, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Williams, Russell L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Williams, Stuart H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Williamson, Alan R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Willis, Edward C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Willoughby, Kenneth, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wilmoth, Frederick, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wilson, Carroll R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wilson, Douglas B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wilson, Gifford D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wilson, John S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wilson, Martin L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wilson, Sanford H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Windham, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Winebarger, Marion, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wingo, Franklin J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Winslow, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Winter, Maurice G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wise, George W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wise, Ronald T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Withington, Robert, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Witter, Lee F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wolfe, June E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wolfe, Rodney D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wollard, Clifford L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Womack, Daniel, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wood, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wood, Leroy A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wood, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Woodall, Jack D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Woodhouse, Donald L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Woodmansee, Harry T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Woods, Roy S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Worthington, Wayne, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wosicki, Walter J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wright, Dean W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wright, Willie F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Yabeman, Sidney H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Yawn, Malcolm T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Yeats Philip L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Yelton, James M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Yelverton, Rush S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Yoder, Kenneth E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Yon, Frank E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Young, Leon A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Young, Richard B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Young, Troy R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Youree, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Zachary, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Zagalak, Stanley J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Zahn, Kenneth C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Zajac, Stephen G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Zaldo, William T., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Zeltman, Ronald W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Zierak, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Zierdt, William H., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Zimbrick, Duane E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Zukowski, Albin T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Zumbro, Harold D., xxx-xx-xxxx

## CHAPLAIN CORPS

## To be major

Alexander, George W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Alexander, Harold L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Allen, Eugene E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Baasen, Wesley A. G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Banton, Huston J., II, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Beckers, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Borson, Bernard K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brough, Alfred E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cooley, Virgil T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Courtney, Ocie I., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Desantis, Michael M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Deveaux, John A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Esco, Hugh R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Flippen, Edward A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Foreman, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hagood, Monroe J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hansen, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hoh, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lembke, Paul W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Libby, Billy W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Linderman, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moore, Bobby D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ness, Leroy T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Peacock, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pember, Marion D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Peterson, Wilbur G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Roque, Francis X., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Saunders, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx

Scott, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Strawser, Ray A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Swim, Vernon G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thompson, James G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ude, Donald E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vanderburgh, Daryl, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vanmeter, James W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Walker, Conrad N., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Walker, Norman G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Webb, Arthur M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wilk, Max W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Workman, Ralph C., xxx-xx-xxxx

## WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS

## To be major

Carroll, Sallie L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gibson, Gwen, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Heffren, Monica A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jorge, Marlene M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kelly, Jacquelin J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Merrill, Pauline D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Phillips, Charlotte, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pomeroy, Mae E., xxx-xx-xxxx

## MEDICAL CORPS

## To be major

Alexander, Byron B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Allison, Howard H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Barclay, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Barreca, Nicholas E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Beaver, Harry C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bell, Randall W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Blumhardt, Ralph, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Buck, Alfred S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Buck, Edward G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Callan, Thomas W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cardell, Jose E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Carolan, Patrick J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Carter Gordon C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cavanagh, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Clarke, John S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dunker, Richard B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Eberhard, Edward J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Everett, Elwood D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Eversmann, William, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Fauver, Howard E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Foy, Gerald W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Garciavergne, Manuel, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gardner, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gernon, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gibbons, Robert B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gober, Lowman E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Grosshans, James T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gryczko, Gerald A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gum, Ronald A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hammond, James B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Handley, George J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Harris, Hugh G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hobson, Robert W., II, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hofeldt, Fred D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hovey, Leslie M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Howard, Freeman I., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Humbert, Paul V., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hunter, John D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, Lawrence F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kearney, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kneppshield, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lehman, Richard H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Linares, Rafael, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Linden, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lindstrom, Eric E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Liptak, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Llewellyn, Craig H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McConnell, Michael, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McDonald, Edward G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McDonald, Herbert L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Miura, Calvin M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Morgenstern, Larry, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nelson, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Noguera-Fuentes, Pablo J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Peck, Morgan S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Price, Herman L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rock, Nicholas L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sawhill, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schneider, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schuchmann, George, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schweers, Carl A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shock, John P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shlaughter, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Smith, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Spicer, Melvin J., xxx-xx-xxxx

Stark, Fred R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Strum, Donald H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Taber, David O., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Taylor, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Teneyck, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thomas, Stephen R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Thomason, Phillip R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Treanor, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vest, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Walker, Olyn M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Watring, Watson G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Williams, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Yelland, Graham, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Zuck, Thomas F., xxx-xx-xxxx

## DENTAL CORPS

## To be major

Baggs, Gary A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Balserak, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Beasley, Joe D., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bent, Jerry P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bernier, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Berringer, Ray D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Blaho, Daniel M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Blubaugh, Edward C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Boyce, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Braun, Edward S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brown, George D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cremer, Jerry L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Crutchfield, David, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cuperd, Hamil M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Edington, Ernest M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Eichel, Thomas F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ellis, Herman B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Fagouri, Edward L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Goldberg, Stuart E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hammer, Henry S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hatch, Edward A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Henry, Samuel W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Holden, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ishimura, Samuel M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, Timothy M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kempf, Kenneth K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kirchoff, Rodney M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Larr, Edwin T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Leahy, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Marshall, Keith J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Matich, Joseph A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McDonald, Frederick, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Merten, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moyer, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 O'Connor, Randolph, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Olive, Kenneth A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pagan, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Provant, Delbert R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Roth, Neal A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Salvo, Joseph A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schreck, Gerald G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Shultz, Rudane E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Temple, Thomas R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tortorelli, Alfred, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Welsh, Stephen L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Woody, Ronald D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Zulaski, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx

## VETERINARY CORPS

## To be major

Barck, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bixby, Howard R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Carraway, Claude W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Depaoli, Alexander, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ebertz, Peter E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Freil, Marvin E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Godzik, Joseph R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gustin, Philip N., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hilmas, Duane E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Huxsoll, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnsen, Dennis O., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Keefe, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nix, Marvin S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ottenberg, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Riddell, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Robinson, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sims, William M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stanton, Jack S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Stephenson, Edward, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vanzytvel, William, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Via, Robert E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vodingh, Ralph A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Walker, Jerry S., xxx-xx-xxxx



## MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

## To be major

Bardill, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Beck, Wilbur L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Beckley, Leander K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bonner, Harry E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Boston, Lester E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Boyd, William M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brady, Patrick H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brewer, Jerry R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brown, Perry W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Burton, Nelson L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Carter, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cobbs, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cohen, Meyer W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Corn, Poe R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Covell, Bruce W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Crow, Kenneth E., Sr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cygan, Herbert E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Diffie, Dale P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dix, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dryden, David D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Duffy, Paul F., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Dupuy, Lloyd C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Fain, Ronald A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Fechner, Ruben F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gilchrist, Alexander, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Giroux, Arthur R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Good, Roger S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Grodt, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gutin, Howard D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Habeck, Edgar J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hanson, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Harris, Leonard G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hatfield, Earl P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hayes, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Helgeson, James G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Heller, Kyle M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Helser, Carl W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Higgs, Richard H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hill, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hoke, Mark L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hubbard, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jackson, Thomas C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jenkins, William N., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, Harry D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Jones, John P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Keim, Walter H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kelling, George H., xxx-xx-xxxx

Kennan, James S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kielman, Roger W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lampert, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lander, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lanier, Daniel, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Lavalley, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Leach, William O., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Madden, John T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McLeod, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Milske, Thomas R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Moore, Douglas E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Murphy, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Odonnell, Frank P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Osborne, Harold S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Paul, C. Peter, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Payne, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Picha, Norbert O., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pittman, Thurman M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Proe, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Roberts, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rockwell, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Roles, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rumley, Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Schiefer, Donald D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Short, Edward L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Simpson, Calbrieth, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sites, William G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Slyman, George L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sobocinski, Philip, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Summary, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Taylor, Edward J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Tuten, William R., III, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Walker, Marvin E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wilson, Jack R., II, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wilson, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Woods, William B., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Wunder, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx

## ARMY NURSE CORPS

## To be major

Allen, Nina R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Baker, Gertrude E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Balkema, Sarah A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Berry, Dorothy M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Bradley, George P., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Brown, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Campman, Keith L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Fore, Curtis W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Ghrvan, John B., xxx-xx-xxxx

Goldsmith, Marie L., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gonzales, Luis J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Gosling, Bernandine, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hawkins, Roberta W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hill, Perry J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hines, Eugene D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Huber, James O., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kamensky, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Kelley, Joan M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Martin, Melvin M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Matthews, Charles D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 McLeod, Darlene K., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Nakama, Shizuko, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pavlakovic, Dorothy, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Petro, Andrew P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rando, Joseph T., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rasmussen, Doris S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Rausch, Francis M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Reddy, Charles J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Scheerer, Marjorie, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Segura, Maria, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Seufert, Helen J., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Sinclair, Janie A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Soltys, Anthony W., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Vancamp, Maryanne, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 West, Nina, xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Whitmire, Betty A., xxx-xx-xxxx

## ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

## To be major

Brady, Barbara R., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Carmona, Louis S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Cover, Joseph D., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hamal, Fay S., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Hummel, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Johnson, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Pavlis, Patricia M., xxx-xx-xxxx  
 Walker, Hilda L., xxx-xx-xxxx

## CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate June 12, 1972:

## DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Thomas Patrick Melady, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Uganda.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## SALUTE TO EDUCATION

## HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, June 12, 1972

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, we are celebrating on June 21 a Salute to Education sponsored by the National Education Association, and as my contribution to that Salute, I wish to describe briefly the tremendous impact that several dedicated individuals in the teaching profession have had on my particular life. It would be difficult to mention all teachers during my career in public education that had a meaningful impact upon the direction my life has taken because there were many. As a matter of fact, I suppose there was no period of time in my life where more people contributed more in assisting me in selecting the course that my future life would take than was the period of public education that began for me in Antioch, Calif., continued through the elementary and secondary schools in Antioch, and after a brief interruption for service in World War II, resumed at Santa Rosa

Junior College and then the University of California at Berkeley, and culminated in my receiving my L.L.B. degree at the University of California School of Law, Boalt Hall.

But, during that long period of time, I believe the most important impressions upon me as an individual were those contacts that I had with some deeply dedicated teachers in the elementary and secondary system in Antioch.

Among those were Betsy Lull, a high school teacher brought out of retirement to teach in the Antioch school system and whom I had for world history and Latin. I acquired a love of history from Miss Lull that has not diminished since that time.

Jack Danilovich, my high school coach, and his ultimate bride, Alice Walsh, my junior high school teacher, were two individuals that have had an enormous impact upon my attitudes toward life in general and who have, in addition, remained close personal friends offering me continuous direction and assistance in any of my endeavors.

Normally you would not expect a typing teacher to contribute much towards attitudes or philosophy, but that certainly was not the case with Marion

Beede, my typing teacher in high school. Mrs. Beede did much to shape my views on a variety of attitudes toward life in general, both while I was in her class in high school as well as during the many years that have passed subsequent to those days.

Mrs. Arch Roberts was a third grade teacher of mine and inculcated in me, even at that early age, a respect for education and teachers that I possessed throughout the rest of my school days and that I possess even now as a result thereof.

Wayne Hawkins, the Dean of Boys at Antioch High School, and Mr. Swenson, my chemistry teacher, were two of the few male teachers in the public school system of those days, and their direction has meant much to me to this very day.

I do not mean to exclude by this brief list the very many other teachers and professors with whom I came in contact during my time pursuing an education, and who contributed so much to me, but there were so many that it would be awkward to attempt to list them all.

In short, Mr. Speaker, what I am attempting to say is that aside from my parents, no group of people had greater impact upon my life and the di-