

SENATE—Tuesday, December 1, 1981

(Legislative day of Monday, November 30, 1981)

The Senate met at 10 a.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Richard C. Halverson, LL.D., D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, Supreme Ruler of the Universe, Thy word declares:

Righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people.—Proverbs 14: 34.

We do not hear these words as a threat or a warning, O Lord, but as a simple statement of fact, an inviolate rule of history. Righteousness brings blessing, sin brings a curse; righteousness is constructive, sin is destructive. No civilization or empire has been able to survive the violation of this principle.

Deliver us, O God, from the presumption that we somehow are the exception, that the rule does not apply to us and can be ignored. Protect us against the false and insidious assumption that we can disregard the divine order and get away with it. Help us to see that whatever else we do, repentance for sin and turning to righteousness is the surest way out of our critical situation. Teach us that intransigence toward God's moral order is the surest way to destruction. Help us, mighty God, to take seriously Thy word to Thy glory and to our national preservation. Amen.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the standing order, the majority leader is recognized.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of the Senate be approved to date.

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

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the expiration of time allocated to the two leaders under the standing order and the four Senators under the special order entered on yesterday, there be a brief period for the transaction of routine morning business to extend not past the hour

of 11:30 a.m., in which Senators may speak for not more than 3 minutes each.

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

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1982

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, at the conclusion of morning business, what will the Chair lay before the Senate as the pending business?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senate will resume consideration of the pending business, H.R. 4995.

Mr. BAKER. Which is the defense appropriations bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is correct.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, it is the hope of the leadership that good progress can be made on the defense appropriations bill today. Senators will recall that there was some difficulty with the managers of the bill being able to handle amendments yesterday because of the delay in Senators presenting them for the consideration of the Senate. I remarked on more than one occasion yesterday that time is short. Today is the first day of December and we hope for sine die adjournment on the 18th of December, and we do not have a day to waste. I hope we can do better than that today.

I now urge all Senators to come to the floor and offer their amendments this morning. I will encourage the managers of the bill to call for third reading if amendments are not forthcoming.

Mr. President, there are other matters on the calendar that may be dealt with. There are other appropriations bills, for instance the military construction appropriations bill. There is the Small Business Act, and perhaps other matters.

If my effort to move the defense appropriations bill does not succeed, and I devoutly wish for the result that it should succeed, I am prepared, Mr. President, as much as I regret to say, to lay aside the measure and take up some other bill so we can make progress. Senators should be on notice that by early afternoon if we are not making good progress on this bill, the leadership will either ask for third reading or ask unanimous consent to temporarily lay aside this measure and proceed first to the military construction appropriations bill or perhaps the small business bill. It will be the intention of the leadership, however, to resume consideration of the Department of Defense appropriations bill either later today or as the first order of business on tomorrow.

Mr. President, it may be that I will make another statement on another subject in a moment, but at present I prefer to reserve the remainder of my time

under the standing order and I yield to the distinguished acting minority leader.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MINORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The distinguished acting minority leader is recognized.

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

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

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I yield now to the distinguished Senator from Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Hawaii.

POSTPONEMENT OF THE MATTER RELATING TO SENATOR WILLIAMS

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, according to the legislative calendar announced previously by the majority leader, the matter of the senior Senator from New Jersey is to be taken up this Thursday. For the past few weeks I have looked over the matter and I have decided to participate very actively in those proceedings. I intend to be on the floor at all times and to assure that the gentleman from New Jersey is accorded his full day in court.

In order to do that, Mr. President, I will need sufficient time to prepare myself. I do not speak as a defense counsel. I have not been asked to do that, nor am I imposing myself on the gentleman from New Jersey. But I wish to actively participate and, therefore, I will need some time.

Accordingly and most respectfully, I ask the leadership of the Senate, Mr. BAKER and Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD, to provide me sufficient time to prepare myself.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I may say that the request just made by the Senator from Hawaii is not a surprise to this Senator. Indeed, he had conveyed to me privately the substance of what he has just remarked. Yesterday, I consulted with the distinguished Senator from Hawaii and with the distinguished minority leader on this subject.

I may say, Mr. President, that there have been many suggestions or reasons why this matter should be postponed, some of them more meritorious than others. But the joint leadership has resisted any suggestions that the debate on this resolution, that is to say, Sen-

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

ate Resolution 204, as reported by the Ethics Committee, should be postponed.

I know I speak for this part of the leadership when I say that I feel the Senate has a special and powerful responsibility to deal with this constitutional duty to pass on the fitness of its Members.

The request made informally yesterday and now stated on the floor by the Senator from Hawaii is in an entirely different category. There are no Members of the Senate held in higher regard and esteem than the Senator from Hawaii. He has few peers.

I congratulate him on his decision to participate in this matter, for no one on either side of the aisle wishes to see the Senator from New Jersey without counsel or without advocates on the floor. I believe the Senator from Hawaii is undertaking an important and honorable responsibility.

In view of that, Mr. President, it is my responsibility to say that if this request is supported by the distinguished minority leader, I am prepared to accede to it and to announce that the matter will be postponed until the convening of the Senate in January.

I may say, Mr. President, that I continue to believe that the matter should be dealt with promptly and if, indeed, it is postponed, if this becomes a decision of the joint leadership, then it will be my intention to ask the Senate to turn to consideration of this resolution as one of the earliest, if not, indeed, the earliest item of business to be considered by the Senate when we reconvene in January.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I share the majority leader's view and his decision that the request that has been stated to us privately on yesterday and now publicly by the distinguished senior Senator from Hawaii be granted. It is a reasonable request. It is a logical request, it is a legitimate request.

I share the majority leader's viewpoint—I do not presume to speak for him—that legal counsel from outside the Senate should not speak on the floor of the Senate. In the final analysis, that would be a judgment for the Senate to make, of course, but I do not believe that legal counsel outside the Senate should address the Senate or ask questions of Senators or examine witnesses or cross-examine witnesses in the Senate Chamber. Legal counsel outside the Senate has not been elected to the Senate by any constituency and answers to no constituency through the political and representative process. I think that only Senators should speak to the Senate on this floor with respect to this or any other similar matter.

That is not to say, however, that Senator WILLIAMS should not have ample opportunity on the floor to speak for himself or that he should not have an advocate or advocates on the floor in the persons of other Senators.

I respect Senator INOUYE for assuming this task. I admire him and, without any reservation, I join with him in expressing to the majority leader the rightness of this course of action.

I also share the majority leader's position that the Senate should not arrange its schedule in this matter in accordance with the schedule of any court. This is not a legal proceeding which will occur in this Chamber, it is a constitutional proceeding.

It should not be equated with a legal proceeding in the sense that the accused would have witnesses, witnesses would be sworn and would speak and would be examined and cross-examined by lawyers for the defense and for the opposite side. The Senate has the responsibility under the Constitution to determine the qualifications of its own Members and to make decisions in cases of expulsion and censure and so on.

I congratulate and thank the majority leader on acceding to the request of Mr. INOUYE. I also compliment the majority leader on adhering to what he believes is the overriding prerogative and responsibility of the Senate. The Senate must reach a decision at some point in this matter. The majority leader has been most considerate in his decisions in regard to this matter. He has not rushed the Senate to judgment; he has not pressed it at all unduly. But, having the responsibility of programming the work of the Senate, having the responsibility of upholding the Senate's constitutional prerogatives and pressing for a just and reasonable decision in regard to one of the Senate's responsibilities, he has, at all times, demonstrated a clear understanding of the process and also a clear understanding of the sensitivities and the needs of Senator WILLIAMS.

He has not sought for any partisan gain. If he had pressed the Senate for a decision today or tomorrow or the next day or last week or a month ago, I think there are those who might have perceived his actions and decisions as being partisan. But he has studiously bent over backward, based on my observations, to avoid that perception. I fully support his decision, as I have supported his previous inclinations in this matter, because I think they have been right. I think they have been fully cognizant of the rights of a fellow Senator. But, also, he has kept in clear view the responsibilities of the institution.

I again express my deepest admiration for Senator INOUYE and I think that this is the right conclusion. I, therefore, yield the floor.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, may I just say that I am most grateful to the leadership for this most considerate accommodation.

Thank you very much.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Hawaii.

Mr. President, I suppose that, in many ways, the distinguished minority leader has perhaps a heavier burden of responsibility in this matter than do I.

I wish to express now to the Senate my appreciation and gratitude to him for the exemplary way in which he has conducted himself in this matter and in the innumerable meetings that have occurred between him and me as the

joint leadership. No one could have been fairer, more resolute, and more courteous than the minority leader has been in the face of this political adversity. Throughout, Mr. President, consideration of this matter has been fully and truly a bipartisan undertaking. That is not a foregone result. It could happen only with the caliber of the leadership the minority leader has brought in his role here and in his previous role as majority leader.

I remarked to the Senator from West Virginia a few days ago on the floor how fortunate I am to have been in the position he occupies as minority leader, because he knows the Senate so well and has such a feel for this institution, its traditions, and its precedents, and perhaps how unfortunate he was as majority leader to have me as minority leader for 4 years.

I freely confess, Mr. President, that he has, by reason of experience and inclination, an understanding of the Senate and the requirements of the Senate that perhaps could not be gained other than as serving in the role of majority leader.

The Senator from West Virginia has never more eloquently shown his credentials as a man of the Senate, as a distinguished Senator, than he has today, in his address with me, as the joint leadership, in this delicate but important issue.

Mr. President, I express my appreciation to him and my appreciation to the Senator from Hawaii for his careful and honorable presentation of a point of view that must be represented in the Senate as we deal with this matter.

Finally, I express my appreciation to the distinguished chairman of the Ethics Committee, Senator WALLOP, and the vice chairman, Senator HEFLIN. They have worked harder than perhaps anybody else in seeing that this matter is dealt with fairly and professionally, that they have undertaken their work with skill and dignity, and that they were fully prepared to proceed with the debate on Senate Resolution 204. It is a mark of their understanding and competence when they recognize the merit of the request made by the Senator from Hawaii and accede in the recommendation of the joint leadership. I commend them.

Mr. President, in view of the colloquy which has just transpired, I announce that the debate on Senate Resolution 204 will not occur beginning on December 3, but will be postponed until the earliest days of the next session of Congress, after sine die adjournment.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader for his kind words.

RETIREMENT FOR HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, it is with genuine regret that I learned yesterday of the decision by the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia not

to seek reelection next year. I know this was a difficult personal decision and one which must carry with it the mixed emotions of leaving an institution which has played so large a part in his family's history. The State of Virginia has been represented in the Senate by a member of the Byrd family for some 48 years. It is hard to realize that this era will be coming to a close.

Senator HARRY F. BYRD, JR., first came to the Senate in 1965, succeeding his illustrious father, Senator Harry F. Byrd. During his 15-year tenure in the Senate, HARRY BYRD, JR., has become best known as a champion of economy in Government and reduced Government spending. The Senator from Virginia has long warned that deficit spending and ambitious Federal programs are unwise, and he has remained the constant guardian of the role of States' rights in our constitutional scheme. In that, he has fashioned a truly independent role and has earned the admiration of all his Senate colleagues.

It was in 1970 that the distinguished Senator from Virginia first sought reelection as an Independent. He ran on this ticket again in 1976, winning the largest vote ever given any Virginia candidate. The people of his State knew that, above all else, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, JR., represented them and their interests. That meant his commitment to coal as a crucial domestic energy resource, his concern for the unique role of Virginia's harbors in this Nation's transportation network, and his dedication to a strong and secure America. It meant his determination that the Federal tax dollars of Virginia's citizens be wisely spent. And it meant his tireless efforts to represent his beloved State of Virginia with honor and integrity.

When the distinguished Senator from Virginia retires from the Senate, I will lose a long-time friend from the Senate. I often refer to him as my "cousin," although we are of no known relation. I will miss him. Despite his independent political views, Senator HARRY F. BYRD, JR., has always caucused with this side of the aisle, lending his wisdom to our deliberations.

So, I say again and again that I will miss him, and his Democratic colleagues will miss him.

Erma and I wish for HARRY and Gretchen God's blessings in the years ahead.

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

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I join the distinguished minority leader in his statement of regret concerning the upcoming retirement of Senator HARRY F. BYRD, JR., of Virginia.

I am sure I join every Member of the Senate when I salute Senator HARRY F. BYRD, JR., for his distinguished service and express our appreciation for his independence, for his political acuteness, and for the balanced judgment which he has contributed to the deliberations of the Senate for so many years.

More than that, Mr. President, the Senator from Virginia is a marvelous human being. On many occasions, I witnessed the warmth of that humanity permeate the most difficult and controversial debates, and that calmness and reason led to a more useful and productive result than might otherwise have been the case.

Also, he is a good friend. Many of us have visited his home in Virginia. Some of us have his apple trees in our back yard. Some of us will continue to call on him as a friend and as a political adviser for years to come. I know that the contribution of HARRY F. BYRD, JR., of Virginia, to the mainstream of the political life of this Nation will not end when his term expires in 1982; but, rather, his restless spirit and deep commitment to the welfare of this Republic will continue to make itself known and his voice heard for many years to come.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR PROXMIRE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time for the leadership has expired.

Under the previous order, the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. PROXMIRE) is recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

THE DEBT LIMIT AND THE BATTLE TO HOLD DOWN FEDERAL SPENDING

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a week ago we stumbled through the first day in American history in which the entire executive branch of the Federal Government operated without any funds. Because Congress and the President could not agree on the level of spending, we did pass a resolution a week ago Monday that postponed a decision until December 15. On or about that date we will confront almost exactly the same situation again. We may have completed and sent to the President a defense appropriations bill that will obligate us to spend about \$200 billion during the fiscal year. But we will probably have all the remaining Government spending bills pending. We could and should send all the other appropriation bills to the President by December 15, and we can and should stay here in Washington in session until we act on every spending bill even if that means we work on Christmas and New Years.

DO IT RIGHT

But, Mr. President, we should do more than simply complete this business. We should do it right. We should send the President appropriation bills that will cut spending much more deeply even than the President has asked. We must find a way to cut spending. We must slash even good, popular, and useful programs. Federal health programs, for example, have generally served an inspiring and compassionate purpose. But they have grown far faster than we can possibly afford. Twenty-one short years

ago in 1960 these programs constituted 2 percent of the budget. They now make up a fat 12 percent of a much larger budget.

We have increased our spending on these programs literally 44 fold in those brief 21 years. Consider that. We have not simply doubled or tripled or quadrupled our spending on health research and medicare and medicaid. In real terms allowing fully for inflation and in per capita terms allowing for our growth in population, we have increased this spending far more than tenfold. This year we slow the momentum a little but the cost surges on.

We should promptly agree to cut the Federal payments for medicaid by 5 percent. Chairman HARRISON SCHMITT, of the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Subcommittee, has urged that for weeks. We should limit student loans to the market rate; that is, provide the loans but eliminate the subsidy. Those two actions; particularly the medicaid cut, will save even more than the President has requested on this appropriation and almost surely assure that it could go forward forthwith and without a Presidential veto. And we should promptly get to work on welfare. We can make similar progress on other spending bills. We can and should cut the HUD budget further. In fact, if we can cut the Health and Human Services budget as I have indicated, why can we not reduce these other budgets that generally do not have as high a humanneed priority? Each reduction will require sacrifice, but this is the price we must pay for an economy with more stable prices, with reasonable interest rates that allow the homebuilding and auto and other industries to prosper and provide the job essential for the economy to function.

DEBT LIMIT—THE KEY

On September 30, when we in Congress passed the increase in the Federal debt limit, we had given ourselves \$94 billion of leeway before the debt limit expired on September 30, 1982. The Treasury has reported that as of November 24—that is about a week ago—less than 2 months later the Government had sunk another \$25 billion into debt. As of that day the national debt had reached \$1.10 trillion. They also said they did not expect to have an official projection of our debt for the remainder of the fiscal year until the President's budget report in January.

Mr. President, I call on my fellow Senators to think about these appalling figures. Far from moving toward a balanced budget, are we on the way to a \$70 or \$80 billion deficit in this fiscal year? Indeed, the way this fiscal year has begun we could easily exceed \$100 billion. And, Mr. President, I cannot think of a worse, more damaging fiscal policy. What has caused this serious recession into which we find ourselves moving? Answer: Inflation and high interest rates. And what constitutes a prime cause of inflation and especially of high interest

rates? Answer: the domination of the credit markets by the Federal Government.

WHY INTEREST RATES ARE HIGH

With a national debt in excess of a trillion dollars—one thousand billion dollars—with a looming Federal deficit meaning a one hundred billion dollars, with this huge, exploding Federal demand for credit, can there be any wonder why private investors have become convinced that once we move out of the recession, the Federal demand for credit will choke off any reviving private demand and thwart any prospect of a sustained recovery for home building and autos? Obviously, even with the best will in the world we cannot and will not balance the budget in a recession year like fiscal 1982. But we can limit the deficit this year and we can take advantage of the 1983 recovery to balance the budget then, and the debt limit offers by far the strongest way to achieve that 1983 balance.

We have arrived at the time when prudent, restrained, conservative fiscal policy will put our people to work. Can anyone reasonably argue with the fact that failure to cut spending and hold down the deficit will cut any general economic recovery short? Who will deny that with our enormous and growing Federal borrowing, high interest rates, as they did both last year and this year, will slow recovery and turn it into recession by smothering all the credit-sensitive industries into recession? So what do we need for more jobs? The precise opposite of what we needed in our deflationary, low-interest-rate environment of the 1930's. We have to do what comes hard to economists and even harder to Members of Congress who are elected or defeated based on our constancy.

CHANGE OUR THINKING

We have to change our thinking about the economy. How beautifully simple, when people need jobs: Just appropriate Federal money to put them to work. Beautiful and under some circumstances right. But when our people need housing, for example, and also need the jobs housing construction brings, and when we know that the private sector produces that housing far more efficiently than the Government can, and when the private sector does not produce housing because mortgage interest rates are too high, and when they are too high because of excessive Government spending and borrowing, then we can actually put far more to work and far more efficiently by actually reducing Federal spending than by increasing it.

This brings us to how we solve the most difficult part of this problem. It is this: Can the President persuade Congress to make the kind of sharp and prolonged reductions in spending we need to balance the budget?

Some have argued that President Reagan has had to reduce his goal of balancing the budget in order to accommodate a hostile Congress that has far less interest in a balanced budget

and far more in maintaining or increasing spending on social programs. Do you believe it? Do not. It is not true. How do I know? Here is how. President Reagan can get a balanced budget, if he wants it. And he can get it when? Precisely the year he wants it. He can force Congress to give him a balanced budget or a \$20 or \$30 or \$100 billion deficit in 1983, 1984, or 1985 or any time.

HOW PRESIDENT USES DEBT LIMIT

How can the President do all this? Answer: By using the debt limit. And here is how: The President can decide now that he will not increase the debt limit above its present \$1.79 trillion level. By the end of the current fiscal year, even with careful and conservative fiscal policies, holding down spending and with no further reduction, we will still use up almost all of the remaining \$70 billion. That would mean that if we do not increase the debt limit by next September then we will have to balance the budget in fiscal 1983 or come very close to doing so. But, you ask, why could not Congress simply pass a higher debt limit? Answer: Because the President could veto any such action by Congress and Congress could not possibly override his veto.

PRESIDENT HAS POWER

In the first place, the leaders of Congress know that the President has this capacity to stop any increase in the debt limit. They know that for them to originate such an increase and try to pass it over his objections by a majority vote would, in all likelihood, fail. They also know that if, for any reason, Congress over the President's objections succeeded in the initial passage of an increase in the debt limit, they know they could not come close to persuading two-thirds of the House of Representatives, let alone two-thirds of the Republican Senate, to vote to override the President.

Would Congress then put the Federal Government at long last on a cash, pay-as-you-go basis? Yes. And here is why:

NO ALTERNATIVE

The alternative to pay as you go would be even worse, because if Congress should continue to refuse to balance the budget, then when the Government ran out of cash it could not send out social security checks. It could not meet its obligations to pay its soldiers, sailors, and marines. It could not buy oil to keep its ships sailing, its planes flying, its tanks running. Consider the plight of the Members of Congress who refused to cut spending, or, if necessary, raise taxes to meet these vital national needs. He would thereby sign his political death warrant. And not many, in fact, probably no Members of Congress would rush out to commit political suicide.

WE DO IT OUR WAY

All this would not assure the country that Congress would balance the budget the way the President wanted it balanced. We might cut military spending more than the President desired. We might reduce the space program. We

might slash water projects. We might cut foreign aid. And we might increase taxes, possibly postpone some or all of the scheduled July 1, 1982 10-percent income tax cut. We might rescind some of the corporate tax cuts. But we would balance the budget and stop net off-budget borrowing. Interest rates would come down and, as long as we persisted in this absolute end of increasing Federal pressure on the credit markets, interest rates would stay down.

BALANCED BUDGET MEANS MORE JOBS

That would happen for two reasons. In the first place, a balanced budget plus the end of net off-budget borrowing by the Federal Government would mean, as compared with 1981, more than \$100 billion of reduction in Federal borrowing.

Second, for the first time in many years the Federal Government would actually borrow less than in the preceding year.

Third, and most important of all, balancing the Federal budget and the adoption of a pay-as-you-go approach by the Federal Government would provide the vital psychological basis for an effective war against both inflation and high interest rates. With this firm, conservative fiscal policy in place—demonstrated—not by rhetoric but by a balanced budget, investors would have a solid basis for believing that the Federal Government at long last meant business about fighting inflation.

THE HARD SELL

But can we fight recession by slowing Government spending and possibly increasing taxes? Doesn't this run smack into the conventional wisdom that has governed this country for 50 years? Whatever psychological faith Americans may have in a balanced budget was not their belief that in a recession the Government should increase spending and cut taxes overwhelm it? And would any attempt to balance the budget in the coming year not only fail in the light of 8-percent unemployment but while failing, at the same time, aggravate and prolong the recession? Let us recognize that as of now we cannot and will not balance the budget in 1982. But we can and should balance the budget in 1983.

A DIFFERENT RECESSION

Second, we must realize that this recession differs sharply from other recessions in the following respects: First, we still suffer from extraordinarily high interest rates, especially long term mortgage rates which remain close to a devastating 16 percent. This key economic fact accounts for half or more of our present unemployment. Any expansionary fiscal policy—more Federal spending or deficit—causing tax cuts—that push this rate up will push more people out of jobs than it can employ; second, we still suffer from powerful inflationary pressures. Any spending or tax measures that increase the deficit will aggravate that inflation, and destroy the faith of consumers, savers, investors that they can count on a gradual, steady reduction in

inflation; third, potential demand for houses and autos has become enormous. Consumer income remains high. Economic recovery can become strong and sustained when people become confident that we have really begun to get inflation under control and interest rates have come down to stay.

FISCAL RESTRAINT: THE ANSWER

For each of these three reasons—because unlike previous recessions we have super-high interest rates, continued inflationary pressure and a potential demand that above all needs to find faith in a policy of fiscal restraint—the balanced budget not in 1982 but in 1983 constitutes the best policy we can follow out of this recession. Selling that policy in the teeth of the recession will be like selling a deep freeze to an impoverished Eskimo family at the Arctic Circle. It is going to be tough. We have to overcome a habit engrained by two generations of steady, unremitting, knee-jerk, increase-spending as the reaction to unemployment. We have to face the grim fact that increased spending will deepen and lengthen unemployment by keeping interest rates and inflation high and rising. And we cannot wait until late 1982 or 1983 after we start recovering to put a fiscal policy in place. We must act now and stick with it.

But the key to all is the will of the President to use the debt limit to balance the budget in 1983.

REMINDERS OF THE PAST

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the latest work of Russian author Varlam Shalamov has just been published and was reviewed this past Sunday by Clarence Brown in the Washington Post's "Book World."

Shalamov's work has been given the English title *Graphite*. It consists of 31 short stories describing his experiences in Russian concentration camps. It is not pleasant reading, but it is important for anyone who wishes to better understand how life was in the Stalinist death camps of the 1930's, 1940's and 1950's.

These stories take place in the camps of Kolyma, a Siberian region infamous for its slave operated gold mines. Here the author eked out his existence for 17 years, living the terrible experiences he recounts for us in his book.

His themes revolve around man's ability to forget. Shalamov treats this ability in one sense as a much-admired feat and, at the same time, as a great tragedy. These men forgot, in order to cope. They forgot their wives, their children, their former lives of happiness. Their sole preoccupation is to survive. In the process they also forgot they are men.

As Brown points out in his review, these men are saddled with the excusable desire to go on living. So they accommodate themselves to a world of thieves, learn their language and do whatever they must to survive.

Mr. President, in this environment

human dignity is an early casualty and human life follows soon after. It is estimated that between 20 to 30 million Russians perished in these camps. Those that survived suffer permanent scars.

We are lucky that Varlam Shalamov survived. His writings remind us of the need to protect man's basic human rights. Most basic, of course, is the right to live. It transcends all political, social, or economic rights man could hope to enjoy. Yet to this day, Mr. President, we have not ratified a treaty designed to guarantee the right to live. We have avoided action on the Genocide Convention for over three decades.

Why, Mr. President? Have we forgotten a heritage whose foundation rests on the natural rights of man? Have we forgotten the misery of untold millions who have perished in the most horrible of manner? If we have forgotten, Mr. President, there will be other Shalamovs in the future to remind us—for this problem will not disappear.

As the leader of the free world—we cannot forget—if this convention is ever to have any meaningful effect. Therefore, I strongly urge my colleagues to ratify the Genocide Convention.

Mr. President, I yield the remainder of my time to the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON) who will be on the floor in just a moment.

RECOGNITION OF SENATOR EAGLETON

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON) is recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes and 58 seconds.

ON PROVIDING FOR THE NATIONAL DEFENSE

THE REAGAN PROPOSAL

Mr. EAGLETON. Mr. President, the Founding Fathers entrusted the responsibility of providing for our Nation's defense to the Congress. At no time in history has this responsibility been more crucial to our well-being than it is today. It has become a regrettable fact of life that every year the Congress appropriates more funding for peacetime war preparation than any other nation in history. No matter what the outcome of the debate on the defense appropriations bill now before us, this year will prove no exception.

Even in the early post-Vietnam years, when antidefense sentiment ran high, President Carter—who was elected in part because of his pledge to reduce defense expenditures—provided for real growth in defense programs in every year of his administration. In his final budget submission to Congress, he—like his successor—proposed massive increases in defense spending in fiscal year 1982. All of this notwithstanding, the size of the defense spending proposal that we debate today is unprecedented.

President Reagan, if he has his way, will spend a staggering \$1.6 trillion on defense over the next 5 years. This

equates to almost \$1 billion a day or about \$34 million every hour. His program will cost the average American taxpayer about \$10,800 over the 5-year period at a time when most Americans are finding it difficult to make ends meet.

A strengthened national defense is a clear part of President Reagan's November mandate, and all of us are aware of the need to respond to the continuing Soviet military buildup by sensible increases in defense spending—particularly in the area of conventional preparedness and readiness. Yet even as a general consensus remains about the need to strengthen our defenses, major areas of dispute continue to surface about the economic pitfalls of pursuing a massive buildup at this time.

Any earnest attempt to improve our defense capabilities must be based on a sound, realistic evaluation of the ever-changing "threat" environment. The true measure of our Nation's defense posture is how well it meets our national need, not how much it costs. As the leader of free-world nations, America must have a military capability that will effectively deter aggression by our enemies, this we do not get by throwing money about indiscriminately. During last year's election campaign, Republican candidates got a good deal of mileage out of accusing Democrats of committing this mistake in addressing domestic problems. The tables are now turned, but the stakes are substantially higher.

DAVID STOCKMAN ON FRAUD, WASTE, AND ABUSE IN THE PENTAGON

It has been clear for some time that the President's principal thought about defense spending is that we need more hardware. He was prepared to throw as much money at the problem as the generals and admirals wanted. The Pentagon was posted "strictly off-limits" to the administration's fraud, waste and abuse hunters.

In his *Atlantic Monthly* interviews OMB Director David Stockman expressed his frustration at the willingness of the President to overlook the massive waste involved in defense spending. He acknowledged that OMB had taken only a cursory glance at the proposed defense budget. He recognized, as he put it:

There's a kind of swamp of \$10 to \$20 to \$30 billion worth of waste that can be ferreted out if you really push hard.

Later in the same interview, Stockman described the problem of Pentagon spending as "blatant inefficiency, poor deployment of manpower (and) contracting idiocy."

Mr. Stockman's revelations have been widely disparaged by administration spokesmen as the indiscretions of an overworked young man. Not a word has been said about the substance of Mr. Stockman's comments. There has been no effort to deny his charges; no attempt to refute his account of White House budget making. The reason, I think, is simple. What Mr. Stockman said about indiscriminately showering tax dollars on the Pentagon without the

smallest effort to assure that the money is well spent is absolutely true.

A few days ago, this President was so anxious to demonstrate his commitment to reduce Federal spending that he was willing to close down the Government over a small dispute about spending for domestic programs. But, this same tight-fisted "watchdog of the Treasury" quietly hands a blank check to the Pentagon to spend and waste as much as it wants.

I think it is time this administration leveled with the American people and faced up to the enormous problem of waste in defense spending.

THE ABSENCE OF A CLEAR DEFENSE STRATEGY

From the outset of the Reagan Presidency, there has been no shortage of White House and Pentagon rhetoric in support of the President's enormous rearmament program. In contrast, there has been scant justification of what purpose the purported additional military capability will serve. Throughout his quest for the Presidency, Mr. Reagan strongly criticized the ideas and assumptions that have governed American defense planning from the outset of the Truman administration. In a recent column, Robert Scheer of the Los Angeles Times observed:

The emphasis of the new administration seems to be less one of preserving a delicate post-World War II peace and more that of preparing for a possible World War III.

Candidate Reagan called for the renegotiation of the SALT II Treaty. He took the hard line position that further progress in arms control could only be linked to a decrease of Soviet global adventurism. He criticized what he termed one-sided détente policies and he took exception to unilateral U.S. concessions in the area of trade, technology transfer, grain sales, and arms control.

Since moving into the White House, President Reagan has failed to articulate a clear, comprehensive alternative to the policies of past administrations.

True modernization and improvement of our military deterrent must be based on realistic assumptions. Valid Pentagon contingency planning must necessarily rely on a firm, coherent statement of domestic and foreign policy. Rhetoric alone is not enough. For instance, America must be prepared for more than an all-out strategic nuclear exchange or a short, high-intensity war in Europe. Today, a far more likely threat to our national security comes from the turbulent Persian Gulf region. That is not to say that the Soviet Union does not remain of paramount concern.

THE NEED TO RESUME ARMS CONTROL NEGOTIATIONS AND CURTAIL FOREIGN MILITARY SALES

In recent days, President Reagan took the first step toward rectifying his disturbing inattention to the most pressing issue facing mankind today: the containment and control of nuclear weapons. It took the President a full 10 months to present his views and he did so, in part, in response to the mounting pressure brought about by the growing

European peace movement. I applaud the President's statement but, as the New York Times pointed out, "A speech is not a policy."

The true test of the policy espoused will be the vigor with which the administration pursues the precepts of President Reagan's speech initially at Geneva in the negotiations over theater nuclear weapons in Europe and subsequently in negotiations with the Soviets over limiting strategic nuclear weapons.

Nuclear arms control is not just an issue for liberals and Democrats; to illustrate this, I offer the following comments of three leading conservatives:

Senators JAKE GARN and PAUL LAXALT: The U.S. should make every effort to negotiate an equitable and verifiable strategic nuclear offensive arms reduction agreement with the Soviet Union at the earliest possible date. Such an agreement must contribute to the security of both countries by reducing the dimensions of their strategic arsenals, particularly in those weapons which constitute first-strike counterforce systems.

JAMES J. KILPATRICK: When will we and the Soviets come mutually to our senses? When will all the imperiled peoples of this earth rise up, and through their leaders demand that this insanity be stopped?

No problem in our lifetimes—not energy, not water, not race relations, not the trivial perplexities of politics and budgets—no problem cries so urgently for solution as the problem of atomic arms. . . .

The bombs we dropped upon Japan . . . were the merest Model T's. The mind of man cannot conceive the destructive power of today's atomic missiles. We are talking of great cities wiped out in fractions of a second, of millions dead and other millions maimed, of a massive radioactive fallout spread by winds around the world. In such a war there would be no victory; there would be survival only—and survival in an unimaginable land in which civilized humans would fight like savages for the means of existence.

While certainly the most pressing concern, containment of nuclear weapons is not the only focus of attention in the area of arms control. At a most delicate time in world history, the Reagan administration has displayed a disturbing trend toward enhancing the U.S. leadership role in exporting arms abroad. Nowhere is this better illustrated than in the sale of AWACS and other arms to the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

Approval of the \$8.5 billion arms package to the Saudis constituted the largest foreign weapons sale in history. I opposed the sale for numerous reasons. I still do not believe it will do anything to enhance Saudi security; rather, I believe it will increase local tension by destabilizing the military balance in the region, jeopardize the Middle East peace process, and ultimately endanger American security interests. Nevertheless, the sale is behind us and I can only hope that future events will prove my misgivings unfounded.

The Saudi sale is only the most notable example. Now before the Senate is a proposal to sell F-16's to Pakistan. This \$1.1 billion transaction narrowly survived a 10 to 7 vote in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee; nevertheless, it survives and will probably be approved. Be-

sides my concern over the propriety of selling such sophisticated weaponry to a developing nation, I fear that it may send just the wrong signal to the government of General Zia at a time when we are lobbying his government to desist its efforts to produce an atomic bomb.

The traffic in international arms has reached a truly frightening level; the United States must not be the leading wholesaler if we are to be credible in our efforts to reduce global tensions.

If we are going to reassert ourselves in the role as the spokesman of free world nations, we must first resume serious nuclear arms control negotiations with the Soviets and curtail the excessive exportation of weapons abroad.

THE REAGAN STRATEGIC REVITALIZATION PROGRAM: BUILD THE B-1 AND PROCEED WITH MX DEVELOPMENT

After months of deliberation and delay, the President unveiled his five-point program to revitalize America's strategic forces. In addition to placing the MX missile in existing, hardened silos in the Midwest, it calls for developing a variant of the B-1 bomber. Under this plan we would deploy 100 MX missiles and build 100 so-called B-1B's—with the first squadron to be deployed by the end of 1986.

The Reagan decision to build the B-1 is based, in part, on his belief that the earlier decision to rely on converted B-52's in the 1980's and develop the advanced technology—or Stealth—bomber for the 1990's was risky given the age and vulnerability of the B-52 force.

But at issue is the penetrating capability of the B-1. In open testimony, Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger has made it clear that the B-1 will have little, if any, penetration capability by the year 1990.

Soviet air defenses, by any measure, are the best in the world. The Soviet national air defense system boasts more than 500,000 individuals manning some 2,500 interceptors and 12,000 SAM's at more than 1,000 separate sites. Nonetheless, as impressive as this system is, it is not wholly effective against low-flying aircraft and high-speed ballistic missiles. Development and deployment of the radar-evading stealth technology and the cruise missile will go a long way toward mitigating this Soviet advantage: nothing short of this will.

The decision on the manned bomber is basically a choice between cruise missile platforms. We can build the B-1, as President Reagan suggests, for a total program cost of possibly \$36 billion; but to be effective it will have to carry the cruise missile.

The alternative is to proceed with upgrading the B-52 force as President Carter proposed. The B-52 fleet is already undergoing such an upgrading; a complete conversion can be expected by 1988. The first aircraft will be completely fitted out this fall and a squadron of 15 aircraft will be on station by the end of 1982. By 1988, 172 of these planes will be carrying 20 cruise missiles each if the program proceeds as planned.

It makes little sense to go ahead with the B-1 when what is needed is the Stealth bomber. Better we continue with the B-52 conversion than risk losing Stealth through a B-1 drain on the budget now.

Likewise, there are reasons why basing the MX in hardened Titan silos may be the least desirable means of shoring up our strategic forces. Foremost among them is the obvious fact that if the Soviets do attack on any scale, the results could be particularly damaging. The inevitable fallout would wreak havoc across a large portion of the United States. Some projections estimate that as many as 100 million people would require relocation from areas that would remain radioactive for generations to come. Large agricultural and energy producing regions would be contaminated for decades if not totally abandoned.

Plans for a new land-based missile program have been on the drawing board for years. In September 1979, President Carter proposed that we build a "race-track" version featuring a multiple protective structure (MPS) basing mode. He chose this over some 30-odd other alternatives such as air-launched MXs, a "trench" system, and vertical silos. Carter argued that the MPS system would "do the best job" noting that it was compatible with the then-pending SALT II Treaty and would keep the Soviets from attacking since, under SALT, they would not have enough warheads to effectively kill all 4,600 of the proposed MX shelters.

President Reagan has decided to "narrow the window of vulnerability" by putting this newest and most accurate missile in our most vulnerable hole, the present Titan hole. In my opinion, there is no way to adequately harden the Titan hole to protect it as the new receptacle for the MX.

What the President's decision does do is to enhance our first-strike capability against the Soviet Union. This may warm the hearts of America's super-hawks, but will chill the minds of the Soviet Union's generals and possibly put those generals on a nuclear war hair-trigger. Seventy percent of the Soviet Union's missile force is land based—as contrasted with the United States roughly one-third land, one-third air, and one-third sea. The MX missile in the old Titan hole poses a potential first-strike threat to the heart of the Soviet missile system and thus risks greater United States/Soviet destabilization.

Further, the placement of the MX in the vulnerable Titan hole makes presumed sense from an American retaliatory point of view only if we pretend to protect that Titan hole with a point-site ABM. Thus, if the President gets his way on placing the MX in the Titan hole, he will in time then seek to abrogate the ABM treaty between ourselves and the Soviets. But do we need an ABM system?

In an editorial in the respected Strategic Review, retired Rear Adm. Arthur Metcalf argues that—

Nothing has been put forward which technologically supports the belief that we (or the Soviets) could, with any degree of confidence, expect to hit one silo at ICBM range, let alone 1,000 of them distributed over an area equal to one-third of the United States.

From this standpoint, an ABM system would be no more than symbolism.

There seems no end to the number of respected commentators and military experts who have voiced various concerns about the MX. I offer the following sampling:

Columnist JAMES J. KILPATRICK: The Pentagon budget drips with fat. In the MX missile system, beloved of the generals, the taxpayers face the biggest boondoggle of all time—a \$60 or \$70 billion squandering of public funds.

Former Defense Intelligence Agency Director and Co-Chair of Coalition for Peace Through Strength, General DANIEL GRAHAM: The problem is that MX is the grotesque child of bad strategy. It's grotesque to take a missile that's designed for counterforce—that is, to hit certain of the most dangerous Soviet weapons before they can hit you—and then deploy it in a system that is supposed to absorb all the effects of those weapons before you fire. That's a grotesquery, from a military standpoint.

And then to put \$50-\$60 billion into that grotesquery is absolutely stupid. The MX deployment scheme should be rejected, not because it's going to endanger the pronghorn antelope or the desert tortoise, but because it is the final offspring of very bad strategy.

Major General W. T. FAIRBOURN of the U.S. Marine Corps, Former Senior Strategic Planner with the U.S. Joint Chiefs of Staff: To continue with the deployment of a system that is already vulnerable, that cannot be fully deployed for 10 years, that cannot accomplish its mission when deployed, that increases the attractiveness of the United States as a target; while failing to investigate reasonable concepts such as presented herein in the author's judgment strategic lunacy.

Former C.I.A. Director STANSFIELD TURNER: I believe the MX project as presently conceived is a serious mistake . . . There is little time left to reverse the momentum of the MX. A dramatic commitment by the new Administration will be needed to accomplish such a reversal, and the key word is 'commitment.' There are great vested and parochial interests in the military and in industry that are intent upon going ahead with the project. But the United States cannot let such interests dictate the course of its security, and indeed, the security of the world. A new program is needed to correct the strategic imbalance—to the extent that it does exist—but, especially, to correct the perception that the United States itself has generated, that it is falling behind. Thus, a prompt but thorough review of where the MX may be taking us, as well as what alternatives there are to the MX, is crucial to America's long-term security.

General MAXWELL TAYLOR: Thus far, it is my opinion that the proponents of the MX have not made a convincing case either as to the need for a new weapons system to replace our silo-based ICBMs or as to the claims of the MX as the preferred replacement. On these issues, I would need to be convinced that, during the next decade, there is a strong probability that the Soviets will launch a surprise attack upon our ICBMs, despite the risk of incurring a destructive retaliation in response. There must also be reason to believe that such an attack would destroy most of the ICBMs. I am un-

convinced on both points and would give a very low probability rating to this threat.

Dr. SEYMOUR ZEIBERG, Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering, Office of Technology Assessment: This (MX basing options) is a question of what is the least rotten apple in a barrel of rotten apples. We see that all available modes of basing MX pose serious problems . . . None of them is without serious risks, high cost, important uncertainties, or significant drawbacks.

WILLIAM H. GREGORY, Editor-in-Chief, Aviation Week and Space Technology: The Air Force wishes deep down the MX would go away, just as the Navy wishes Trident would. Babysitting a motionless tube in a hole in the ground or in the confines of a submerged submarine at sea for months at a time has little career appeal. It is a factor in the retention problem that both services have.

A recent New York Times article on the subject of the Reagan strategic program quoted "well-placed" administration officials as saying that Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger and others—especially OMB officials—would not be upset if the Congress voted to delay plans to base the MX in hardened silos, but suggested that the administration would fight a little harder to save the B-1 program. But, one acknowledged that the White House is now wedded to the proposed timetable of either program. Deferring the MX basing decision and cancelling the B-1 would go a long way towards reducing a deficit now growing out of control. In addition, such an action would not jeopardize our overall defense posture.

One official, noting that Secretary Weinberger had not promised a decision on the MX basing mode until 1984, said:

You'd have to be awfully naive if you thought that date just fell out of the sky.

CONVENTIONAL FORCES: BEEFING UP THE RAPID DEPLOYMENT FORCE (RDF)

Even more critical a challenge to improving our Nation's military capabilities than putting a new face on our strategic arsenal is properly addressing the documented deficiencies in our conventional force structure. For the Reagan administration, this means developing the RDF; it is a strategy of growing controversy. Only three things can be said about the RDF today with certainty: it is not rapid; it is not deployed; and it is not a force.

On January 20, 1980, during the annual state of the Union address, President Carter announced the so-called "Carter Doctrine" and spelled out a specific U.S. policy toward the troubled Persian Gulf region. With it he gave birth to the RDF mission.

In President Carter's words:

Any attempt by any outside forces to gain control of the Persian Gulf region will be regarded as an assault on the vital interests of the United States of America, and such an assault will be repelled by any means necessary, including military force.

Initially created by Presidential Directive 18, in August 1977, the RDF was envisioned to be principally an army force of about 100,000 strong under direct control of the Army Chief of Staff.

The principal justification for creating this quick strike capability was to preserve the all-important Persian Gulf shipping lanes. No doubt that the timing of the decision was affected by the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and it was issued as a warning to the Soviets that the United States intends to deter any form of intervention—specifically in the Middle East and Persian Gulf region. But the RDF has yet to prove itself a deterrent.

In the fall of 1980, in a test of the RDF's capabilities, it took a disappointing 6 days to complete the movement of a 900-man infantry battalion from the United States to Egypt. This is a far cry from the stated goal.

In his book, "The Rapid Deployment Force, and U.S. Military Intervention in the Persian Gulf," Jeffrey Record, a critic, charges:

The RDF is little more than a hodgepodge of improperly equipped and structured units lumped together under a confused command apparatus rent by unusually vicious and debilitating inter-service rivalry for domination of the rapid deployment mission.

He and others claim that it will take at least 5 years and another \$25 billion to field a force capable of combating large-scale aggression in the Persian Gulf region.

If there were a challenge to the security of the Persian Gulf oil fields, for instance, it is estimated that we would need three Army divisions, four air wings of 72 planes each, a Marine amphibious force of 50,000 men, and two carrier task forces on hand; the RDF of today is not equal to the challenge.

Notwithstanding the fact that the Reagan administration has budgeted an extra \$2.5 billion for the RDF in fiscal years 1981 and 1982, many critics continue to argue that the developing force is still too oriented toward a Soviet take-over of the area, an area in which the United States would be unable to counter trouble caused by indigenous forces.

A Library of Congress study on the subject estimated that it would take the United States a full 10 days to transport just the 82d Airborne, its ammunition, and a 5-day supply of rations and fuel to the Persian Gulf. This does not include the tactical air wings the 82d would need for ground support.

The most serious problem confronting RDF planners is a serious shortage of airlift capability. Today, we must rely on the Air Force's fleet of 77 C-5's and 234 C-141's. The standard C-5 requires a runway of at least 5,000 feet—a rare item in most parts of the world; in addition, the C-141's are not capable of carrying our larger equipment, such as the M-1 tank. Regrettably, plans to buy a fleet of McDonnell-Douglas C-17's—the CX—have all but been abandoned. Unless changed, this apparent decision will leave the United States with a growing inventory of out-sized equipment and no effective means of transport: it.

If we are going to proceed with plans to field a force that we can rapidly project and subsequently support from a distance, we must enhance our airlift

capability. In addition, we must increase the training time of our forces so as to improve the mobility of both troops and equipment. We must buy more ammunition and spare parts for our equipment. These programs are not glamorous and do not receive a great deal of attention; nevertheless, they are nothing short of essential. Finally, we must work more closely with our allies to increase the leverage of our respective military strengths and defense investments.

GLOBAL COMMITMENTS: SHARING THE BURDEN

Senator SAM NUNN said it best during consideration of this year's Defense authorization bill: "A bipartisan consensus supporting increased defense spending currently exists," but that the consensus could dissolve unless Congress is satisfied that the "spending priorities are being established within the context of a coherent national strategy." The problem we face is determining what direction to take. Many defense analysts argue that a military reorganization by the United States and its NATO allies could vastly increase the West's conventional defense capability without a large increase in costs. One such approach would be a shift in the balance of roles, with the United States increasing its naval and air defense contributions to NATO and Europe increasing ground roles.

This arrangement would go a long way toward alleviating the horrifying economic problems encountered by enlisted personnel and their dependents living in Europe and would significantly reduce the bitter exchanges we are having with our allies over the matter of NATO burden sharing.

During floor debate on the authorization bill, I spoke to this particular issue.

Burden sharing is defined as "the fair distribution of political, manpower, material and economic costs of maintaining our alliance posture." Today, relations between the United States and her major allies—the NATO countries and Japan—are strained by a basic disagreement over what constitutes a "fair distribution" of defense responsibilities.

In May 1977, the Carter administration proposed a new "long-term defense program" for NATO. The keystone of this proposal called on the NATO nations to pledge to increase defense expenditures to achieve real growth on the magnitude of 3 percent per annum. In May 1977, NATO defense ministers issued a communique that embraced the call to increase defense expenditures and stated that such increases "should be in the region of 3 percent recognizing that for some individual countries: Economic circumstances will affect what can be achieved."

A Library of Congress review of the performance of the Allies in meeting this objective during 1979 and 1980 produced mixed results. Only three countries met or exceeded the 3-percent goal. Luxembourg, 9.9 percent; United States, 3.6 percent; and Portugal, 3.2 percent.

Denmark's performance was rated so poorly—and planning for 1981 included so many reductions in defense efforts—

that the term "Denmarkization" came to be used to characterize wealthy democracies with extensive social welfare programs, which in times of limited economic growth, cut defense efforts.

Burden sharing is not a new issue. It has been with us for years. Virtually every Secretary of Defense in the past 10 years has discussed this American concern in testimony before Congress.

A decade ago, then Secretary of Defense Clark Clifford testified before the Congress that:

We are acutely aware and seriously concerned that maintaining large numbers of U.S. troops in Europe has caused a considerable budgetary strain and has contributed to a substantial deficit in the U.S. balance of payments. In this regard, we have pressed upon our allies the need for them to do more for their own defense. We have long felt that, by almost every measure, the tremendous growth in the economies of our European allies has not been accompanied by a commensurate increase in their respective contributions to the common defense.

A major U.S. role in the defense of Europe and Japan was warranted in the early post-World War II era when our allies were weak economically and had fragile political structures; but the economic and political maturity of the allies now suggests that they should play an increasingly more responsive role in providing for the common defense.

Under the protective shield of the United States, European countries and Japan have been able to modernize their industrial plants. The U.S. industrial base is, on average, considerably older than those of Europe and Japan. This gives a competitive advantage to our allies in matters of international trade.

The increased threat of Soviet aggression in the European theater mandates increases in allied defense spending. If the United States is going to make sacrifices to take the lead in this effort, the Europeans and Japanese should be encouraged to follow.

To date, America's efforts to convince our allies to increase expenditures and share a greater portion of support costs have been disappointing. It is evident that our efforts have failed to convey the message that increased participation is of critical importance. A clearer message is obviously needed.

SOME NEW THOUGHTS ON SOME OLD PROBLEMS:
THE WORK OF SPINNEY AND BOYD

A considerable amount of attention is currently being paid to a small school of so-called "military reformers" who are characterized as espousing the theme that "America's defense is not giving value for the money and needs 'more bang for the buck'." The basic contention of this group is that U.S. military hardware tends to be too sophisticated, too complicated, too unreliable, and too expensive.

In the coming 5 years, the President proposes that the Congress fund the MX, the B-1 bomber, and a new generation Trident missile. The emphasis is clearly on weapons procurement and will be to the exclusion of the other key elements of a balanced defense posture. That is not

to say that vast sums have not already been expended building the most technologically sophisticated war machine ever. Make no mistake about it, in their respective classes, our front line weaponry is the world's finest, notwithstanding its shortcomings. But, weapons superiority did not prevail in Vietnam and there are those who would contend that it will never suffice in future conflicts.

Nowhere is this warning sounded louder than in an impressive pair of studies conducted by two analysts of the Secretary of Defense's program evaluation staff—his in-house think tank. Between them, John Boyd and Chuck Spinney have put together a two-session, 7-hour presentation of their material.

To my knowledge, I am the only Senator who has taken the time to attend both sessions of their briefing; I would strongly urge my colleagues to take advantage of their availability. According to the two, military conflict can generally be distilled to three basic ingredients: Manpower, weaponry, and strategy.

Boyd, in his work entitled, "Patterns of Conflict," focuses on the role of strategy and manpower in the mixture. His research and his conclusions are persuasive. Beginning with the battle of Marathon (490 B.C.) and working his way forward, Boyd points out that in a surprising number of historical engagements, superior military forces succumbed to the surprise, deception, and confusion tactics employed by a weaker opponent. Despite numerical disadvantages, successful commanders have effectively employed strategy to achieve lethal leverage over adversaries.

Perhaps the most interesting note of Boyd's historical perspective is that although military strategy remains a developing yet imprecise science, the general body of theory upon which it relies has been with us since the Chinese master Sun Tzu gave us his "The Art of War" treatise around 400 B.C.

The point to be made is that although warfare has changed dramatically since then, the basic principles of engagement have not. For that matter, evolution notwithstanding, little has changed concerning the role of the individual. As always, the foot soldier does little more than employ the weaponry available to him in the manner prescribed by his superiors. What has changed dramatically, though, is the weaponry itself. Technological breakthroughs continue to insure that our Armed Forces have the advantage of superior firepower over all adversaries.

We had such superior firepower when we went into Southeast Asia; we did not return the victors. There is still no consensus on the matter of the Vietnam war, but numerous defense experts have questioned the suitability of the weapons we employed given the nature of that guerrilla war.

Evidence continues to mount that the Defense Department's preoccupation with state-of-the-art technology has led us to develop weapon systems that are increasingly more costly and of very

questionable reliability under battle conditions.

Chuck Spinney, in his work entitled, "Defense Facts of Life," explores the matter of "high-tech" complexity in weaponry—particularly as it has affected Air Force tactical aviation.

Building on the work of a former Pentagon analyst, Mr. Pierre Sprey, Spinney has analyzed the variance in the Defense budget over the past 30 years. He approached the subject with an eye toward a better understanding of how budgets have changed in the past and to better project how procurement planning will respond to future, but unforeseen, changes.

What his study dramatically depicts is that in the years of measured defense increases, funding has been disproportionately distributed between investment in weaponry and operation and maintenance accounts. While we have vigorously pursued the promise of technological achievements, we have neglected our inventories, facilities, and—most importantly—our people. While we have built a large tactical air force, we have systematically cut back the training of pilots, the replenishment of spare parts inventories, and aircraft maintenance.

All the time, the costs of providing for the national defense are rising. As vital operation and maintenance programs take a back seat to weapons procurement, the rising cost of these programs tends to decrease overall readiness.

In Spinney's words:

This pattern reflects a tendency to reduce our current readiness to fight in order to modernize for the future; however, because of rising operating costs, the price of even low readiness is rising inexorably over the long-term. We will see this as happening despite a long-term decline in the overall quantity of people and equipment. Moreover, modernization is being slowed and forces are declining because (a) the cost of replacement is increasing and (b) because the long-term budget constraint has made it necessary to squeeze total investment growth in order to relieve the unavoidable long-term growth pressures in the O&S and Retirement accounts.

We have uncovered a pattern of destructive growth—when some parts of the whole start growing faster than the whole itself, they start eating up the remaining parts. One could think of this as a form of organizational cancer. The short-term strategy of trying to hold down growth in the O&S account to pump growth into the investment account does not cure the problem because although we have been able to hold O&S growth to a level approximating overall growth, we have reduced force size and we are accumulating a current readiness bill (in terms of deferred people and material costs) that is not reflected in the budget data. Sooner or later, this bill will have to be paid.

This pattern of behavior can be expected to continue as long as costs, particularly operating costs, grow faster than the budget.

The Spinney study drives home three significant points. First of all, budget growth, by itself, is not a solution to our defense problems and may, in fact, exacerbate an already difficult situation. Second, the current plans for historically unprecedented growth displays the same unrealistic pumping up investment—the

same pattern that in the past has failed to yield increased readiness over the long term. Finally—and most importantly—Spinney points out that we will continue to suffer the undesirable consequences of increasing technological complexity if we continue to pursue the course of action implied in the Reagan defense proposals.

The message of the Spinney briefing is indeed disturbing. An obsession with high technology has led Pentagon planners to create a lineage of weapons in which each succeeding generation of weapons costs between 2 and 10 times more in constant dollars than its predecessors. Acknowledging that constant increases will always be a fact of life, statistical analysis indicates that no "practical" amount of spending can match the trend in increasing per unit costs. Norman Augustine, vice president of Martin Marietta puts it this way:

From the days of the Wright brothers through the F-18, aircraft costs have been increasing by a factor of four every ten years. If the trend continues, in the 2054, the entire defense budget will purchase just one tactical aircraft. This aircraft will have to be shared between the Air Force and the Navy, three and a half days per week.

The F-16 presents a good example of a weapon system that has grown in complexity and cost over time. The constant dollar cost of the aircraft has grown strikingly since it was initially priced out in 1972. Much of the cost growth is attributed to increasing complexity of the aircraft and its changing mission.

To quote from Spinney:

What started off as an austere high performance within visual range air-to-air fighter will be transformed by the later 1980s into a lower performance radar missile air-to-air fighter with avionics intended to attack ground targets in night or adverse weather. These increases in the complexity of the F-16 imply downstream cost and supportability consequences that were not imagined when the decision was made to develop the F-16 in 1972—consequences that, although still imperfectly understood, we will have to live with in the year 2000.

According to the Spinney findings, the rising costs and complexity of our tactical aviation programs has had a profound impact on equipment inventories and the effect is likely to grow in magnitude. According to his research, some tactical aircraft programs have experienced cost increases of between 30 and 40 percent. This has occurred at a time when the total inventory of American fighter planes has fallen off from 18,000 to about 7,000. Since the midfifties, our substantial inventory of proven aircraft have been retired and are being replaced by smaller numbers of more complex and expensive planes.

As James Fallows points out in an Atlantic article entitled, "High Tech Weaponry—Why More Money Is Buying America Less Defense," the growing cost of complex weapons is not a phenomenon unique to aircraft procurement. It is shared by every weapons system now in production or development. Pentagon designers have so successfully pushed increased technology as the solution to American defense woes, that the cost of

any new weapon is predestined to rise irrespective of increased efficiency or reliability.

In an attempt to put the magnitude of such cost increases into perspective, Fallows offers that, in constant dollars, the M-1 tank today will cost more than seven times as much as did the World War II Sherman tank, and the next nuclear aircraft carrier will cost five times as much as its World War II counterpart.

Of course, rapidly escalating costs cannot be looked at in a vacuum. They must be evaluated against the value of the high technology weaponry we are producing. But here, too, the message is sobering. Thus far, "more complex" has not meant "better". Too often, "more complex" has meant either "not combat-ready" or "still in production".

Reports by the General Accounting Office have frequently focused on reliability of high-technology weapons. For example, in a letter to Secretary Weinberger dated January 21, 1981, Comptroller General Elmer Staats noted:

We believe that the sophistication of many weapons systems deployed today is one of the contributing factors that has led to budget problems, inventory short falls, and a low state of readiness for certain combat categories.

We have not advocated that DOD elements do anything which would tend to lessen any technological advantage currently existing or that DOD use cheap or simple weapons in quantity as substitutes for more costly, more capable equipment. However . . . a much better balance between performance and reliability must be obtained.

QUALITY VERSUS QUANTITY: THE TRADE-OFF DECISION

By all odds, our individual weapon systems are the best in the world. In their respective classes, for example, the F-14, F-15, and F-16 aircraft, when in a one-on-one posture, are clearly superior to comparable Soviet craft. However, when confronted by more numerous but less sophisticated aircraft, technological superiority rapidly dissipates.

In June, CBS aired a five-part documentary entitled "The Defense of the United States." It was, in my opinion, an excellent journalistic work. The report's visual format allowed layman and expert alike to follow the lines of the arguments presented and conclusions offered. One particularly noteworthy segment dealt with the matter of quality versus quantity under combat conditions.

Both CBS and Fallows, in National Defense, point to the findings of a relatively little-known test program—code named AIMVAL/ACEVAL—conducted during the late 1970's in the skies over Nellis Air Force Base in Nevada—to support the contention that quality does not always provide the necessary edge over quantity.

For 2 years, 1976 and 1977, two teams of Air Force and Navy pilots—one flying sophisticated F-14's and F-15's, the other flying the "simple" F-5's—engaged each other in simulated aerial combat. The test results were conclusive. When the F-14's or F-15's were matched one-on-one against the F-5's, technology reigned supreme. But when the match-

ups were, say four-on-four, the technological advantages of the more complex aircraft were neutralized completely. Essentially, pilots found that with eight planes in the air at one time, things were too chaotic and moving too quickly for sophisticated avionics to be of much use.

As part of CBS's look at these tests, Richard Threlkeld interviewed Bob Fay, the now-retired Air Force officer who was in charge of the testing. Quoting now from Fay:

When you're up in the sky searching for something in that gray mass . . . your eyes tend to gravitate to the first object you see. And you can see large airplanes quicker than you can see small airplanes.

Fallows recounts the recollection of two Air Force officers who participated in the tests:

There was not a single ACEVAL 4-versus-4 trial in which the Blue (F-15) side managed to target a missile against all four Red machines at the outset of the flight. This outcome is rather sobering given the high costs of F-15/F-14 avionics, together with the fact that air combat in a future war in Central Europe is likely to be more on the order of 50-versus-20.

Pierre Sprey, the former Pentagon analyst who contributed much to Chuck Spinney's work, once conducted a major study of the relative combat capabilities of U.S. fighter aircraft—comparing all major fighters built between 1950 and 1975. Sprey's study purposely avoided comparisons of design specification; rather, Sprey measured performance using what he termed "combat-derived criteria." The study conclusions support Mr. Sprey's contention that instead of comparing top speed figures and electronics complexity, a plane's relative worth is better measured in terms of: First, ability to surprise; second, ability to outnumber the enemy; third, maneuverability; and fourth, lethality. Of these figures, Sprey argues that the ability to surprise one's enemy is paramount.

Indeed, the "element" of surprise remains the single most important ingredient in an aerial encounter. And while advanced technology has given us bigger, more powerful, more lethal aircraft than those possessed by any other nation on Earth, it has also made us more vulnerable to attack. It is easy to appreciate that a larger aircraft is easier to see. In addition, the pilot who turns on a powerful radar to scan airspace leaves a "calling card" for all other aircraft in the area. To use Fallows' analogy:

For the same reason that automobiles equipped with a "fuzz-buster" can tell when police are running a radar speed check, pilots with passive radar warning systems are instantly aware when another plane has turned on its radar to look for them.

A plane with a radar warning system will know that another plane is scanning the area long before visual contact is even possible.

In the words of Charles Myers, a former Pentagon official:

Imagine yourself holding a gun and a flashlight in a pitch-dark room, with a lot of other guys with flashlights and guns. Who's going to turn on his flashlight first? Well, radar is that flashlight.

In summing up the AIMVAL/ACEVAL tests, I refer to the comments of Mr. Michael Kramer as carried in a New York magazine article.

AIMVAL/ACEVAL taught the Air Force—or, more precisely, should have taught it—four lessons. First, combat is always confused. The only textbook battles are in textbooks. Second, the number of planes available to fight was far more important than the technical capabilities of the planes in the fight. Third, the smaller, harder-to-see planes outlived the bigger ones—no matter the advanced gadgetry on the "better" planes. And, fourth, the pilots of the smaller, less souped-up planes learned to fly them faster and, for the most part, flew them better.

As for the powerful radar that our "hot" planes utilize in order to let them "see" the enemy early—well, that radar often backfires. When in use, it acts like a beacon, and thus denies its user the single most important advantage in air warfare—surprise.

THE DEFENSE ACQUISITION PROCESS: THE COST OF COMPLEXITY

It is a basic fact of life that it takes years to bring new weapons systems "on line." In recognition of the difficulties that accompany the development and construction of complex weaponry, the Congress appropriates multiyear funding to support procurement programs. Take for example, the case of shipbuilding; the Navy regularly receives a 5-year obligatory authority. Unfortunately, it is all but impossible to complete a construction program in a 5-year time frame, given the complexity of the modern naval combatant. In actuality, the life span of some major ship construction programs extends to 10 years.

The first of our Trident submarines—the *Ohio*—took 7 years to build and was delivered 2½ years behind schedule and \$280 million over budget. The rapidly increasing lifespan of procurement programs—coupled with the growing complexity of the weapons in general—and the perils of an uncertain economic future contribute significantly to the out-year ramifications of defense spending decisions.

When President Nixon granted production approval in the early 1970's, the Navy envisioned having seven Tridents at sea by the summer of 1983. This was considered essential to counter the decommissioning of Polaris and Poseidon submarines that will reach their planned retirement age in the early 1980's.

Last March, Vice Adm. Earl Fowler, Commander of the Naval Sea Systems Command, testified before a House subcommittee on the status of the Trident submarine construction program underway at the electric boat shipyard in Groton, Conn. According to Admiral Fowler, we will be lucky to have two Tridents at sea in 1983.

Engineering changes have caused delays and contributed to increased costs. Costs on the *Ohio* rose during its construction life from \$1.5 billion to \$2 billion, in fiscal year 1982 dollars. Construction delays were caused by an alarming number of basic failures; the most graphic example was the discovery of some 2,700 faulty or defective welds on the *Ohio*'s hull after it was determined that substandard grade steel with

inferior crack-resistance and "weldability" was used in hull construction.

To use another example, the M-1 tank—hailed at the Pentagon as the world's finest armored and combat vehicle—has also experienced surging costs and production delays, while questions linger about its performance. In 1972, the cost per tank was estimated at \$500,000. The Pentagon's latest estimate for a production of 7,000 tanks is \$2.68 million per copy, if you include research and development costs.

If this alone is not alarming enough, Chrysler, who is building the tank, reports having difficulties meeting production schedules. The company still is not producing tanks at its Lima, Ohio, plant at the specified rate of 30 per month. To boot, an internal Army report notes that while some design flaws uncovered earlier have been remedied, the tank still does not meet military requirements for durability and reliability.

The problems experienced with the Trident submarine and M-1 tank programs cannot be dismissed as aberrational. They seem to be symptomatic of serious failings in the way that the Pentagon approaches the planning and development of high-technology weapons and the shortcomings of the defense contractors who provide the weapons.

Commenting on the "Spinney briefing," James Fallows notes:

The real message of Spinney's analysis is that unrealistic military planning, which chronologically pays too little attention to the economic and military effects of complexity, constitutes a "form of organizational cancer." The pattern, in essence, involves four steps. . . .

First, the planners are eternally optimistic about the amounts of money they will be able to spend to buy new equipment.

Second, in their desire to buy more equipment for the force, the planners forget or fool themselves about how much money they need to set aside for "operations and maintenance" of new equipment, especially the more complex varieties.

Third, as a natural consequence of the second step, the military has to make unexpected cuts in its "investment" in order to make up the cost of maintenance and overruns on previous programs.

Fourth, when certain parts of the military do enjoy monetary prosperity, they tend to use the money not to bail out the projects they have already started, but to get yet another complex system, with yet another inadequate maintenance budget, underway.

The Trident and M-1 construction problems are also symptomatic of problems faced throughout an industry that lacks the depth to competitively provide for the Pentagon's increasingly exotic needs.

Weapons systems tend to change in configuration as development programs extend in length. Whether because of the lure of evolving technology or the need to address changing mission requirements, Pentagon planners routinely reconfigure weapons without the slightest consideration for the impact change will have on basic program objectives.

In addition, the effects of escalation and cost growth caused by change are magnified by program decisions that invariably increase the complexity of systems. A good example would be the Navy F/A-18 (Hornet) program.

Initially planned to be a low-cost alternative to the expensive F-14 fighter—the mainstay of the current fleet air defense—the program quickly exploded into the "strike fighter" program known today.

Originally, the F-18 was intended to cost no more than \$5 million a copy. But at the time of the fiscal year 1977 budget, the F/A-18 was priced out at \$10.3 million—flyaway unit cost—per copy. In 1981, the cost grew to an incredible \$16.1 million. Recent Defense Department estimates have an F/A-18 program of 1,377 aircraft costing \$35.3 billion—a unit cost of \$21.6 million. It is significant to note in citing these figures that "flyaway" costs do not include amounts spent on initial spares, support equipment, research and development, and military construction.

Inflation notwithstanding, the F/A-18 program has grown dramatically in cost during its short life. Nevertheless, the F/A-18 continues to be sold as the most "cost effective" solution to meeting fleet aviation requirements. When the "cost saver" becomes more expensive than the aircraft it is replacing—which is the case here—we kid ourselves to talk of low-cost or cost-effective replacement systems.

Another good example of extraordinary cost growth is the Black Hawk helicopter program. When this transport was designed in the early 1970's, planners projected that the aircraft would cost less than \$1 million apiece. By fiscal year 1980, the Black Hawk costs better than \$2.5 million per copy. In fiscal year 1982, the Black Hawk—with only minor engineering changes—will cost in excess of \$5.2 million per, a 100-percent increase over 2 years.

To add to this dilemma, once investment decisions and commitments have been made, they acquire a momentum of their own. They are not easily undone or modified even if, as sometimes happens, evidence accumulates that the initial decision was ill advised, or is rendered obsolete by changed circumstances.

The August 11, 1980, issue of *Business Week* carried a much heralded article entitled "Missiles, missiles, and missiles: The New Defense Posture." The article format features this quote by William Perry, the Pentagon's chief of research and development. "The new missiles * * * will revolutionize warfare." To many, technology is synonymous with superiority; not everyone agrees. The same article recounts at length, the views of Norman Augustine, vice president of Martin Marietta and former Pentagon official, and the tale of the Maverick missile.

"Change a few of the names, and this (Maverick) could have been any account of any exciting new weapon written in the last 25 years," was the comment of one defense analyst. No matter how sophisticated we make our front-line weaponry, it is just a matter of time before advancing technology offers a new bauble to focus on. No matter how well a weapon performs, it is always behind the state-of-the-art by the time it is deployed. We must ask ourselves, "at what point should we be satisfied?"

The story of Maverick and its suc-

sors as recounted in the *Business Week* article, merits repeating.

Maverick was initially developed as an electro-optically guided missile that carried a small television camera in its nose. The camera was to photograph potential targets and assist the missile in locking on to them. Trouble arose when it was discovered that the camera did not work well in clouds and at night. This led the Air Force to abandon the camera in favor of an infrared guidance system.

While the infrared system made the Maverick an all-weather missile, it was not sensitive enough to distinguish between some targets, leaving the computer guidance system unable to accurately steer the missile.

Because it did not see full shapes or images, Mavericks still could not distinguish among real and spurious targets. Now we look to the air-to-ground Wasp and a new missile called AMRAAM (advanced medium range air-to-air missile), to correct this.

Perhaps the single best example of the extremes to which a runaway procurement system can take us is recounted by James Fallows in his book "National Defense":

During the time when Curtis LeMay was the Air Force chief, there was a big movement to develop the Air Force flashlight. Flashlights never work, so they decided to develop their own. It's nice to have one to read maps in the cockpit, to count the turbine blades before you take off at night, things like that. Well, people started thinking about all the extra things it should do. Somebody said, wouldn't it be great if it were a signal flashlight, so you could read maps at night and protect your night vision. And there were the usual military specs about performing after two weeks on the North Pole, or in the Sahara. Finally, it became the Tri-Command Flashlight: the Strategic Air Command, the Tactical Air Command, and the Air Defense Command all added their requirements. By that time, the thing was so huge that you couldn't fit it in your flight suit—hell, if you had to bail out, you'd never take it with you, so what was the point of all the signal flashing or the heat and cold requirements.

The Air Force turned out about 100 of the things and left them around Andrews Air Force Base for pilots to try out. General LeMay came out one time, saw one of them all wrapped up, and asked what it was. "That's the new Air Force Flashlight, General!" the supply officer said. He asked LeMay if he wanted to take one on this flight, and LeMay said sure. So they peeled the air-tight wrapping off one of them, got out a new battery—and it just wouldn't work. The lights wouldn't even turn on. They opened up a second one, with a second battery, and it wouldn't work either. Finally they got the third one to work, but that was the end of the Air Force Flashlight. Most pilots use the \$1.50 plug-in model now.

AN AILING DEFENSE INDUSTRY: A SECURITY CANCER

Last December, a special panel of the House Armed Services Committee published a report questioning the Defense Department's ability to procure military equipment in a "timely, efficient manner." The report characterizes the defense industry as "crippled" by declining productivity, aging facilities, and shortages of skilled labor and strategic materials. This assessment was bolstered by a recent study by the Defense Science Board, a group of industry executives

and former Government officials which faults the Pentagon for giving "little effective attention" to industrial preparedness.

In his book, "The Defense Industry," Jacques Gansler, former Deputy Assistant Defense Secretary for Materials Acquisition, has cataloged the bottlenecks and shortcomings afflicting the defense industry. Gansler notes that after the Vietnam war, as defense procurement decreased, the number of defense subcontractors fell dramatically, weakening the industrial base, reducing competition, and driving up costs.

One result of buying fewer more costly weapons, Gansler notes, "is that the peacetime defense industrial base cannot achieve high production rates or be easily maintained for future emergency surge demands." Generally, instability in demand has forced large contractors to undertake production chores previously farmed out to subcontractors, thereby further increasing concentration in the industry, reducing competition, and driving up costs. In short, Gansler makes the crucial point that defense contracting is presently a "thin" industry with few firms capable of providing for DOD's very demanding needs.

At the present time, for example, only one company makes castings for tank hulls, only one makes airframe bearings, and only one makes the titanium extrusions found in our more sophisticated planes. Even if these few firms could meet the demands of the administration's defense wish list—an open question among defense experts—the non-competitive nature of the industry must raise prices higher and higher.

According to a report by Coopers and Lybrand, materials such as titanium sponges are the "driving force" in price increases. Competition between the military and commercial firms—particularly in the aviation sector—for limited production facilities and materials could increase production delays and further inflate costs. As MIT economist Lester Thurow has written:

These companies have little extra capacity for production, and few other firms can surmount the technical and bureaucratic obstacles to entering the field. As a result, when demand goes up, as it has modestly done in the last few years and will dramatically do in the next few years, prices go up faster.

Concern about the complexity of the weapons sought by the Pentagon, and the structure of the defense industry, is intensified by the Defense Department's vulnerability to fraud, waste, and mismanagement. As Senator GOLDWATER noted in a letter to Secretary Weinberger, our defense procurement policies and the management of defense contracts have been disastrous:

Runaway costs characterize our entire defense program. These vast expenses have nothing to do with maintaining the strength of our military forces. They are, pure and simple, the result of a system that permits DOD officials to operate as though the public purse has no limits. It is a system that can and must be changed.

During the Carter administration, W. Graham Claytor, Secretary of the Navy and then Deputy Secretary of Defense,

once told Congress that "there is nothing wrong with the Navy that money won't fix." Such a mindset is wrong, and dangerously so. Given the problems often associated with high technology weapons, the present structure of the defense industry, and the Pentagon's approach to procurement and management, the worst thing we could do is simply give the Defense Department a blank check without addressing underlying problems which plague defense production.

MAINTAINING A "HIGH-TECH" INVENTORY: THE PROBLEM OF OPERATIONAL READINESS

Last year, Armed Forces Journal ran an article that quoted a then-classified memo authored by Secretary of Defense Harold Brown on the subject of readiness as it relates to "high-tech" aircraft.

As he had testified before a House Appropriations Subcommittee, Brown admitted that the overall readiness rate of tactical aircraft often hovers at about 50 percent. Loosely translated, this says that without sufficient warning, some 1,700 of the tactical aircraft now in our inventories would be inefficient or ineffective if suddenly needed. In a world where turbulence is the order of the day, such a grim assessment is cause for serious concern.

There are numerous factors that contribute to low operational readiness rates. Two key factors in the case of tactical aircraft are equipment maintenance and spare parts availability. Despite the \$1 trillion pumped into the Pentagon over the past decade, these programs remain woefully underfunded.

Secretary Brown expressed his concern that—

During peacetime, underfunding of depot maintenance . . . reduces the availability of operational aircraft despite the low operating tempos.

He pointed out that the backlog in the Navy's aircraft maintenance program has grown in 3 years from \$60.3 to \$284.1 million and the Air Force backlog from \$67.7 to \$196.1 million. Such a trend, allowed to continue unabated, threatens our ability to maintain a credible deterrent. The swiftest and surest means of enhancing military air capabilities is to revitalize our inventories and resist the temptation to divert required funding to procurement programs. Increasing spare parts inventories is deserving of the same priority treatment.

In his memo, Brown pointed out that inadequate inventories of spares requires cannibalization of aircraft and the drawing down of war reserves, especially in the case of the more complex aircraft:

Cannibalization is a particularly inefficient use of resources in which increasingly scarce, highly-skilled manpower is wasted on the removal and reinstallation of two pieces of equipment instead of one, and aircraft bought to fight the enemy are turned into grounded "hangar queens." Drawing down war reserves to maintain peacetime activity rates can be extremely dangerous particularly since the drawdown tends to be greatest in precisely those parts we would need most in wartime.

Maintenance programs require and must receive an increased share of our limited defense dollars.

One has to take into account the time

that sophisticated equipment is "down" for repair and maintenance. As a rule of thumb, the more sophisticated the weapon, the greater the likelihood it will require increased maintenance and increased skills on the part of those doing the maintaining. This raises, of necessity, the military personnel problem. We are terribly undermanned in the skills necessary to maintain the most sophisticated military equipment and the situation worsens every day. More and more of our skilled personnel opt out of the services for more lucrative job opportunities in the private sector.

We can have the best fighter aircraft on the Earth, but if we cannot maintain them adequately and keep them operational a high percentage of the time, then they do not give us the security protection that the heavy investment in such equipment ostensibly is designed to provide.

THE ALL-VOLUNTEER FORCE: DWINDLING MANPOWER RESOURCES

History shows that the single most important element in the defense equation is manpower. The military services are going to have to come to grips with its burgeoning manpower problems. According to General Edward Meyer, the Army Chief of Staff, it will take "in the neighborhood of 80,000 men" to accommodate the new Army role. If the White House persists in its plans to build a 600 ship Navy and add additional air wings to the Air Force structure, Pentagon manpower requirements are going to increase dramatically—about 200,000 additional individuals by the mid-1980's.

Dwindling manpower resources cannot be attributed solely to the All-Volunteer Force (AVF) recruitment shortfalls. Scuttling the AVF in favor of returning to the conscriptive service will not, in itself, improve the situation. At issue is the alarming exodus of those who—in years past—could be relied on to make the military a career. Today, skilled technicians are completing their tour of duty and instead of reenlisting, they are leaving the service at an increasingly alarming rate.

Statistically, the Defense Department reports achieving most of its recruitment goals. In contrast, reenlistment rates have fallen dramatically. The first-time reenlistment rates have fallen dramatically. The first-time reenlistment rate of Army personnel is down 8 percent and retention of Air Force pilots with 12 years of experience is down 9 percent. A Time magazine article on the subject, pointed out that an Air Force pilot with 12 years of experience has received pay, allowances, and training worth roughly \$4 million.

The need to address the issue of the growing manpower shortage in the congressional decisionmaking process is evidenced in the growing support for reactivating the battleship fleet. While there is no doubt that room can be made in the coming year's defense bills to overhaul those mothballed giants, the Congress is in no position to ignore the vital issue of manning.

At this point, we can only hope that the Navy would be able to come up with the number of officers and enlisted per-

sonnel required to properly staff these ships. With the Navy now estimating that it is short some 21,000 petty officers—the backbone of the fleet—there is cause for skepticism.

Since the Congress moved in 1972 to increase military pay to bring it more in line with private sector compensation, there has been the need for a comprehensive revamping of the total military pay and benefits structure.

All too often, you hear the charge that the Congress has been systematically eliminating the "perks" of military life and that this has caused the mass exodus. This is simply not the case. I believe that a careful study of the issue would support the conclusion that the money we spend maintaining some of the more outmoded and increasingly more expensive benefits programs has minimal—if any—impact on retention.

Last year, Congress passed the so-called Nunn/Warner compensation package. Despite critics who say it did not go far enough, Nunn/Warner provided a fresh approach to the problem of addressing critical skill shortages. This year the Senate passed the Exxon graduated pay bill. Experience has shown that "across-the-board" pay raise approach to retention has been a failure. We need to go further in this direction. I favor giving the Secretary of Defense more discretion in determining how future pay increases are to be distributed.

The military compensation issue has become increasingly more controversial in recent years. It has been nearly a decade now since Congress altered its philosophy on military pay. But retired pay, designed in part to compensate for what was once a low wage structure, has not yet been brought into line with the revised active pay structure. As a result, retirement benefits—which are linked directly to the pay system and tied to the cost of living—have skyrocketed. Even the Defense Department has been motivated at times to say that the system "provides excessively liberal benefits." Former President Carter offered some of these same sentiments—especially as they relate to federally reemployed military retirees, or "double-dippers" as they are popularly called.

And I've been particularly concerned at the excessive retirement benefits that are available to those who served in the military, who then retire and get full-time jobs working for the government. This is too expensive.

This problem of "double-dipping" is inextricably entwined with the "20-year-and-out" syndrome so prevalent in the military services today. There is something basically wrong with a system where more than half—50.5 percent—of all military retirees leave at or shortly after reaching their 20th year of service, usually at an age of under 45. It is very disturbing to me that so much talent and expertise is being lost to the military through this premature retirement. The costs to the Defense Department are considerable in that skills, training, and professionalism developed in a 20-year career are very difficult to replace.

I do not find persuasive the argument, used so often in defense of the current system, that extended career will result in a military force that is too old to

fight. Much of the support capability, command, control, and communications operations, can be handled as well—if not better—by older, more experienced personnel.

If we are going to solve the critical problem of manpower drain, some immediate action is essential. We have to come to grips with the unique aspect of military service that requires sacrifice beyond that of regular Government service. We can never be comparable in pay to the private sector, but we can be competitive.

We must reward excellence and achievement through pronounced pay differentials. If necessary, we must track military pay so that those who sign on for longer terms in critical skill areas receive higher pay and benefits than short terms and nonskilled counterparts. Such a scale could be enhanced with bonuses for greater lengths of service and rewards for filling critical combat assignments.

THE ECONOMICS OF DEFENSE: THE GREATEST DANGER

Military manpower shortages and the serious problems we are experiencing with our weapons development programs are not the only threat to our national well-being. It may well be that the greatest danger facing us today is economic. The decline in our standing in the world relates more to double-digit inflation, falling productivity, decay in our industries, and debilitating energy dependence, than it does to any shortage of military manpower. We must ask ourselves, "at what cost do we pursue a course of massive increases in defense spending?"

Sound national defense involves far more than powerful military forces. Measures to strengthen our economy, increase energy independence and improve public education are examples of non-military efforts which enhance the financial, industrial, and social elements of a sound national defense program.

The proposed Reagan defense buildup threatens to divert resources from more productive investment, perhaps delaying the revitalization of U.S. industry. American allies, unburdened by similar increases in their defense programs, may well gain a competitive edge while the United States revitalizes its role as the world's preeminent military power.

In May, the Brookings Institution published its annual review of the Presidential budget. Mr. William Kaufman—a leading authority on the subject of military expenditures—observed in the publication:

The United States can afford whatever is necessary for a prudent defense. It cannot afford to overshoot the mark . . . Aside from the undesirability of provoking an even greater arms race, the expansion of defense spending must be tempered by budgetary and economic consideration.

Certainly, we must enhance our defense, but we must do so in a way that is somehow consistent with strengthening and revitalizing our economy.

To quote from a work by John Kenneth Galbraith, entitled "The Economics of the Arms Race—and After":

Military expenditure is at a cost to economic strength; and it is upon economic

strength that our world position in the past has rested.

He reminds us that the prestige and position our Nation enjoyed in the early years that followed World War II depended more on our economic strength than our military might.

The Reagan administration would have us believe that military prowess plays a more vital role in our national and international politics than does our economic strength. The respected Wall Street economist, Henry Kaufman, disagrees:

The influence on our economy caused by a rise in defense expenditures . . . is probably not fully appreciated. We have not had a flourishing defense sector for well over a decade.

The powerful stimulative combination of large tax cuts and sizeable increases in defense spending is likely to more than off-set the restraining influence of a slow in federal expenditures.

Massive tax cuts, large leaps in defense spending, and a slowdown in other Government outlays will not, in my opinion, be enough. These measures will place an extravagant strain on monetary policy, leading to further distortions in financial markets, much higher interest rates, and additional fragility of our financial system.

In an article entitled "How To Wreck the Economy," economist Lester Thurow warns that a massive increase in defense spending, undertaken during a period of tax reductions, could have a devastating effect on the economy—locking it into double-digit inflation for years to come.

Professor Thurow emphasizes three points.

First, he points out that the "military buildup that is currently being contemplated is three times as large as the one that took place during the Vietnam war."

Second, he asserts that "President Johnson's refusal to raise taxes to pay for the Vietnam war is legitimately remembered as one of the key factors leading us into our current economic mess . . . President Reagan wants both dramatic tax cuts to encourage investment and an even more extensive military buildup (without increasing taxes). If his current program is carried out, he too will wreck the economy"

Thurow notes that the ill effects may not be immediately evident: "Initially, output will rise and unemployment will fall," as it did during the Vietnam experience from 1966 to 1968. "But eventually, a sustained inflation will result from the economy's inability to produce both the civilian and military goods that are being demanded of it." And unlike Vietnam, where inflation took off from a starting point of 2.9 percent in 1966 to 1967, we start this time from the neighborhood of 12 to 14 percent.

Third, in addition to dangerous inflation, the massive defense increase coupled with sizable tax cuts, threatens irreparable harm to our hope of rebuilding economic productivity. Thurow points out that the proposed buildup is to take place at a time when our allies are not raising their military expenditures at anything like the rapid pace of the United States.

THE SOVIET RESPONSE AND DOMESTIC SOCIAL COSTS

In addition to economic considerations, we must anticipate what the Soviet response will be to our massive arms buildup, however misplanned or misdirected that buildup is. Clearly the Soviets will view it as a grave threat. Clearly they will view our prospective sale of "lethal" weapons to the People's Republic of China as a grave threat. Clearly they will respond to both our massive arms buildup and our "playing of the China card" as compelling reason, to even further augment their already escalating arms buildup.

The Soviet response will surely take into account their growing alarm about the direction of American policy. According to Soviet Defense Minister Marshal Ustinov, the current U.S. policy will "undo whatever good was done in Soviet-American relations during the 1970's and break the rough military parity between the U.S.S.R. and the United States." Mr. Ustinov claims the United States hopes to undermine the Soviet bloc economies by drawing them into a heated arms race. He wrote recently:

It is already being calculated by some men in Washington how many of the U.S.S.R.'s economic programs would thereby be frustrated and how much less the people in the Socialist countries would get of food and medical care.

Five years from now, after the expenditure of \$1.6 trillion and with the People's Republic of China armed with modern American equipment, we may find ourselves no better off vis-a-vis the Soviets than we are today. The Soviets will not benignly sit by and watch us attain dominance or overwhelming superiority in armaments. As we dare them, they fear us. As we build, so will they.

To me, we would be well advised to heed the prophetic words of George F. Kennan:

We have gone on piling weapon upon weapon, missile upon missile, new levels of destructiveness upon old ones. We have done this helplessly, almost involuntarily: like the victims of some sort of hypnotism, like men in a dream, like lemmings heading for the sea, like the children of Hamlin marching blindly along behind their Pied Piper. And the result is that today we have achieved, we and the Russians together, in the creation of these devices and their means of delivery, levels of redundancy of such grotesque dimensions so to defy rational understanding.... no one could deny, I think, that the present Soviet and American arsenals, presenting over a million times the destructive power of the Hiroshima bomb, are simply fantastically redundant to the purpose in question. If the same relative proportions were to be preserved, something well less than twenty percent of these stocks would surely suffice for the most sanguine concepts of deterrence, whether as between the two nuclear superpowers or with relation to any of those other governments that have been so ill-advised as to enter upon the nuclear path. Whatever their suspicions of each other, there can be no excuse on the part of these two governments for holding, poised against each other and poised in a sense against the whole northern hemisphere, quantities of these weapons so vastly in excess of any rational and demonstrable requirements.

If the current trend continues unabated, the likely outcome is predictable,

if not pleasant: American scientists, engineers, and technicians will increasingly be drawn into the defense sector, leaving the civilian sector, while our allies' finest scientists, engineers, and technicians will be devoting their talent to civilian endeavors.

In a memorable speech delivered to the American Society of Newspaper Editors on April 16, 1953, President Eisenhower spoke passionately of the social cost of this type of resource drain.

Every gun that is made, every warship launched, every rocket fired signifies, in the final sense, a theft from those who hunger and are not fed, those who are cold and not clothed. This world in arms is not spending money alone. It is spending the sweat of its laborers, the genius of its science, the hopes of its children...

In the area of national defense, it is vital that we learn from our experiences of the past decade. If the record suggests high technology weapons inevitably produce soaring costs, production delays, and disappointing reliability, we ignore those lessons at our peril.

There are a range of choices available to us: For example, we could avoid the "technology trap" by turning to simpler weapons; or make improvement in technology more likely by spurring competition in the defense sector through vigorous reforms in procurement and contracting. We could—and probably should—pursue some combination of the two.

The worst possible course would be to pretend that the problems do not exist, and commit ourselves to some Pentagon "wish-list" which will never be attainable. Our defense effort must be grounded in reason, not rhetoric.

Nothing could be more important than to correctly assess the likely impact of our proposed defense buildup on our economy. We may discover that we simply cannot afford to do everything that might be desirable from a defense standpoint. Choices and tradeoffs must be made. It would not be startling to discover that we cannot cut taxes and engage in a massive military buildup at the same time.

Back in the early 1960's, Lyndon Johnson said we could have "guns and butter" at the same time. This policy, exacerbated by the energy price surge, became the inflation momentum of the 1970's. Ronald Reagan, in the face of double-digit inflation, says we can have "guns and Kemp-Roth" in the 1980's. One has to wonder if we will ever learn the lessons of history.

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. BAKER. 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 OF PROCEDURE

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I am advised that the Senator from Arkansas and the Senator from Nevada have no further requirement for time under the

special orders heretofore entered. I ask unanimous consent that the orders be withdrawn.

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

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, not to extend past the hour of 11:30 a.m., during which Senators may speak for not more than 3 minutes each.

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

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

CONGRATULATIONS TO DONNA AND PAT BUTLER

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, that blessed of blessed events has been bestowed upon a member of my staff, and I want to take this opportunity to send my congratulations to Donna and Pat Butler on the birth of their first born—a baby girl.

The good news is that mother and daughter are doing fine, and anxious to go home. The bad news is that Papa Pat is a nervous wreck. We all hope things settle down for the old man, and we look forward to his return.

THE NATION'S ECONOMIC PERIL

Mr. CANNON. Mr. President, I am compelled to speak out today on an issue that is perhaps the most serious issue this country has faced during all my years in the U.S. Senate. It is the issue presented by the continuing double-digit inflation with which we are all burdened as individuals, and as a nation. Inflation and the resulting high interest rates threaten to destroy not only the traditional dreams and hopes of individual Americans and their families, but also our way of life, our economy, and our security and position in the world at large.

From every possible source and without regard to party affiliation, political ideology or economic school of thought, we are assailed by only the bleakest of forecasts for the economy. Over the next 3 years we face huge Federal budget deficits amounting to \$200 or \$300 billion. And we are, it is now commonly conceded, in a recession that began earlier this fall and continues to advance. All the indicators show that this current downturn is exacting a terrible price from the American people and from the life of the country as a whole.

Housing starts have reached the lowest levels since the Depression of the 1930's. The stock market is in a long continuing decline. Unemployment is up to 8 percent and rising. Interest rates are still

too high to end the rigid credit crunch that holds our economy in check. Recession may indeed be too soft a word to describe the fix we are in today. To read or to hear the news today is to encounter over and over again a litany of words called back from the 1930's—loss, default, slumping, falling, and fear.

And there is much to fear. It is not just that the individual American cannot afford to maintain his livelihood, or that there is now little or no development money to start new enterprises. Industry itself complains that it cannot afford the credit needed to expand or, in some shocking cases, even to survive. Failure, bankruptcy, acquisition, and merger are the words today as American business and industry fight the high interest rates, the general lack of credit, and the high costs of everything that plague us all.

Worse yet, Government itself is squeezed in the prevailing vice of inflation. The Federal Government, perhaps the biggest borrower of all, has paid increasingly high interest rates in today's money market. And those higher and higher interest rates have fed inflation even more with well near disastrous results.

We are finding, for instance, that no matter how serious the weakness in our defense—and even in the face of a continually growing threat to peace throughout the world—we cannot afford the new weapons we need, and we can acquire them only at the cost of multi-billion-dollar deficits. Talk of a new bomber—the B-1 or the Stealth *** talk of an MX missile system, of more Trident submarines and other naval weapons, of an adequate and effective rapid deployment force *** talk of maintaining the combat effectiveness of our forces overseas and in reserve *** all talk of achieving and maintaining military parity in the world of the future is problematical today. It all hinges on ever-rising costs, and it hinges on our resulting necessity to accept what are really unacceptable multi-billion-dollar deficits.

All talk of our ability to go on providing minimal social programs is also problematical, if not specious, with today's economy. In the face of continuing inflation and continuing high credit rates, the outlook for the individual hard-pressed American—the outlook for the American family, the outlook for American communities and their needs—is as bleak and unpromising as it is for the country as a whole. Local government is as hard pressed by inflation and high interest rates today as is the Federal Government.

Yet, it is still blandly supposed or blindly assumed that the enormous shortfalls of needed revenues can be made up by further taxing our working men and women—or that the greater share of the tax burden still to be levied can fall without further damage on the backs of our senior citizens—that the American family can somehow be made to pay the bill, or that even our children can be further penalized in order to somehow make up the deficit and bail us out.

I am reminded of the story of the old Nevada miner who, when his mule fell

dead in the traces, replaced the old mule with his little terrier. "That dog," they told him, "will never pull your load." But the old miner, still stolidly determined to get where he had to go, said, "Yes, he will. I'll walk ahead of him and whistle."

Well, we can go on whistling. But, if you ask me, I have to say we have put the wrong dog in the traces. The everyday American is already asked to carry more than his or her fair share of the tax burden. But we have somehow exempted the only class of citizens who can afford to bear their share—but who do not even begin to bear their share—the super rich and the huge conglomerate corporations for whom we have provided generous tax advantages which are no longer justified, and which must be ended if any semblance of fairness or a free market economy is to survive. For the plain and simple fact is that this country can no longer afford to give the super rich a super tax break.

Consider the chief among those who have benefited from this liberality of ours in the past—the big oil companies with their windfall profits, depletion and exploration and other allowances, that run into the billions of dollars every year. And year after year since the early 1970's these oil producers—and I want to make it clear I am not talking about retailers or distributors—have reported increasing and tremendous profits. Since the mid-1970's these beneficiaries of our tax liberality have risen from 50th or 60th ranking among the richest and most profitable corporations in America to being four of the top five, according to a recent House Committee study. With what result for the rest of us?

Energy has been the single largest factor in inflation. As the oil company profits have increased, so have the prices of oil and gas at the pumps where we fill our cars, and on the meters that measure fuel fed into our homes. The high price of oil, the ever rising cost of energy, continues to escalate year after year. Yet, we have done nothing to seriously tax the rising profits big oil has earned for itself over the years since the disastrous Arab oil boycott of 1973.

On the contrary, we have, in effect, lowered their taxes and increased their profits. We did so in the conviction that those lowered tax rates and increased benefits would be plowed back into exploration and discovery of new energy supplies—and that this exploration and discovery would, in turn, lower our energy costs.

But that has not happened. And why we continue to excuse the super rich oil companies from paying their fair share of taxes to help meet the rising costs of their energy driven inflation is beyond my ability to understand. It is also beyond my ability to believe that we must continue to expect this kind of tax loss to be made up by the average American taxpayer.

But that is what we are left with at the moment—the necessity to now consider once again how to further tax retired American workers, and thus further deprive them of social security and pension benefits they have earned with their labor over their working years—how to further cut school lunch funds—how to more certainly end for

American families the dream of owning a home—how to further deprive the needy—and how to further reduce our support of schools, of research, of the development of minds and of ideas on which our future as a people will depend.

Rather, I firmly believe, we must now take a look at our tax structure and our tax laws in the harsh light of today's reality. We must take a new look at the gross inequities that exist. And I encourage my colleagues of the Finance Committee to take that second hard look at the law and the legislation now proposed or still to be proposed. I charge them to search out and to close the loopholes and alter the shelters that allow—and even encourage—immoral tax inequities to stay on the books.

I do this for more than reasons of alarm at the clear and present dangers we face today—threats to our economy, threats to our defense, threats to our health as a nation. I do so for reasons other than those of concern for the injustice and unfairness suffered by most American taxpayers today. I do so for what I regard as soundly pragmatic, economic reasons as well. The present tax structure in America is more than unfair or unjust. It is dangerously inefficient and uneconomic as it is immoral.

Exempting the super rich from their share of the tax burden is a costly procedure we can no longer afford. Looking around the world we can see ample evidence that this is so. Where the super rich escape their tax responsibilities, national economies are as soft and as inflation-driven as our own. That of Great Britain is a fair reflection of this. Great Britain now has an average yearly rate of unemployment of almost 6 percent. Our own unemployment rate now stands at 8 percent. Great Britain has an average yearly increase of 14.4 percent in consumer prices. Our rate of increase is now 10 percent.

On the other hand, when we look at Germany and Japan, two of the most successful and sound economies in the world today, we see another picture.

Both Germany and Japan are 10-percent dependent on foreign oil with resulting high energy costs. Both have inflation and all that it entails. Our high interest rates, for example, impacts on their economies. In Japan, however, the unemployment rate is only 2.1 percent and their average yearly increase in consumer prices is only 6.5 percent. Germany is similarly better off than we are, with unemployment at only 4.2 percent and consumer prices increasing at only 4.1 percent. Neither Germany nor Japan faces the slowdown in growth and the enormous deficits we are facing today. That is largely because, in both Germany and Japan, the big corporations pay their share of the tax burden and also pick up the tab for many social services as well.

It is certainly true that in the past the undoubtedly health of the German and Japanese economies has been due to our support. Their economies have further benefited from the fact that both Japan and Germany have very low defense costs. But if the super rich in Germany and Japan were not paying their fair

share of the national tax bills, their economies would be as shaky as our own.

It therefore behooves us, it seems to me, to look askance at our own situation with respect to theirs, and to wonder at the sorry and unbelievable spectacle of an America—groggy, disabled, and all but disarmed under the blows of economic forces that Germany and Japan have survived with undeniable prosperity. And that they are prosperous is undeniable, even with their dependency on foreign oil.

We, on the contrary, have allowed our privileged few to escape their fair share of the tax burden. Year after year since the 1973 Arab oil boycott, the super rich companies have racked up billions in earnings, much of it very lightly taxed and some of it not taxed at all. Should there be any doubt of this, let me refresh your memory with some facts.

Between 1972 and 1980 the after-tax profits of the nation's 20 largest oil companies quintupled—that is, increased five-fold. From 1976 to 1980 their gains nearly tripled—from \$11 to \$29 billion annually. In 1980 the major petroleum, oil service, and oil supply companies showed an annual profit that increased from 29 to 46 percent, while all other major industries—including steel—showed an average after-tax profit increase of only 4 to 5 percent. Just this past weekend I read a newspaper account of a new congressional staff study, which traced the \$19.6 billion increase in combined net income of the 500 largest industrial corporations during the past 2 years. The study says the 20 largest oil and gas companies accounted for 83.7 percent of the \$19.6 billion, and that 24 others plus 12 industry and supply firms accounted for an additional 14.2 percent. That left only 2.1 percent—or \$403 million—for the rest of the corporations. The net cash flow of just one oil company—Exxon—last year equalled \$1 billion a month.

What kind of taxes do these companies pay on all that money? Not very much. By virtue of their deductions, allowances, write-offs, and adjustments, oil companies have been able to cut their Federal tax bills well below the percentage paid by all other industries. In 1977, for example, the oil industry had an adjusted income subject to tax totaling \$47.7 billion. For this the industry paid \$18 billion in foreign taxes—37.5 percent—and only \$3.5 billion in American taxes—7.5 percent. If the oil industry would pay as much to our Treasury as they pay to foreign countries, we would have the President's \$12 billion deficit paid in a year's time.

And what have the oil companies done with these enormous tax savings? They would lead you to believe they are putting money into exploration. Yet, the major oil companies spent less than 2 percent of their adjusted revenue in 1980 for exploration of new oil and other energy sources. In fact, 90 percent of all new wells being drilled, and 80 percent of all significant oil and gas discoveries, is the work—not of the major oil companies with all their tax allowances—but of wildcat independents. What the oil companies seem to be doing in this regard is not much of a mystery. They

seem to be tying up land with leases and waiting for the price of oil to rise even higher.

So it is not into new oil discoveries and new wells that the major oil companies are putting their money. It is into mergers and new acquisitions. Of the 204 such mergers and acquisitions by major oil companies since 1968, 116 of them were in nonenergy fields. These include, I must advise you, life insurance companies, almond growing, fabrics, paperback books, jet engine parts, crushed stone, ready-mix concrete plants, magnetic tapes, a shipyard, carpet dyes, perfume, motel operations, shoe manufacturing, and even a Scottish trout farm—to say nothing of a computer software firm. commendable enterprises all. But how, may I ask, do they improve our energy situation or help to relieve us of our deadly dependence on Arab oil? Must we continue to be the potential victims of blackmail by a handful of feudal Arab princes and our own oil barons so that, with the taxpayers' help, Exxon can develop a word processor to compete with Remington Rand or IBM?

And where else do you think their money goes? In a recent major newspaper investigation it was revealed that 94 oil Political Action Committees—PAC groups—doubled their congressional campaign contributions from \$2.1 million in 1978 to \$4.5 million in 1980. The headline of the special newspaper series was "How Oil Money Helped To Change The Face Of Congress." The article stated that four U.S. Senate candidates last year received oil money totaling \$100 thousand each.

And what about advertising? Every time I turn on the television or read a newspaper or magazine, I am reminded by oil company advertisements of their efforts to spend money helping our Nation become more self-sufficient in energy. What kind of budget does the oil industry have for magazine ads, television specials, and fancy photography? I do not know what this enormous budget is. I am sure it is one of their better kept secrets. And I am sure that a portion of that budget would go a long way toward helping us find funding alternatives.

It disturbs me to realize that all this expansion into new fields by the oil companies, all this growth, and all this prosperity has been funded by the American public. And it has been funded through the guise of tax benefits granted in the belief that the American oil industry would, in turn, deliver some relief for the energy squeeze and its attendant ills of inflation, the credit crunch, and now recession, unemployment, and the rest. What has been delivered to us is not the promised energy independence. Instead, it is, as David Stockman has pointed out, a Trojan horse, saddled and bridled to fit the superrich, a long disproven Republican white elephant theory of trickle-down economics under another name, and a \$200 to \$300 billion deficit to be faced by the American tax-payers in the next 3 years.

Think of \$200 to \$300 billion. Our President seeks just \$12 billion to supposedly make his economic program work. Just think of the money spent by oil companies for exploration, campaign

contributions, and even advertising. Just think of the \$400 million a year that an Interior Department Commission claims nine oil companies underpaid the Government for petroleum and gas produced on Federal property. Just think of the billions in taxes the oil companies should be paying to the Federal Treasury, and what it would do to end the credit crunch, stop inflation, eliminate much of our deficit, and bring our Nation back to economic health.

Instead, we have only that enormous deficit. It is a dismal prospect we face, dismal unless we call an end to unfair tax benefits and allowances and other giveaways enjoyed by the superrich today—dismal unless we call an end and say enough—stop—no more. For the truth is that if the superrich had been paying their fair share of the taxes, we would be facing no super billion-dollar deficits today. And only if they pay their fair share of the taxes can we hope to see our economy thrive as it should, and our country secure in the world as it must be.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

If not, morning business is closed.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS, 1982

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the pending business.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4995) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year 1982, and for other purposes.

The Senate resumed consideration of the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 638

(Purpose: To add funds to procure four additional KC-10A tanker/cargo aircraft in fiscal 1982)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending question is the amendment of the Senator from Michigan.

TIME LIMITATION REQUEST

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I inquire of the Senator from Michigan and the distinguished manager of the bill on the majority side if they will be agreeable to a unanimous-consent order that the debate on this measure will occur as they may prefer but that the vote will occur at 2 p.m.?

Mr. LEVIN. I appreciate that.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the Senator.

I intend to ask that the Senate stand in recess from 12 o'clock until 2 p.m. I can adjust that time, but there are caucuses on both sides of the aisle that such a recess would facilitate.

Will 20 minutes provide enough time for debate?

Mr. LEVIN. I shall try to end it in 20 or 25 minutes, but it may take a few minutes more than 20 depending on the other side. May I have a few additional minutes?

ORDER FOR RECESS FROM 12:15 P.M. UNTIL 2 P.M. TODAY

Mr. BAKER. Let me put the request this way: I ask unanimous consent that

at the conclusion of the debate on the Levin amendment but in no event later than 12:15 p.m. the Senate stand in recess until the hour of 2 p.m.

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

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I further ask unanimous consent that the vote on this amendment, the rollcall, if a rollcall is ordered, occur at 2 p.m. when the Senate reconvenes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is the understanding of the Chair that the rollcall has been ordered.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that that vote occur at 2 p.m. on the reconvening of the Senate after the recess.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I thank the Chair.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the amendment was introduced last night. It was introduced on behalf of myself, Senators HOLLINGS, NUNN, and PRYOR.

This amendment would restore \$220 million to purchase four KC-10A refueling tanker airplanes. I say restore because the Senate had these planes in its authorization bill; the House had the planes in its authorization bill; the planes were in the President's March budget proposal. But then the President sent over some cuts in readiness and operations in October, and a number of those cuts were adopted in conference, including a cut in the number of KC-10 tankers from eight to four. That leaves us below the authorization bills which the Senate and the House had previously adopted.

Even though the conference reports accepted the President's level of four tankers, it was only because, in my opinion, there was no practical way of amending the conference report.

The decision was made certainly by me at that time and, I think, by others, that we would support on the appropriations bill an increase in the level to restore the number of tankers purchased this year from four to eight, as originally intended in March by the President, as clearly intended through the authorization bills by the Senate and by the House.

There has been some question raised as to what is the relationship between this amendment and another amendment that a "Dear Colleague" letter has been sent around on, a "Dear Colleague" letter signed by Senator HOLLINGS and myself, which indicated that we would be offering an amendment to strike the B-1 bomber and to spend the money on readiness items and on the Stealth bomber.

We pointed out in that letter there had been serious cuts in readiness from the levels adopted by the House and the Senate in their authorization bills and the levels established by the President in March, in his March budget, and that we felt the B-1 bomber, because of the inadequacies of it compared with Stealth, was something that should be cut and the money spent instead on

readiness, operation, and maintenance and on Stealth.

We decided because of the great interest in the number of items we would have funded with that money to try to add in those items first to the appropriation bill. There was so much support for additional funding for some of these operations, including people who did not want to cut the B-1 program in order to fund them, that we have decided to offer a number of amendments which will make these readiness restorations so that the Senate will have an opportunity to vote on individual amendments doing things such as restoring the Indian Ocean presence and readiness. We have cut that by 25 percent, unbelievable, a 25-percent reduction in Indian Ocean and Persian Gulf readiness.

We have reduced the size of the Army, we have eliminated the B-52 program—part of that has been restored by the Appropriations Committee—but the early retirement has not been totally rescinded because insufficient funds have been placed in this appropriation bill to eliminate that early retirement and to go back to our planned B-52 program.

Other reductions in our readiness which have been outlined in that "Dear Colleague" letter are now going to be made the subject of individual amendments.

Then, at the end, later on in this debate, we will be offering the B-1 cut itself.

Some of us may want to fund some of these add-ons through the B-1 elimination. Others may want to fund the add-ons which will be proposed in a series of amendments by different Senators in many ways. There are some Senators who may want to simply increase the size of the appropriation bill in order to fund these critical readiness items and the Stealth item. But, in any event, a number of individual Senators will be offering individual amendments on these add-on items, and only at the end, when that process is through, will we be offering the B-1 elimination amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the "Dear Colleague" letter, which summarizes these additional funding items, these readiness and Stealth items, that has been signed by Senator HOLLINGS and myself be printed in the RECORD.

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

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, D.C., November 25, 1981.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: The Federal Government is currently experiencing fierce competition for increasingly scarce resources. No where is this more prevalent than in our defense budget. And yet, in spite of this fact, we are embarking on a program to procure three new major strategic systems; the B-1, the ATB, and the M-X missile system. These three systems over the next ten years will require tens of billions of dollars. If we, in fact, pursue this course of action, we will do so at the expense of readiness and force modernization and we will be weaker, rather than stronger, militarily in both strategic and conventional capabilities.

Therefore, we the undersigned intend to offer to the Department of Defense Appropriation Bill for FY 1982, an amendment to delete funding for the B-1B Bomber and allo-

cate these savings to certain Defense modernization and readiness priorities.

Our amendment would reallocate a portion of the B-1B funding for the following items:

(A) Additional funding for restoration of full amount of requested Navy steaming hour program, \$73 million;

(B) Additional funding for restoration of reductions in Air Force and Army active end strengths, \$77 million;

(C) Additional funds for acceleration of advanced technology bomber, \$300 million;

(D) Additional funding for a classified program, \$350 million;

(E) Additional funding for procurement of ammunition for the Army, \$148 million;

(F) Additional funding for one attack submarine, \$518 million;

(G) Additional funding for B-52D modifications/spares, \$82 million;

(H) Additional funding for B-52D flight simulator development, \$5 million;

(I) Additional funding for Navy fleet modernization program, \$80 million;

(J) Additional funding to retain nine ships in the Navy active and reserve fleet, \$15 million;

(K) Additional funding to support the Trident submarine program, \$20 million;

(L) Additional funding for Army force modernization, \$60 million;

(M) Additional funding for procurement of thirty M88A1 recovery vehicles for the Army, \$29 million;

(N) Additional funding for procurement of four KC-10A (ATCA) aircraft for the Air Force, \$220 million;

(O) Additional funding for procurement of 100 AGM-84A Harpoon missiles for the Navy, \$50 million.

We have reached the juncture in defense budgeting where the Congress must exercise its responsibilities and begin to make hard choices. We must begin to choose between competing weapon systems designed for a similar mission and between competing priorities within the overall defense posture.

You will find attached a reprint of Fritz's speech made to the Senate on Monday detailing a rationale for the amendment. If you are interested in co-sponsoring this amendment, please contact Mike Joy at 4-0850 or Peter Lennon at 4-9104.

Sincerely,

CARL LEVIN.
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS.

[From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Nov. 23, 1981]

DEFENSE AND THE B-1 BOMBER

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, to understand the controversy over the B-1 bomber, a person must appreciate: First, the nature of modern weapons; second, the limits of our economic resources; and third, the limits to the usefulness of a manned penetration bomber.

THE NATURE OF MODERN WEAPONS

The strategy for American survival is premised on the superiority of technology. We do not and cannot compete against the Russians or Chinese militarily on a man-for-man basis. We do not and cannot compete against the Soviets one tank versus one tank.

We have 11,000 tanks while the Soviets have 50,000. How do we hope to fight and win given this ratio? The answer is in a superior tank with a superior tank operator.

We intentionally include on our tanks sophisticated fire control systems advanced suspension systems, laminated armor, and other state-of-the-art gear because we know it is not going to be one-for-one situation. Our one tank must be capable of knocking out 5 or 10 of theirs in order to prevail.

We are constantly hearing today that America's weaponry is too sophisticated, that it contains too much expensive technological gear, and that we cannot find the

skilled personnel to operate and maintain the weaponry. Some argue that all we need is a cheap, "tough" tank—like the Soviets build—to survive better in battlefield conditions.

We could easily produce that kind of tank, if we are ready, willing, and able to produce and man 50,000 of them. This we cannot do. For one thing, we do not intend to have that large a standing Army, so we go for the superior tank, making sure the advanced technology is designed for the needs of the battlefield. This has always been our military approach.

It applies to the shoes the soldier wears as well as to the bombers we send aloft. The constant task facing Congress is to insure that we keep ahead with technology. We want our troops to have the best equipment in every aspect. Of course, we must also be able to afford it.

THE LIMITS OF OUR ECONOMIC RESOURCES

When we fought World War II, an M-1 rifle cost \$41.20. A Sherman tank went for \$40,000. And a B-17 manned penetration bomber cost \$97,000. Right now it appears that the projected cost for each B-1 bomber would be \$400 million.

Everyone knows that today we are operating with limited economic resources. In a world reeling under inflation and high interest rates, every program is being cut. While we are trying to increase our defenses, that is not to say we are trying to increase our costs. We must look at each proposed military expenditure from every angle—not only how much it costs, but how much it costs to repair; not only how much one of them costs, but how much do 100 cost and what is the effect on the budget and the economy.

We must make economical buys, and when it comes to bombers they must last. We are not looking at the cost of just long-range bombers, but the cost of medium bombers, the cost of fighter bombers, the cost of fighters, of helicopters, and observation planes all the way down to the Piper Cub. And we must figure the cost of the manned Shuttle because it too has military applications.

These costs must be seen within the larger context of the overall defense budget—the cost of equipping the infantry, the cost of building aircraft carriers and Trident submarines at \$2 billion apiece, and the cost of ammunition from the rifle bullet to one piece of ammunition fired from a plane—the Phoenix missile costing over \$1 million a copy. Over and above hardware come personnel costs which exceed \$100 billion a year.

All these defense costs must be considered against the backdrop of other Government endeavors—like law enforcement, highways, health costs, social security, price supports for agriculture, and aid for small business. Somewhere there is a limit—and we have been exceeding the limit. We have been borrowing from the next generation in order to pay for all this Government. The results—busted budgets, tax cuts written in red ink, and high interest rates.

At \$400 million each, the 100 B-1 bombers being asked for will cost us \$40 billion; \$40 billion over the next 5 years is about what we had hoped to increase the entire defense budget.

For \$40 billion, we can buy a lot of sorely needed infantry-fighting vehicles, submarines, tanks, helicopters, destroyers, pre-positioning ships, landing gear for the Marines, and ammunition for everybody.

So before we commit to \$40 billion and 5 years on a single weapon, we must stop, look, and listen. We must understand that our conventional forces are in a sorry state of readiness—the principal trouble being that we have denied them the equipment, the flying hours, the steaming hours, and the vehicles necessary for training, mobility, and readiness.

We are 60,000 trucks short in the Army right this minute. Look at our inability to

defend against gas or chemical warfare. The next war will not be fought by one soldier just shooting at another man. The field of battle for conventional forces may very well be gassed by our adversary. The Russians have already used gas in Laos, Cambodia, and Afghanistan.

Their infantry wears protective clothing developed for this kind of warfare. In another advance, Soviet troops travel in modern infantry-fighting vehicles. They have 76,000 of these—the United States has none. It is tough to tell the Commandant of the Marine Corps that we cannot give him the gear he needs because the B-1 has just gobbled up all the money. I just did that this week.

We are not prepared to fight a conventional war. Clausewitz said, "History shows that a nation fights the war that it is prepared to fight."

We are not prepared to fight in the Indian Ocean, so we will not. We are not prepared to fight a conventional war in NATO, so we will not. We are only prepared to fight a nuclear war—so we will if one comes. The best way to avoid the nuclear holocaust is to be prepared to fight the conventional battle. But the B-1 is a nuclear carrier. Underprepared for conventional war, the B-1 overprepares us for nuclear.

The Soviets did not march on Angola or Afghanistan with a nuclear attack. They went with conventional forces. For 10 years now, we have been "detenting" and dillying and disarming while the Soviets have been beefing up and outspending us militarily by \$500 billion.

We cannot repair this difference in a year. It will take several years. So we must set priorities. Is the primary need another Trident submarine, or is it an aircraft carrier? Is the first order "X" number of tanks, or helicopters? A manned bomber, or more and better equipment for our conventional forces?

I believe the first priority is manpower. I have written about the draft in a previous newsletter. I believe that the one best move to build our military and show our commitment is the universal draft. It would get a cross-section of our society participating in America's defense. It would give us the skills. It would cost less, and it would evidence our will power as well as our military power.

My second priority would be readiness. That includes money for ammunition, money for fuel, money for operations and maintenance of the equipment, and money for adequate flying, steaming, and training hours.

Rather than \$40 billion for a single weapon—a manned penetration bomber—I would rather spend that same amount over the next 5 years on fleshing out the Rapid Deployment Force in the Indian Ocean, equipping the Marines, equipping our National Guard and Reserves, refitting nine Navy ships, buying some attack submarines, tanks, helicopters and fighters, and speeding up development of the next generation of manned penetration bombers—the Stealth.

THE LIMITS TO THE USEFULNESS OF A MANNED PENETRATION BOMBER

So you will understand where I am coming from, I am a strong believer in the military and a strong supporter of the Air Force. At this moment, we have many bombers. We have long-range penetration bombers, such as 345 B-52's and 63 FB-111's. We have many medium- and short-range bombers such as the F-15's, remember the Saudis were asking for bomb racks for their F-15's; hundreds of F-16's, remember this is the plane that Israel used to bomb Baghdad. We soon will have the superior F-18 fighter-bomber by the hundreds. We have A-6's, A-7's, and VSTOL fighter-bombers. I touch on this to emphasize the difference between medium-range bombers and the long-range bombers needed to penetrate Soviet defenses. We are continuing to build and capitalize on America's technology. But as concerns the B-1,

there are limits to its ability to penetrate. Generally, there are limits on the manned bomber which makes it necessary for us to put our egg in more than one basket.

Everyone agrees that the B-1 bomber can no longer be depended upon as a penetration weapon after 1990. We know that the B-52, old as it is, can carry us that far. And we know that we cannot get the first squadron of B-1's flying until 1987 at the earliest.

The bottom line then, if everything proceeds on schedule is a \$40 billion program to provide penetration for the 3 years between 1987 and 1990. After that the state of Soviet defenses will make it impossible for either the B-52 or the B-1 to get through.

The B-1 has simply become too expensive for its primary mission. Surely it can be used after 1990 as a stand-off cruise missile carrier but paying \$400 million a copy for this role is unthinkable. The \$400 million cost has been disputed.

But special studies by the General Accounting Office and the Congressional Budget Office confirm this cost.

Finally as a maneuver with the Congress, the Air Force has been citing inflated costs to keep the B-52's going until the 1980's inferring that rather than paying the expense to keep the B-52's in the air, you could use the same money to buy the new B-1.

Whether you go for the B-1 or go for the Stealth or go for both or go for neither, every plan shows that the B-52 must be kept current and flying until 1993. And so those costs will have to be paid.

Then when they are phased out in 1993, the question is: shall they be replaced totally by the Stealths that can penetrate or by the B-1 that cannot or by both—if we had the money.

The B-1 is a superb plane and I wish we had 200 B-1's on the line today. Five years ago, I implored President Carter to move forward with the B-1. Instead we wasted 5 years and \$5 billion and the opportunity to have them flying over the kind of reasonable lifetime that such a huge investment requires.

Carter made his decision, the factory has closed down, and the cost has soared from \$100 million apiece to \$400 million. There is a time for every weapon, and the B-1's is passing.

On November 5, Secretary of Defense Caspar Weinberger testified:

"I think there is no question whatever that we will not be able to use the B-1 as a penetrator after 1990."

Earlier, Secretary Weinberger had emphasized the limits of the B-1 after 1990 by stating:

"If you do the B-1 only you spend a lot of money—again I am trying to guess at the extent of development of the Soviet air defenses, so if I use a couple of years, give me leeway 1989, 1990, probably 1988 to 1989—you lose the ability to penetrate unless someone wants to direct suicide missions and that is not anything I am going to do."

This only confirms a similar statement by Fred C. Ikle, Under Secretary of Defense for Policy before the Armed Services Committee on October 27, 1981.

Recently, the United States has been developing a Stealth or advanced technology bomber. This plane is designed to confuse the enemy radar and fire control system so that it can penetrate successfully and reach targets well within the land mass of the Soviet Union. Some would argue that the technology is unproven, too "chancey" to count on and will not be ready by 1990.

However, the technology has been proved and as former Assistant Secretary of Defense for Policy Perry has stated, it can be developed by 1989.

Wanting both the B-1 and the Stealth, the Air Force is dragging its feet on the Stealth to make it seem that both planes will be necessary.

Accordingly, the administration has re-

quested both the B-1 and the Stealth. Given the limited usefulness of the B-1, given our other defense needs, and given the general state of the budget and the economy, I do not believe we can afford to proceed with both.

It would be far more cost effective, and far better for the overall strength of the military, if we speeded up the Stealth bomber and tried to get it on line a year or two earlier than presently projected.

To understand the limits on manned bombers generally—and to appreciate why proceeding with two new systems is outlandish—we need to remember that America's strategic defense consists of a triad: First, the intercontinental ballistic missile, or ICBM; second, the Poseidon or Trident submarine; and third, the manned bomber.

These provide the options for penetrating the defenses of the Soviet Union over a long distance. If the military need ever comes to penetrate all the way to Moscow, the best way is with a ballistic missile launched from either land or sea.

An almost equally good way is with a cruise missile, whether it is land launched from Europe, submarine launched from the sea, or launched from a B-52 standing off outside the borders of Russia. The most inefficient way is by manned bomber, given Soviet defenses and the vulnerability of the weapon.

So, in recent years, the long-range manned bomber role is being more and more taken over by the small, difficult-to-detect cruise missile. It is relatively cheap, accurate, and better able than a bomber to get through to its target.

Some of our armchair experts argue for the superiority of the bomber over the missile by saying that once the missile is launched, there is no calling it back. My answer is that we better not have a plane with a nuclear bomb wandering around Moscow while we are still wondering if we have given the right order.

In fact, I cannot imagine an American Commander in Chief ordering a manned bomber to attack Moscow unless we are already into a nuclear holocaust.

When that point in warfare has been reached, it seems pretty clear that we would be going with our ICBM's, intermediate ballistic missiles, and cruise missiles.

This is not to say that the role for the manned bomber is finished. But it is to say that it does not have the commanding role it once had. It is now part of a larger weapons inventory that includes faster and more accurate systems.

Some, like the cruise missile, are far cheaper. We can and should retain the ability to penetrate Soviet airspace with a manned bomber. We have that capability with the B-52 which has served us long and well and which can be used to fly those 3 additional years beyond 1987.

After 1987, neither the B-52 nor the B-1 will be able to penetrate Soviet air defense. After that, only the Stealth will be able to get through.

So is it not the wisest policy to accelerate Stealth? It will be able to penetrate from the 1990's on, and it can be delivered as early as 1989. By taking this course, we can save the \$40 billion and expend it on readiness and in all those other areas of preparedness that we have been short changing for the past decade.

I know this disappoints my friends in the Air Force. Secretary of Defense McNamara back in 1964 canceled the B-70, and in 1977 President Carter canceled the B-1. I am sure by now that if someone could give a guarantee that the Stealth would be built as a replacement for the B-52, the Air Force would abandon its drive for the B-1.

They have been worried for years about a replacement for the B-52 and now they have a President, finally, willing to go along—even though it is economic nonsense.

As a result of this paranoia, the Air Force has requested a \$400 million conventional bomber and a \$300 million Stealth strategic bomber. For a conventional bomber, we could easily and far more economically beef up our FB-111's at \$64 million a copy rather than \$400 million as recommended by Gen. Richard H. Ellis, former Commander in Chief of the Strategic Air Command. But we cannot afford the B-1 and the Stealth.

We need to strengthen our Triad with the Stealth. We need to strengthen our overall readiness in defense. The task is to allocate limited resources. On this basis, I oppose the B-1, favor expediting the Stealth, and favor immediately allocating this \$40 billion to readiness.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, less than a month after this body went through a bruising fight on the AWACS and F-15 enhancement package, a package which the administration argued was necessary to protect our interests in the Persian Gulf region, the administration slashed a critical program designed to improve our capabilities to rapidly deploy forces to the Persian Gulf and to Europe and to defend our vital interests, and that program is the Air Force's KC-10A advanced tanker cargo aircraft procurement program.

As a matter of fact, the cut in this program from the March budget level of the President, from the Senate-authorized and House-authorized level, the cut was part of a number of cuts in airlift and in sealift, and shockingly enough—and I say shockingly advisedly, because as a member of the Armed Services Committee which has reviewed our airlift and sealift needs so closely, we have actually made over \$1 billion in cuts from March to October in airlift and in sealift while, at the same time, talking about how critical it is that we be able to rapidly deploy our forces to the Persian Gulf and to Europe to defend those vital interests.

This KC-10A program, this program which originally was intended to purchase eight of these refueling tanker airplanes, but in the present bill are only four, is a way of restoring and achieving some of this critical airlift that is so essential if we are going to be able to rapidly deploy our forces.

We have short-changed our airlift and our sealift. General Davis, the head of SAC, testified as follows in front of the Armed Services Committee on October 28. He said that:

Modernization of SAC's tanker force is one of the Air Force's highest priorities. As you correctly noted, the air refueling shortfall has been of deep concern for several years...

In addition, tanker support for general purpose airlift and fighter requirements will also increase over time. DOD planned enhancements to U.S. force projection capabilities cannot be fully attained without commensurate increases in aerial refueling capabilities. Of particular concern is the requirement to responsively deploy and employ our Rapid Deployment Joint Task Force, a formidable mission under the best of circumstances. Suffice it to say that the Air Force will continue to operate through this decade with a shortfall... unless aggressive steps are taken to modernize the tanker force.

Let me underscore one of those sentences that General Davis stated:

DOD planned enhancements to U.S. force projection capabilities cannot be fully attained without commensurate increases in aerial refueling capabilities.

That means quite literally, Mr. President, that we cannot get there from here. Our tactical fighter aircraft will find it extremely difficult to ferry nonstop to the Persian Gulf or Europe, and critical delays could occur in our efforts to reinforce those areas.

We need aggressive steps to modernize the tanker force. Instead we took a critical step backward between March and October when we cut over \$1 billion in airlift and sealift from the first budget and from the first bill on which we had a chance to vote here in the Senate with the authorization bill for the DOD.

General Davis said:

The KC-10 is being procured specifically to support general purpose users. This unique cargo-tanker aircraft provides an outstanding opportunity to increase both airlift and aerial refueling while incurring minimal RDT&E risk and expense.

This is an ongoing program, Mr. President. This is not a risky program. This is an ongoing program which has fallen desperately short of what everybody concedes is needed.

As a matter of fact, we originally were going to buy eight in March, and whereas this Senate, and the House in their authorization bills before the conference took place said eight, we had a recommendation from the administration that it be zero, that we buy zero, that is what they said in October. The armed services authorization bill, the bill which the Armed Services Committees of both Houses referred to this body, and to the other body in conference restored four of those eight. This amendment will restore the other four.

We would add back sufficient funding to restore in fiscal year 1982 these four tankers that were so inadvisedly cut in that authorization conference that we previously voted.

Mr. President, the Senate and the House Armed Services Committees and the Senate and House themselves have been on record as supporting this full tanker program. For instance, the House Armed Services Committee wrote the following in the report which they submitted to the full House. They said:

The budget request contained \$437 million for the procurement of eight KC-10A aircraft in fiscal year 1982.

They pointed out the KC-10A is a modified DC-10 aircraft capable of providing air refueling capability for airlift support. They said:

The air refueling capability of the KC-10 will permit deployment and reinforcement of U.S. military forces without reliance on uncertain intermediate foreign basing rights. Tactical fighter forces and their support equipment may be deployed simultaneously. In addition, the KC-10 aircraft will significantly expand U.S. strategic airlift capacity, especially with respect to long-range movement of oversize cargo.

Mr. President, the JCS, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, in their 1982 posture statement wrote:

The KC-10 provides increased fuel offload capability over a greater operating range, thereby reducing dependence on staging bases in other countries. It also carries cargo

to facilitate more rapid worldwide deployment of general purpose and airlift forces.

The Reagan administration was correct to add eight KC-10's to the fiscal year 1982 DOD budget in March. The Senate and the House were right when we authorized the eight. It was wrong for the administration to reduce that eight to zero in its October budget. It was wrong for the conference of the House and the Senate on the authorization bill simply to reduce four.

We could not correct that in any practical way at the time of the vote on the conference report because it was not amendable. We can correct that today. We can restore the additional four KC-10 tankers which were originally supported both by the Reagan administration in March and again by the Senate and House in their original actions on the authorization bill.

Mr. President, at this time I would be happy to yield the floor. I see my colleague from Georgia is here. I know he did have a few words on it, but I do not know whether the manager of the bill wants at this point to speak or to allow the Senator from Georgia to speak.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I support this amendment and I congratulate the Senator from Michigan for sponsoring the amendment.

One of the most critical deficiencies is aerial refueling capability to support strategic and conventional missions, and that would be enhanced if this amendment is adopted.

We must look at the overall tanker requirements, and we must look at the KC-135's and the KC-10's, and that is what the amendment focuses on.

Gen. Bennie Davis, the new commander of the Strategic Air Command, testified that modernization of SAC's tanker force is one of the Air Force's highest priorities.

Currently the KC-135 tankers are integral to the SIOP and a very significant percentage of the bomber force is limited in its effectiveness due to inadequate air refueling availability. The KC-135 enhancement program is necessary to provide additional capability.

The KC-10 is being procured specifically to support general purpose users. It is unique cargo-tanker which increases both airlift and aerial refueling with minimal R. & D.

It is essential to the rapid deployment force; it is essential to many of our other contingency missions.

I urge that the amendment of the Senator from Michigan be adopted. I hope the committee will accept it, but I will certainly urge the Senate to adopt it.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I am pleased to see this amendment presented because I think the Senate ought to realize that this is the beginning now of the battle on the B-1. The letter that the Senator from Michigan has placed in the RECORD, comes from the distinguished Senator from Michigan and the distinguished Senator from South Carolina. It adds some \$2.27 billion to the budget that the Appropriations Committee adopted. The strategy by my good friends, is to delete the funding in the bill for the B-1 bomber, while attempt-

ing to make the case that these items are needed more than is the B-1.

The KC-10 is not needed to fuel in flight the B-52's. The KC-135's do that. The KC-10 is related to the generation of the B-1 bomber and the ATB.

The decision was made to go ahead with both the B-1 and the development of new technologies. In doing so, it was necessary to reduce some of the items that will be needed later. The Senator is correct; and our committee has observed the authorization bill. We have funded the full amount of the authorization bill, which was signed into law today by the President. The DOD authorization bill provides for four KC-10's. As a matter of fact, that is in addition to the President's September mark with respect to the budget request.

I find it very interesting that the committee has been criticized for having such a large budget; yet this is the first of a series of amendments designed to add over \$2 billion to the bill. The impact here seems to be that there is great support for financing our efforts to modernize our defense forces, but as long as we keep the numbers in, it makes no difference for what the money is spent.

Our committee has worked long and hard trying to allocate the funds we feel are absolutely necessary to meet the strategic priorities of our defense forces. I must say parenthetically here that I am a little bit disturbed that there is always some group in every one of the services that is willing to gather around any Senator who wants to add more money to their particular service. The time will come when we will find some way to have the services follow the lead of the Commander in Chief in deeds rather than merely in words. These amendments are wrong, and I intend to make a motion to table each one of them as they are offered.

I hope the Senate will recognize them for what they are. They are good tactics. I hold no malice for my good friend from Michigan. I think it is one of the most delightful and strategic tactics I have seen on the floor in a long time.

He is going to put me in the position of voting against the KC-10's, and I do favor, ultimately, the construction of all eight KC-10's. There are other items in this list. Just so the Senate will know what we are going to face, there is going to be an amendment, I assume, to restore the money for the Navy steaming hour program, \$73 million. I will discuss these as they come up.

I anticipate amendments to restore the reductions of the Air Force and Army active end strengths; to accelerate the advance technology bomber; and to provide additional funds for a classified program, although I hope this amendment is not offered on the floor. There is no way this Senator can control the information.

We have everything from an additional attack submarine at \$518 million to the pending amendment which proposes additional funding for the four KC-10 attack aircraft.

This amendment adds \$220 million, Mr. President. We have been criticized, as I said, for going over the President's

budget, and we are over the budget. We are over the budget in some areas that are critical in terms of the relationship of this body and its negotiations with the other body over what the final version of this bill will be. We are over the budget because of two major items: One is the \$4.8 billion associated with the pay raise, and the other is the necessary \$1.6 billion to fund a level of inflation with regard to the procurement item. This funding level is more realistic and compares more accurately to our actual experience.

Mr. President, the difficulty that I have with this amendment is again, the level of funding. I hope the Senate will understand the problem that we would have in getting this bill through conference. Currently we have a bill which is conferenceable. There is enough difference in this bill as compared to the House version for both the House and the Senate to want to come to an agreement, to get a bill before the Christmas recess. Actually, it is in everyone's best interest to get a bill. It is in the best interest of the Department of Defense, because they will know what they can spend. They will not be forced to sit there and see themselves affected by the tactics of having to absorb something like the pay increase or other items, while living under a continuing resolution.

Because the B-1 and MX are in the House version of the bill, the impact of that bill is such that if we do not get a final version of the bill the major weapons systems will be funded. But the minor weapons systems are where we have the major disagreement. Mr. President, that is where the current jobs are. That is where people are working now, in the smaller procurement items. We really do not have the massive procurement going on yet in terms of B-1 and MX. So if you are interested in the employment picture of this country, you want to build. If you are interested in getting the best possible defense for the least amount of money, you want to build this year.

We want to build. The amendment before us is one of the amendments that, if it is adopted, will lessen the necessity for a conference.

We have conferenceable items that exist between the House and the Senate repeated throughout this bill. Many of the items listed on the "Dear Colleague" letter sent by the distinguished Senators from South Carolina and Michigan, as I said, are substitutes for our items. The Senators have chosen the areas where we have actually reduced the House bill or changed the House bill so that we know there is a reason to get together and reach a final version of the bill.

I am hopeful that the Senate will realize that this is not an item that is of immediate priority. It is a high priority item, there is no question about that. But the outlay of money in this fiscal year for that item is of low priority. We believe that the \$220 million that we are already over the budget to acquire four KC-10's is enough for this year.

Mr. President, I intend to offer a motion to table the Senator's amendment, but I ask unanimous consent that it be in order to make that motion when we reconvene at 2 o'clock. As I under-

stand it, there is still time for debate here and I do not want to make that motion now to cut off debate.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. D'AMATO). Is there objection?

MR. LEVIN. Reserving the right to object, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

MR. BRADLEY. 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. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to an amendment which I will offer on the defense appropriations bill immediately after the disposition of the amendment that is presently pending, offered by the Senator from Michigan.

MR. STEVENS. Reserving the right to object, it is just my understanding that the Senator wants the privilege of being recognized after the disposition of the Levin amendment. I do not have any objection, if that is what he seeks.

MR. BRADLEY. That is correct.

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

Is there objection?

MR. LEVIN. Mr. President, I do object.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

MR. LEVIN. I understand that the request of the Senator from New Jersey has been granted.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct. Does the Senator still lodge an objection?

MR. LEVIN. Yes; I do object. I understand we had a prior unanimous-consent agreement that there would be a rollcall vote on my amendment at 2 o'clock, so I object to the unanimous-consent request being granted.

MR. STEVENS. I ask that the clerk get the record. It was my understanding that the majority leader made the request that the rollcall vote take place at 2 o'clock. I have not made a motion to table yet. I intend to make a motion to table unless foreclosed. I ask that the clerk get the record and read it, to see if a vote is ordered to take place at 2 o'clock.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The Official Reporter will be asked to read back the record.

MR. STENNIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings for looking up the record be suspended for the time being. I want to use about 5 minutes, Mr. President, on the amendment.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Mississippi is recognized.

MR. STENNIS. Mr. President, I certainly have no objection to these KC-10 tanker planes by their nature. The authorization bill has four of them in it. But, Mr. President, an overall judgment has been made here of the relative importance of these items, and the request itself has been moved back and forth and changed twice this year. I respect-

fully submit that to get four now in view of the large, increased amounts that are admitted to be necessary in a year when we are trying to make reductions overall, that that is enough.

Let me say this about the offered amendment. The Senator is a member of our committee and we do not have a more valuable member. He has a fine capacity. He is a hard worker. He is determined but open to reason always. He is making himself felt. I am proud of his record. I do not want to flatter him. However, I had something to do with him having a chance, as the newest member of that committee, to dig in, and to ask him to take work. He would take the tough ones, the hard ones, and would do a good job. But I cannot support him in this position.

Mr. President, let me generally observe that this bill is the largest we have ever had. This does not qualify me to know what is best, but for at least 15 years, every year, I have been in the debate about this appropriations bill. For a good number of those years, it was my privilege to handle the bill on the floor, back in the Johnson administration during the war in Vietnam, then the Nixon administration and the war in Vietnam; the effort to withdraw troops from NATO, from Europe, to put conditions on appropriations bills which would weaken NATO, all of those things.

That is an experience. Through all these innovations, though, we have never gone in a big way for the cargo plane, I mean on a broad scale. This item has been knocking on the door of the Senate Committee on Armed Services for authorization for the last few years along with the MX, the B-1, and other modern weapons. It has run second best. It has not gotten authorized in a big way by our committees.

There is reason for it, the plausibilities are there, but you just cannot do everything. When the chips are down, the choices that have to be made are not in favor of a new cargo plane. There is reason for that.

So, as these extra planes in this amendment go along with the cargo concept on a larger scale, I think that is highly relevant. This is something that we can leave off and we ought to leave it off the bill, this time; and when there is an advancement in the cargo plane generally, these tankers will really have their part to play. Right now, they are not in the center part of the advanced stage but they are having to wait their time. I shall oppose the amendment for those reasons, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

MR. LEVIN. Mr. President, let me make a couple of points clear. First, this amendment is totally delinked from a subsequent amendment relative to the B-1. There is so much evidence supporting this amendment and other amendments that they were delinked from the B-1 and have nothing to do with the B-1. As a matter of fact, many supporters of the B-1 program assured me they would be voting for this amendment and other amendments.

Second, the list of items that are part of the letter referred to by Senator HOLLINGS and myself are examples of possible amendments. They do not constitute necessarily all the possible amendments, nor is there any assurance that all of these itemized items will be made part of separate amendments. It was my statement, which is accurate, that many of these on the list relative to readiness and Stealth improvements, fleet modernization and the restoring of the size of the Army, I do expect will be made part of individual amendments. But this has nothing to do with a B-1 program.

(By unanimous consent the name of Mr. DECONCINI was added as a cosponsor of the amendment.)

RECESS UNTIL 2 P.M. TODAY

MR. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we recess in accordance with the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 12:14 p.m., recessed until 2 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (MR. MATTINGLY).

MR. BAKER. Mr. President, is there an order for a vote to occur at 2 p.m.?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, there is.

MR. BAKER. Have the yeas and nays been ordered?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

MR. BAKER. I thank the Chair.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Michigan. The yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

MR. STEVENS. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) would vote "nay."

MR. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. TSONGAS) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. ZORINSKY) are necessarily absent.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber wishing to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 55, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 430 Leg.]

YEAS—38

| | | |
|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Baucus | Eagleton | Matsunaga |
| Bentsen | Exon | Melcher |
| Biden | Ford | Metzenbaum |
| Boren | Hart | Mitchell |
| Bradley | Heflin | Moynihan |
| Bumpers | Hollings | Nunn |
| Byrd, Robert C. | Huddleston | Pryor |
| Cannon | Inouye | Randolph |
| Chiles | Jackson | Riegle |
| Cranston | Johnston | Sarbanes |
| DeConcini | Kennedy | Sasser |
| Dixon | Leahy | Williams |
| Dodd | Levin | |

NAYS—55

| | | |
|------------------------|-----------|----------|
| Abdnor | Glenn | Pell |
| Andrews | Gorton | Percy |
| Armstrong | Grassley | Pressler |
| Baker | Hatch | Proxmire |
| Boschwitz | Hawkins | Quayle |
| Burdick | Hayakawa | Roth |
| Byrd, Harry F., Jr. | Heinz | Rudman |
| Chafee | Helms | Schmitt |
| Cochran | Humphrey | Simpson |
| Cohen | Jepsen | Specter |
| D'Amato | Kassebaum | Stafford |
| Danforth | Kasten | Stevens |
| Denton | Laxalt | Symms |
| Dole | Lugar | Thurmond |
| Domenici | Mattingly | Tower |
| Durenberger | McClure | Wallop |
| East | Murkowski | Warner |
| Garn | Nickles | Weicker |
| | Packwood | |
| NOT VOTING—7 | | |
| Goldwater | Mathias | Zorinsky |
| Hatfield | Stennis | |
| Long | Ta'ongas | |

So Mr. LEVIN's amendment (No. 638) was rejected.

Mr. TOWER. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was rejected.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, under the order previously entered, Mr. BRADLEY is to be recognized to call up an amendment at this time. I should like to call up an amendment at this time. I have discussed this with Mr. BRADLEY and I have alerted the distinguished floor manager on the other side of the aisle. I ask unanimous consent that I may be recognized to call up an amendment at this time without prejudice to the order for the recognition of Mr. BRADLEY to call up his amendment following my amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President, and I shall not object because the distinguished minority leader has discussed this question with us, I will object to putting aside the Bradley amendment any longer. He asked for priority and his amendment will be the next amendment.

I shall also object to any attempt to set aside an amendment once it is brought up until we can get it to a vote. It seems to me, Mr. President, that we have to find some way to handle this bill. I hear now that we have a lot of votes, we are going to be here a long time today. So, with due respect to my good friend from West Virginia, I do not object, but I will object to any subsequent attempt to put aside the Bradley amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from West Virginia is recognized.

UP AMENDMENT NO. 723

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD), for himself, Mr. NUNN, and Mr. LEVIN, proposes an unprinted amendment numbered 723.

On page 28, line 18, strike "\$9,076,906,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$9,326,960,000."

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia (Mr. NUNN).

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I ask the Senator from West Virginia, how much time does he have on this amendment? It is my understanding that the bill will be set aside at 3 o'clock. I do not want to take an undue amount of time, but my remarks relate to the B-52 and the costing of that, the B-1, and also the Stealth. I do not want to take up too much of the Senator's time.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, there is no time limit on this amendment. I wish the distinguished Senator would take whatever time he desires. I think it will be helpful for the Senate to hear what he has to say.

Mr. NUNN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, unfortunately, the major strategic issues facing us were not debated thoroughly during the military authorization process because the administration did not submit its strategic program until the authorization bill was already in conference. At a later point—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will please come to order. Those desiring to speak, please go to the cloakroom.

The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. NUNN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, at a later point in the debate on this appropriation bill, I intend to have a more thorough statement on the President's overall strategic package because of the long-term and far-reaching consequences of that package for our national security. At this point, however, with the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia pending to add money to a very important program called the Stealth program, I want to focus on just one problem area. That is the issue of affordability, particularly as it relates to the strategic bomber program.

Mr. President, I believe that our Nation must allocate sufficient resources to our overall security to assure our freedom and to provide every incentive for peace. It is naive, however, to assume that the defense budget is opened. If we allocate so much of our defense budget to strategic programs that we allow our conventional posture to suffer, we will inadvertently decrease our options in protecting our vital interests without resorting to the use of nuclear weapons.

We have seen much focus on the \$180 billion price tag for the President's strategic program.

Few people in the news media and few people in Congress at this point seem to realize that this \$180 billion figure is only the 6-year cost measured in constant 1982 dollars. The \$180 billion figure does not include inflation. Neither does it include most of the cost of the Stealth bomber, the procurement of the Trident II(D-5) missile, or the permanent basing mode for the MX. Those are not exactly what you call small ticket items. Given this budget situation, it is no wonder that the Army and Navy as well as the Marine Corps and some in the Air Force are concerned about the allocation of resources for conventional programs, when this overall strategic package comes to fruition.

There are two critical questions on the B-1. The reason why I bring this up at this time is that I have to make a rational, informed judgment on the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia, which is, to accelerate the Stealth. I think we need to discuss the B-1 in that capacity, and that is the reason why I make this argument at this time.

There are two critical questions on the B-1.

No. 1, will the B-1 penetrate Soviet air defenses for a period of time sufficient to justify its expense as a penetrating bomber? For this answer, I submit that it is a matter of picking your expert.

Dr. Richard DeLauer, Under Secretary of Defense for Research and Development, testified:

I am confident that the low radar cross section of the B-1B (which is less than one hundredth that of the B-52) and its state of the art electronics will allow it to penetrate to needed targets well into the 1990s.

Dr. William Perry, who held the same job in the Carter administration, testified:

I have no idea how anyone could make that kind of projection if the penetration depended on ECM (electronic countermeasures). . . . I can't think of any field in which there is more dynamics and in which there is see-saw back and forth between measures, countermeasures and counter-countermeasures.

So we are not going to resolve that decision in this debate. Experts who hold sincere views have profoundly different views on this subject.

I may also say that the former head of the Strategic Air Command, General Ellis, has a fundamentally different view on this subject from that of his successor, Gen. Benny Davis.

The question of penetration of the B-1, again, is a matter of choosing your expert, so far as I am concerned. I do not have the answer to it, and I am not sure that anyone can have the answer here on the floor. It is a matter of judgment.

The second question on the B-1 is a question of economics, as I see it. I believe that the economic consequences of the B-1, over a period of time, may well exceed the military effect of the B-1 on the balance of power. The question is, can we afford to spend \$400 million per unit for a plane that even in the best penetrating case—in other words, if you take the best case for penetration—will be limited to being a conventional bomber or a cruise missile carrier for most of its useful life? Not for all its useful life, but for most of its useful life. That is the economic question.

Based on the Air Force's extensive research and development of the B-1, and Rockwell International's excellent reputation, I have confidence that the B-1 will be a sound airplane. The issue is, how much should we spend for this plane as compared to extending the B-52's and accelerating the Stealth bomber program, which is exactly what the Senator from West Virginia proposes we do here.

Much attention has been given a recent DOD cost analysis as provided to

Congress by Dr. Richard DeLauer during critical decisions by the Senate Appropriations Committee.

Over and over again, I have heard members of the Appropriations Committee say that this was the main part of their decisionmaking progress—that is, a comparison of cost for the B-1 and the ATB or Stealth bomber, compared to the B-52 extension with the Stealth bomber added on.

For the purposes of analysis, these two estimates are \$93 billion for the current B-52 force extended and \$114 billion for the B-1B Stealth program. These figures are about the same as estimates previously provided by the Air Force and contained in the Air Force Secretary's recommendations to Secretary Weinberger which has now officially been provided to the committee. The point is obvious. For \$21 billion more, if these figures are accurate, a new two-bomber program is indeed an attractive bargain and an attractive option.

These figures, however, must be subjected to detailed scrutiny, since there is considerable disagreement over what is actually required in modification costs for the current B-52's.

In July of 1981—and at that time I did know about these figures; I had no idea about the figures—I asked Gen. Richard Ellis, then SAC Commander, to provide an analysis of what modifications of the B-52's would be necessary if this Nation opted to produce only the Stealth and to extend the B-52 force as needed. SAC's analysis was provided in writing and did not include a significant number of the B-52 modifications and costs which Dr. DeLauer now includes in his list. I will give a few examples.

For example, Dr. DeLauer included \$6.3 billion for reengining the B-52 G's and H's. General Ellis did not. Is this \$6.3 billion modification necessary or not? There is no testimony supporting this requirement for the B-52 extension.

Dr. DeLauer includes a \$4.3 billion requirement for modifications for the B-52D's. General Ellis did not. What is the justification for spending \$4.3 billion on the B-52's which, I think everyone agrees will be useless as a penetrator in the mid-80s and which will not be modified to carry cruise missiles? These planes were supposed to be phased out in 1986, even before the B-1 was revived. So we are talking about a \$4.3 billion requirement for modification included in the DeLauer list for the B-52D models which are going out in 1986. There is no testimony to support this level of modification.

Dr. DeLauer includes \$5.7 billion in operating and support costs for the B-52's beyond 1986. General Ellis does not. What is the basis for this cost estimate? There is no testimony I know of supporting this position.

Dr. DeLauer includes \$4.9 billion for electromagnetic pulse hardening work. General Ellis did not. General Ellis agreed with the January 1982 budget justification data as submitted by the Air Force in which the total costs of this program was stated to be \$465 million. This estimate was based on the only actual nuclear trestle test and supported by the nuclear labs. Where is the testimony to

support a tenfold increase in this program from January 81 to November 81? \$465 million is a long way from \$4.9 billion. Even in the history of cost overruns, I do not know of any 1,000 percent program increase that has occurred in this timespan.

The total in question in the DeLauer submission, as I will call it, at this point adds up to over \$21 billion.

To summarize, that \$21 billion would include \$6.3 billion for re-engining the B-52G's and H's; \$4.3 billion for modifications of the B-52's; \$5.7 billion in operating cost for the B-52 after 1986; and \$4.9 billion for electromagnetic pulse hardening work.

Both the Strategic Air Command and the Air Force conducted a considerable amount of detailed analysis as to what was needed to extend the B-52 force after former President Carter canceled the B-1 in 1977. I think everyone should keep in mind that this work was done by the U.S. Air Force after the B-1 was canceled, when there was no B-1 or Stealth on the horizon and the B-52's actually were being extended. Even when the Stealth was the only follow-on bomber option, these modifications to the B-52's were not included. None of Dr. DeLauer's questionable \$21 billion add ons appeared until the promotional program began for the B-1.

It is interesting to note in a letter I just received—and other colleagues received it—from Senator GARN, for whom I have a great deal of respect in this area, and other Senators supporting the two-bomber approach that they state—

The B-52 and is not sufficiently hardened to withstand nuclear blast effects and it cannot be modified to do so.

I believe that these Senators would be interested in learning that in the projection that Dr. DeLauer submitted to the Appropriations Committee showing the comparison of B-52 extended versus B-1 and Stealth combined, I think they would be interested in recognizing that Dr. DeLauer included in that list \$4.9 billion in his current fourth projection for the hardening of the B-52, even though I would certainly agree with the signers of that letter that that program does not make sense, but that is a part of the comparison of cost that is officially before the Appropriations Committee and that they made a great deal of their decision on.

The letter from our colleagues also cites this very analysis by Dr. DeLauer on extending the B-52's as a major reason to support the B-1 and Stealth package. In other words, the letter, first of all, says you should not harden and cannot harden the B-52's and then it goes further to include the B-52 hardening by implication when it includes the DeLauer letter that has that \$4.9 billion electromagnetic pulse hardening work.

So it is clear, Mr. President, that this package of costs for extending the B-52, at least it is clear to me, was engineered to convince the Senate that it is cheaper to procure and operate two new bombers than produce only the so-called Stealth or ATB and maintain the B-52 as needed.

Where are the facts—I ask again where are the facts and where is the testimony supporting Dr. DeLauer's

analysis? How did it change so much from the SAC analysis that was submitted back in early summer? These are very, very large differences.

If this \$21 billion in questionable costs for the B-52's is removed, then the total differential between extending the current force and procuring the planned two-bomber program is significantly larger than the figures given to the Senate Appropriations Committee. The difference, if these \$21 billion in costs are eliminated, the difference is \$43 billion and the \$21 billion unsupported add-on costs is coincidentally, I am sure, about the same as the constant dollar estimates for the procurement of the B-1.

Mr. President, until I receive further evidence, and perhaps there is further evidence on this, but until I do I would at this stage conclude that this analysis by Dr. DeLauer and the Air Force is clearly designed to make the B-1 option look like a bargain. In my mind, however, it raises more questions than it answers.

The issue of affordability also applies to the number of B-1's being procured. A great deal has been focused on the total costs of the B-1—from the \$20.5 billion that Secretary Weinberger supports to the \$25.2 billion GAO estimates. If DOD makes good on its promise to hold the costs to \$20.5 billion, will they also make good on their promise to procure 100 B-1's for that amount? If the costs increase as much as commonsense and history indicate, will then the sacrifice occur with reduction in numbers of the B-1's? What number of planes, then, is affordable as the unit costs increase and the numbers decrease? What number makes sense in terms of force size?

What number of planes will be cut out of the overall program?

These are questions that I think probably cannot be answered now but certainly are important ones in considering both this amendment and the overall bomber program.

The final issue on what I call affordability or economic analysis relating to the strategic bomber relates not to our budget in this country but rather to the budget of the Soviet Union.

Although it is difficult to quantify and assess precisely, the Soviets have already expended a significant amount of resources to counter and defend against low-altitude penetrators such as the B-52, the air-launched cruise missile, and B-1. Experts estimate these costs in excess of \$100 billion. Determining the gap between expenditures to counter the B-1 and additional expenditures to counter the Stealth is very, very difficult to make.

And certainly my remarks should be understood with that background.

Testimony indicates that our own technical wizards have great difficulty in projecting a defense against the Stealth. This means the Soviets will probably have an even greater problem. It is reasonable to assume from the Soviet's historical emphasis on strategic defense that they will expend significant sums over a long period to deal with Stealth and if and when we develop it and they will have to largely redo their current \$100

billion defense system if and when we develop the Stealth.

The critical economic question then must be asked. Would Stealth cause the Soviets to divert and expend resources for defenses at far greater levels than currently planned?

My answer to that without any equivocation is, yes, it would.

Although no defense experts are willing to speculate on the record as to the costs for Soviet defense of the B-1 versus Stealth, off-the-record, reliable defense sources—and I hate to use that term but I must in this case—

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

Mr. NUNN. I am glad to yield for a question.

Mr. STEVENS. I have great respect for the Senator. But I have sat here listening to things I have read only in classified documents and I am concerned that this may not be unclassified.

Mr. NUNN. The Senator is incorrect. There is nothing here that is classified. Every bit of this has been in unclassified sources.

The Senator is in a position, and I did not intend to bring this up at this time, of having done damage to some of the classified programs in this budget and then every time anyone brings it up in committee or in the Chamber or in conversation, the Senator says any discussion is classified.

Now the Senator is not going to put me in that position because I know that what I am talking about is not classified. If the Senator wants to have someone on his staff check it out I will be delighted.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I am going to be happy to do that.

I want to tell the Senator I have not done what he says. He knows better than that. I have been in this body almost as long as many of the people in the Chamber right now, and I never remember a Senator making the suggestion that the Senator has made before to me here dealing with a highly classified category and in effect saying that it is political.

Mr. NUNN. I am not saying that.

Mr. STEVENS. We have to get this straightened out somewhere. If we have to go into a classified session of the Senate, then we are going to do it. Even the very word "Stealth" was classified as far as technology until barely a year ago.

Mr. NUNN. Does that mean I cannot use the word?

Mr. STEVENS. No, not now. It has been divulged now.

The things the Senator is talking about put together add up to classification and he knows they do. He knows they do when he talks about the amount of money it is going to take the Russians to overcome certain strategies. Those conclusions become classified in terms of our analysis of their strategies vis-à-vis ours.

Mr. President, I am serious. I have not stayed in this Senate for the 13 years I have been here to be the manager of the defense bill and see the classification system that protects our security weakened in the Chamber, and I hope the Senator understands that. I have great respect for the Senator.

Mr. NUNN. I yielded for a question.

Mr. STEVENS. It is going too far to suggest that I have damaged the classification system by virtue of responding to a request which we have discussed with the Senator at length.

Mr. NUNN. We had about a 15-minute discussion and during that discussion we were not even permitted to go into detail there because the Senator felt that the classification was too high.

Mr. STEVENS. It is too high to be discussed in the Chamber or in the room we were in. I offered to go into the classification room in this building and to invite members of the Armed Services Committees of both the House of Representatives and the Senate, the Appropriations Committees of both the House of Representatives and the Senate, and discuss the matter with the Senator, without any rancor and without any politics.

Mr. NUNN. I would say to the Senator the Senator is talking about a different amendment and a different program that I have not even decided to bring up yet. We are talking about Senator BYRD's amendment to the Stealth bomber. I submit the Senator from Alaska may not have seen the transcript before the Armed Services Committee and what has been unclassified. This has been very thoroughly researched. I have been informed by the staff of the Armed Services Committee that it is unclassified, and I would like to see anywhere that this is not unclassified, and so I am very carefully avoiding that.

But I would say to the Senator, as I have said privately, when you start having very significant cuts in black box programs the Senator invites discourse on the subject, and I am going to avoid that if at all possible. But when you do that in the appropriations bill then you are inviting the kind of discussion that you say you fear, and which I will avoid.

I will assure the Senator I will avoid that. But the Senator puts everyone who is concerned about these programs in a virtually untenable position regarding classification after making very serious cuts in the program, and I find that to be disconcerting.

I do not think anyone in the Senate has more respect for the security of our classified secrets than I do, and if the Senator implies otherwise, then I would issue him a challenge to find anyplace in this statement that I in any way used anything other than unclassified sources. If he cannot find that, then I would expect at some appropriate time for him to correct the RECORD at this point.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I will be happy to look at the RECORD. I have not yet said what I would like to say in terms of that black box reference, and the time will come when I will do it. We will just have to wait and see whether the Senator wishes to raise that question on the floor or not. If he does, we will have a closed session and we will discuss it.

The amendment before the Senate now, the amendment of Senator BYRD, does not say anything other than to delete an item, strike an item, and add another. It amounts to an increase, and it adds the same amount that the Senator addressed before.

Mr. NUNN. The Senator is mistaken. I have not even discussed this program with the Senator.

Mr. STEVENS. Will the Senator tell us what program he is discussing?

Mr. NUNN. I am discussing the advanced technical bomber program which is the subject of the amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. Maybe I am wrong, is that not Stealth?

Mr. NUNN. That is right. But the Senator and I were not discussing this program the other day.

I am now talking about the ATB program. That is the one the Senator from West Virginia is now amending.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. May I advise both Senators to address all questions to the Chair.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NUNN. Yes.

Mr. GLENN. This brings up something—I will not belabor this discussion which has been going on here—but I was in discussion with the majority leader yesterday just very briefly and the Senator from Alaska addressing the same thing as well as the Senator from Georgia. How do we get effectively the word across on some of these very complex and secret programs to 100 Senators so that they can vote intelligently without risking giving away some of our secrets, and that is a problem here.

I have wrestled with this for the last 3 days, thinking about it as to whether I would ask for a closed session of the Senate to go into these very matters that are being kicked around here right now.

There are matters pertaining to the whole Stealth technology, very highly classified, but which we cannot—which every Senator needs to know to vote intelligently, and yet if we close the doors and brief 100 Senators on the technical aspects that some of us have gone into privately, I can imagine about how secret it would be. Yet how can we vote intelligently on these things without having that kind of information?

The same thing applies to the MX basing and some of the other things we are faced with here.

But the issue under discussion here of Stealth technology is one that I am very vitally involved with, and it is one of the key elements in whether Members here will vote for the B-1, whether we will vote straight for Stealth, whether they will vote for a B-52 add-on of some kind here that is a modification program, and I do not know how we do this. I do not think this body is well set up to handle it.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GLENN. In just a second.

We supposedly have a room set up here—I personally set up two different meetings in which I had all the Pentagon experts over so I could put forward with other Senators some of the reservations I had about some of these technologies that have been touted to the skies and I do not believe are that good.

Nevertheless, we had those meetings, and we got about 10 or a dozen Senators at each one of those meetings, which is not bad. Some of those were repeats, so we actually have only briefed on the real

technologies involved here on the questionable aspects of them, we have only briefed, I would say probably not more than 15 Senators or maybe 20 Senators here who have gone into all these real details, and yet we are expecting to come out here and vote.

I am still debating whether we should have a closed session, and I hope Members could be impressed with the fact that this is something that each Senator should treat as the most highly classified information and keep it to himself, not even to his staff. But it is a lack that this body seems to have to deal with classified material, and we are getting more into this all the time.

I hope that everybody listening in their offices or anyplace else is thinking about this so maybe we can have some sort of a closed session here tomorrow or the next day before this bill is off the floor so that we really can go into some of these details, because we cannot intelligently, without knowing them—and yet we risk putting these things out in public to somebody through inadvertent slips of the lips, if they do not treat this with the most confidentiality.

I yield.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator raises an important question. Arrangements have been made for the program director to converse with Senators about this matter. This is in room 407, which is a secure room, and I would hope any Senator who wishes to have such a discussion would go to that room and raise any questions they have or may have.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, that is the same room that is cleared and in which I set up two previous meetings. We got about a dozen Senators there for each one. But every Senator here should know this information to vote intelligently, and yet we are not going to. We will have about 25 or 30 Senators who will really be informed, and the others will come running in asking, "Which side of the aisle am I on and how am I voting because I am on this side of the aisle," and we are talking about a 25- or 30-year program. I think I can imagine how many people are going up to that room this afternoon to get briefed with all the other pressing things, committee meetings, and so forth, and we are just not set up to deal with this, and I would like to have some more discussion with the majority leader on this.

I do not know how we handle this, but we cannot require Senators to go up there and get briefed nor can I sit up there for 2 days bringing up my doubts for people as to what they should be looking into and get answers to. So we are going to vote as an ill-informed body, as I see it, when we vote on this Thursday or Friday.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. NUNN. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. EXON. Mr. President, I would like to ask a question, trying to figure this out. I have been listening to the debate. I am on the Armed Services Committee, and I know about most of these things. I am simply confused now myself, and I hope the body is not as confused as I am. But it seems to me in listening to the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia, and having listened quite

carefully to the statements thereon by my colleague from Georgia, it seems to me that all this amendment has to do with is the advanced technology bomber, sometimes known as the Stealth bomber, and there is not anything classified about those words, nor have I heard the Senator from Georgia make any classified statements.

The question is simply this: To my friend from Georgia, does not the amendment offered by the Senator from West Virginia, which you have been talking to, have only to do with adding additional money to the advanced technology bomber, sometimes known as the Stealth bomber, nothing more and nothing less, with the idea of moving that along faster than the administration wants to do?

Mr. NUNN. That is right. The Senator from Nebraska is absolutely correct.

The Senator's amendment is aimed at that. It is clear on the record it is aimed at that. There is nothing classified about those words.

Just to save members of the news media time if they look through my remarks very carefully, which I normally encourage, they will not find any new information whatsoever except the matter of opinion on these programs, and they would certainly find nothing that has not already been declassified completely. That was done very carefully before we even started this.

It seems that the Senator from Alaska had in mind a different program, and that different program is one that we have discussed and that different program has been cut, and that it is not classified, that itself is not classified. Beyond that I do not say any more. But at this point in time I have not chosen to bring up an amendment on that. I keep my options open on that, and I will be glad to discuss it in a specific way with the Senator from Alaska if we can find a way to deal with that subject.

But the Senator from Nebraska is entirely correct. The point I was about to close with in supporting the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia is simply this one: On the question of economics and the question of the B-1 versus the Stealth B-52 combination, one of the most critical elements is one that most defense experts do not have any answer to as a matter of judgment, a matter of speculation, and I have not seen any defense expert go on the record on this not because of classification but because it is highly speculative. That is the judgment of about how much the Soviet Union is going to have to spend to defend against the Stealth as opposed to how much they have to spend to defend against the B-1.

If the Senator from Alaska is concerned about that being classified I would alleviate his worries because these figures do not even exist. They are not on the record, classified or otherwise. It is a matter of judgment.

I think one of the judgments that people need to make in considering this overall area is the question of what it does to Soviet resources in trying to defend and also the question of what happens if they decide that they cannot make adequate defense in these areas and decide at that stage that the penetration capability of the Stealth will not be interfered with in their air defense.

Those are crucial questions and will affect the balance of power.

Now with all our saying on that subject, there is nothing in it even in any way remotely concerning classification. I do close by saying that the Senator from West Virginia has a good amendment, it is an important amendment, and I would hope that it would pass. I would hope that it would pass overwhelmingly.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I apologize. If the distinguished majority leader wanted someone to yield to him, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. GLENN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Yes.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I do not know whether this is classified or not. I will preface my question with that. Can the Senator tell us how much money is already provided for?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I think that would be a highly classified figure.

Mr. NUNN. The increments are not classified. The total program is.

Mr. GLENN. The increments are not but the total is. Is that figure available to us privately?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. GLENN. Is that figure available?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Is what figure available?

Mr. GLENN. Is the total figure being spent available? I do not mean here, but can that be made available to Members who request it?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. It can be available to any Senator who goes to room 407.

(Mrs. HAWKINS assumed the Chair.)

Mr. GLENN. The total cost?

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. That is my understanding.

Madam President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Georgia (Mr. NUNN) for his meaningful and forceful supporting statement. May I say for the benefit of the Senate that I have cleared every word that I am about to say with the appropriate people in the program as to classified material because I certainly would not want to say anything on the floor or anywhere else with respect to unclassified material if it would endanger the program in any way or endanger this Nation's security.

This amendment, in which I propose \$250 million of additional funding to the advanced technology bomber, or Stealth bomber program, would assure the delivery of an operational aircraft at the earliest feasible date.

I have been concerned, as have many of my colleagues, that the initiative on the B-1 program will delay important classified programs, including the ATB or Stealth bomber. Many in the Senate have expressed concern that the initial operational capability—or IOC, which is defined as a 15-plane operational squadron—of Stealth not be allowed to slip. I believe most of my colleagues agree it is desirous to have the earliest possible deployment of Stealth technology.

It is my understanding that the administration has assured the Senate that it is committed to the fastest track possible and the earliest IOC feasible tak-

ing into consideration the various uncertainties which must be resolved.

Yet, Madam President, I do not know to what IOC the administration has in fact committed itself. Obviously, we cannot pin a date certain down with absolute assurance, because we have not yet finished answering all the questions. Nor can anyone say with complete certainty the exact amount of funding which would bring us to the earliest possible IOC. But I am very concerned that, because the administration has also opted for the B-1 bomber, funding for Stealth will be inadequate. The Congressional Budget Office is now estimating the B-1 could well end up costing us \$400 million per copy over the next 5 years. In light of the almost certain competition for funds between the B-1 and Stealth, I am satisfied that the evidence shows this appropriations bill does not contain enough resources to launch a vigorous program. I am concerned the IOC will be delayed as a result—perhaps substantially—if this practice continues. The net result could well be one in which by the early 1990's we will not have a manned bomber in place which can penetrate Soviet air defenses with assurance.

Why am I so concerned that the program offered by this bill does not meet the urgent national need in this area? First, I have relied upon the testimony of our strategic air commanders on the question. Second, the action of the other Chamber on this bill which increased funding for the Stealth program. Third, my own knowledge of the program. And fourth, a pattern that seems to be emerging which is one of delaying the necessary hard decisions to correct the strategic imbalance with the Soviet Union.

Both past and present commanders of the Strategic Air Command have testified that the enormous cost of the B-1 will require a stretching out of the Stealth program. They have also stated that the uncertainties of B-1 penetration capability after 1990 make an early Stealth IOC a matter of urgent national security.

General Ellis, the highly respected, recently retired, SAC commander stated in Senate testimony that:

The B-1's would have questionable capability in terms of successful penetration to the degree that would be acceptable in war-planning in the early 1990's.

Although he stated that a case could be made that developments in electronic-countermeasures, or ECM, might allow our SAC forces to stretch that date beyond 1990, it is a "weak crutch and it is one that could be protected by early development of the ATB," or Stealth. The unique characteristics of the ATB, he further stated, are such that the airplane would cause the Soviets "great difficulty through the 1990's and into the next century."

There are many unknowns in this game, so the decisions we make are calculated risks. How fast will Soviet air defenses be upgraded? How quickly can technological uncertainties in Stealth be solved? But, as General Ellis again stated, if there are many unknowns in the 1980's,

there are a "lot more unknowns in the 1990's." Given these uncertainties and what is known about Stealth capabilities, he concludes that it would be better to "take the risk in the 1980's than in the 1990's. The earlier we get the ATB the less risk we have in the 1990's."

General Davis, the present SAC Commander, admitted in open testimony that going with the B-1 would delay Stealth. He said that "we couldn't afford to proceed at the same pace with ATB if you went with the B-1."

As has been stated in this debate before, Senators should not delude themselves as to the serious question of whether or not the B-1 can penetrate Soviet airspace after 1990. I remind my colleagues that the Secretary of Defense was quoted on November 5, 1981, less than a month ago, that sending our boys into Soviet air space in a B-1 after 1990 would be tantamount to directing "suicide missions and that is not anything I am going to do." The Secretary reiterated this statement several times. Since that time, he has restated his position, and other officials have had to revamp their arguments. Now we are told the B-1 is judged able to penetrate Soviet airspace "well into the 1990's." This changed analysis disturbs me. It reduces my confidence that this bomber decision is being made on the merits, on the basis of cold technological fact, and with the best risk calculation we can develop.

Let us be clear about this scenario. If the B-1 could penetrate only until 1990 or thereabouts, it might make sense to still build the airplane as a cruise-missile carrier or conventional bomber. But it only makes sense to do this after we have funded Stealth fully. In other words, if penetration is our top priority, and I think it should be, we must develop Stealth first. Then we should look at the B-1 as something we might evaluate as a successor to the B-52 in a conventional sense.

General Davis was asked his view of these dates. He was asked whether or not he would recommend procurement of the B-1 if we knew it could not penetrate Soviet airspace in the "early 1990's." He answered that he could not make such a recommendation. Yet, that is precisely what is happening.

We must ask about what could be characterized a "window of nonpenetrability" between the time when our B-52's lose their penetration ability and when the Stealth comes on board. I submit that an accelerated Stealth program, which gave us an IOC in the very early 1990's, would assure us that a penetration gap would not occur. To support this contention, I point to General Davis' statement that the B-52H, the latest model of which we have about 90 in our inventory, could penetrate to "1989 or so." Indeed, according to public reports the Central Intelligence Agency, in testimony before the Appropriations Defense Subcommittee, testified that the B-52 force could indeed penetrate Soviet air defense with acceptable degree of risk throughout the remainder of this decade.

Madam President, it may be argued that the B-1 would be a more effective penetrator than the B-52, but the point

is that both aircraft could do the job. Soviet air defense could be likened to a hitter in baseball, and our bombers as a pitcher on the mound. If the batter can only hit baseballs traveling at 80 miles per hour, it really does not matter if a pitcher can throw a ball at 85 miles an hour or a second pitcher can throw it at 90 miles per hour. Both pitchers will be able to strike out the batter. In other words, both the B-52H and B-1 can do the job.

But if the next batter can hit any ball under 100 miles per hour, then we had better be getting a new pitcher ready in the bullpen. Because the betting is that only our Stealth pitcher will be able to win inning after inning, and game after game, as the decade of the nineties opens up.

I want to be sure that it is the technology, and not the funding level, which limits the pace of the Stealth program.

The second point I want to make is that the House of Representatives has funded the Stealth program at the level I am proposing in my amendment. It should be noted also that the House version of this bill is some \$11 to \$12 billion below the level of the Senate bill. I pose the question, then: Are we to assume that the House is being overly extravagant with this vital program at the same time it is so far below the Senate appropriations bill in our overall defense spending effort? I do not believe this to be the case. The House also sees the desirability of avoiding a "window of nonpenetrability" in our strategic bomber systems.

Third, I have consulted other Senators who have studied the details of the Stealth program. It should be pointed out that these Senators are well briefed and up to date on the status of the program. I am confident that the present funding level in the bill, as opposed to the full funding I propose, will lead to an IOC that will be measurably delayed—at least a year, but more probably longer if the B-1 funding eats up more and more of the budget in the out-years.

The important thing is not the \$250 million additional for Stealth development in fiscal year 1982. The important thing is the initiation of a practice of seriously underfunding the development of a technology which, in its many uses, may very well have a major impact on the Soviet-American strategic balance through the end of this century. It could very well negate a Soviet air defense infrastructure into which the Russians have invested well over \$100 billion thus far.

The administration has argued that it will be more successful in conducting negotiations with the Soviets on strategic weaponry only if it goes into those negotiations from a renewed position of strength. Yet, there is a growing feeling that the recent mix of strategic decisions announced by the administration, in reality, only reduces our strategic capabilities. In sum, we intend to retire B-52 bombers earlier than previously scheduled and retire Titan missiles earlier than previously scheduled. There is nothing to take their place until after 1985. The hardening of our current silos,

be they Titan or Minuteman, from what I understand, will not add to our missile survivability.

Therefore, it is probably a waste of money for the lack of a workable program. In the meantime, we are delaying a decision on the possibility of a mobil MX basing mode until 1984—a 3-year delay. On top of that, Stealth would be delayed if Congress agrees to the administration's funding request contained in this bill. Furthermore, we shall be reducing our procurement of cruise missiles very significantly, from about 5,000 if we kept the B-52 in service, down to only 3,000 if we opt for the B-1.

In sum, Madam President, this defense appropriations bill does not look like a commitment to strengthen our strategic posture. Indeed, General Davis admitted in open testimony that we "lose capability" with the program funded by this appropriations bill. This is extraordinary. The head of our Strategic Air Command has testified that the strategic program announced by the administration, and funded by this bill, will be providing us with a gradual reduction in our capability over the next 5 years.

In my estimation, there are serious flaws in this program which weaken our entire strategic posture. The Senate has a responsibility to correct these flaws to the extent it is possible. The Stealth issue is merely a part of the problem, but a very important part.

It is possible that the Senate will endorse the administration's decision on the B-1. But this administration's policy is purportedly one of pursuing an aggressive Stealth program which will not be sacrificed at the alter of the B-1. I do not have confidence that there are sufficient funds in this bill to carry out the administration's policy on both the B-1 and Stealth, and that is the purpose of my amendment. The Senate should agree here and now that we fund the Stealth technology at the maximum level until the aircraft are all delivered.

To those who argue that the technology is not developed enough and that we would only be throwing money at it, I would agree there are risks. But if one goes to the major corporations involved in the development of Stealth, they will tell one that the risks are no greater than they take with any major new commercial development. Further, it is hard to address risks by conducting only paper research. We have to start spending money to build the equipment in order to find out the potential problems of any premise.

To say that since all our programs slip, so must this one, is simply throwing in the towel. It is the same criticism that this administration leveled at the previous administration's defense program, Madam President.

Our leverage with the Soviets rests upon exploiting our technology to the fullest and Stealth represents the most advanced technology we have the capability of developing in a critical strategic program. If we fail to provide adequate resources for the Stealth program, it would be a tragic mistake.

Madam President, my amendment would fulfill a commitment made by the

administration that the Stealth program would be funded at the fastest prudent pace. I share that commitment. My amendment is putting the resources behind the administration's commitment.

I urge the adoption of the amendment, Madam President.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, my good friend from West Virginia makes an interesting presentation to the Senate. It is a complicated one. I can say at the outset that, as he may recall and other Members of the Senate will recall, when I first started digging into the overall question of the manned bomber and the ATB and the program for the future, I had some question whether we could afford the course that we are on. As a consequence, we have had hearings. We have had a series of hearings in our subcommittee examining into the question of the options that we have.

The first option is obvious, to maintain the B-52 force, the present force. The second would be to go to the B-1. The third would be to go to the combined B-1/ATB, and the third one would be to put all our eggs in the ATB as quickly as possible.

As I examined that and the members of our committee examined it, it became apparent that the first option was unworkable. The B-52's, which originated in the generation of Harry Truman as President, have served the country well. To maintain them into the future involves a substantial cost and does not present a change in technology that is necessary to deal with the ever-increasing threat that we face. The cost of maintaining them through the year 2000 is substantial and, should we decide to do that, maintain them into the 1990's, when we reach whatever deadline we set, we would have no more manned bomber. We would have no asset value left in our main vehicle as far as manned bomber force is concerned.

The B-1B is a different breed of cat than the B-1 and we are presenting here in the committee bill the approach which is basically the combined B-1B/ATB option. That option is cost effective. It means that we can, in fact, go into an interim vehicle, the B-1B, which will meet all our program objectives, have a life span beyond the year 2000, and, at the same time, be able to concentrate as much of our defense funds as possible in the area of ATB.

Following the appearance of representatives of the Department of Defense in a classified session of our subcommittee—and we did receive a classified statement at that time—I asked for an unclassified explanation of the position of the administration on the bomber modernization portion of the President's strategic modernization program. It is, I think, a very enlightening document. It is one that I hope Members of the Senate will study, because it contains enough information, in my judgment, to reach an opinion on the bill before us without any classified information. As a matter of fact, if Members of the Senate wish to compare the two, I would be happy to let them read the classified document and the unclassified document. It becomes apparent what is classified in this

process. But that classification is not, in my judgment, a determining criterion as far as the issue before us is concerned.

Madam President, there have been many things mentioned about the Secretary's testimony and Secretary Weinberger has testified before several committees, including ours, that the B-1B will penetrate with competence well into the 1990's. In a letter of November 9 to the chairmen of the Appropriations and the Armed Services Committees, Secretary Weinberger and the CIA Director, Mr. Casey, maintained the B-1B would have the capability to penetrate anticipated Soviet air defenses well into the 1990's in a multitude of employment modes and perform effectively as a cruise missile carrier and a bomber into the next century.

It was that judgment that led us to decide to recommend to the Senate the combined program.

We do not have an ATB option only. We are not abandoning the B-52's. There is money in the B-52's to keep them operational until the B-1B's are delivered and operational ready for combat.

However, we are looking for the ability to deal with the projected changes in Soviet air defenses, and the program we present to the Senate gives us that ability.

I quote from Dr. DeLauer's letter, which was declassified. He states:

The combined program offers both near and far term modernization that will force the Soviets to improve their air defense program starting now, and continuing throughout the rest of the century. The heavy investment this will require will provide the U.S. with significant leverage and restrict the Soviet's ability to upgrade their offensive forces. In contrast to this, an ATB only program allows the Soviets to delay the improvements to their air defenses and gives them many years to work exclusively on ways to counter ATB technology. Finally, the combined program allows us the option of deciding to buy more or less of either the B-1B or ATB at mid-decade depending on the progress made and the cost of each program. This competitive posture is extremely important in controlling costs and exists only in the combined program.

Madam President, Dr. DeLauer goes on to say:

Air defense in today's world is done in depth and consists of varying degrees of defense depending on the importance of the target and timing of the attack.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the unclassified letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, together with the statistics which are attached, be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, D.C., November 17, 1981.
Hon. TED STEVENS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Defense,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Yesterday I sent to you a classified explanation of the Bomber modernization portion of the President's strategic modernization program. At that time you and other members of the committee expressed a desire for an unclassified explanation. This letter is in response to your request.

The President's recommendations for a two bomber force have their genesis in the joint, Office of the Secretary of Defense, Air Force, Bomber Alternatives Study, which was mandated by the FY 81 Department of Defense Authorization Act. As you know the Authorization Act directed our study to focus on a multirole bomber that would be operational prior to 1987 and be able to perform the missions of a nuclear weapons delivery platform, cruise missile carrier, and a conventional bomber. This study and other analyses have convinced the Air Force and the Administration that the aging B-52 must be replaced as soon as possible.

As you know, to be an effective deterrent a manned bomber must be able to accomplish three basic parts of the manned bomber mission; take off and base escape prior to being struck, with particular concern toward a surprise attack; navigate and fly safely the long range to its targets; and, penetrate any defenses required to reach its targets.

As the Soviets deploy increasing numbers of warheads (which can be used for barrage attack), and develop more effective forward air defenses, the B-52's ability to accomplish all three parts of its mission in sufficient numbers to be an effective and credible deterrent becomes increasingly questionable in the last half of the 1980's. In addition, the cost of the B-52's operation and maintenance is rising dramatically as its age increases. In contrast to this, the B-1B and the ATB can accomplish all three parts of the bomber mission effectively and will be able to do so for many years to come.

As I mentioned to you during your hearing, we were able to narrow our bomber alternatives to four basic options: (1) modifying and modernizing the present force of B-52's and FB-111's, and (2) an all B-1B force, (3) an all ATB force, and (4) a mixed force of B-1B's and ATB's.

When these alternatives were examined in detail, we found that the cost of operating the present force until the year 2000 would range between approximately 85 and 100 billion (FY 81\$) including tanker costs, cruise missiles, and other costs needed to keep the force operational and depending on the modification and retirement schedule for the B-52.

The cost for an equivalent force of B-1B's turned out to range between approximately 86 and 106 billion (FY 81\$) given an IOC for the B-1B of 1986 and depending on the retirement schedule for the B-52. The cost of the ATB only option is, of course, classified but I can say that the cost is not significantly different from the cost of the combined B-1/ATB program recommended by the President. The combined program, however, is much more effective in maintaining the deterrence of the manned bomber force. It also provides significant added capabilities in this decade which the ATB only program does not. An unclassified cost comparison of these programs is attached for your information.

The combined program offers both near and far term modernization that will force the Soviets to improve their air defense program starting now, and continuing throughout the rest of the century. The heavy investment this will require will provide the U.S. with significant leverage and restrict the Soviet's ability to upgrade their offensive forces. In contrast to this, an ATB only program allows the Soviets to delay the improvements to their air defenses and gives them many years to work exclusively on ways to counter ATB technology. Finally, the combined program allows us the option of deciding to buy more or less of either the B-1B or ATB at mid-decade depending on the progress made and the cost of each program. This competitive posture is extremely important in controlling costs and exists only in the combined program.

In closing, I would like to briefly mention the controversy over the issue of the ability

of manned bombers to penetrate Soviet air defenses. On 10 November 1981, Secretary Weinberger and Mr. Casey, the Director of the CIA, sent a joint letter to you which discussed this subject in detail. I can only add that people uninformed with the facts and technical details of air defense often imagine air defense as a wall or barrier that is or is not broken at any given point in time. This conception is misleading. Air defense in today's world is done in depth and consists of varying degrees of defense depending on the importance of the target and timing of the attack.

Thus, there is no magic moment when a given type of bomber cannot "penetrate." What occurs is that the probability of air defenses being effective over a range of desired targets gradually increases over time as defenses are improved. These improvements, however, can be offset through the introduction of new equipment and tactics in the attacking force. I am confident that the low radar cross section of the B-1B (which is less than one one hundredth that of the B-52) and its state-of-the-art electronics will allow it to penetrate to needed targets well into the 1990s. The improvements that the ATB will offer in these areas promises to allow similar effectiveness to be maintained well into the next century. By combining these two programs, we maintain the important deterrent capability of manned bombers, that is, reliability, survivability, recallability, endurance, and ability to hit mobile targets, well into the future for essentially the same cost we would incur if we continued to operate our older obsolete systems.

Attached per your request are unclassified point papers which elaborate further on our bomber modernization program, I trust you will find them helpful. Please feel free to contact me at any time if you desire additional information.

Sincerely,

DICK DELAVER.

B-1B/B-52 COMPARISONS

| | B-1B | B-52 G/H | B-1B internal and external | B-52 internal | B-52 internal and external |
|--|----------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|---------------|----------------------------|
| Physical characteristics: | | | | | |
| Length (feet) | 147 | 159 | | | |
| Wing span (feet) | 78/137 | 185 | | | |
| Wing sweep (degrees) | 67.5/15 | | | | |
| Takeoff gross weight (pounds) | 477,000 | 488,000 | | | |
| Maximum inflight gross weight (pounds) | 477,000 | 488,000 | | | |
| Performance data: | | | | | |
| Power plant/number of engines | F/101-GE-102/4 | J-57/TF-33/8 | | | |
| Takeoff distance (feet) | 8,300 | 10,500/9,500 | | | |
| Speeds (mach number) | | | | | |
| Maximum high altitude | 1.20 | 0.90 | | | |
| High altitude cruise | 0.70 | 0.77 | | | |
| Low altitude penetration | 0.85 | 0.53-0.55 | | | |
| Weapon carriage capacities: | | | | | |
| Nuclear gravity: | | | | | |
| B-28 | | 12 | 20 | 4 | 16 |
| B-43 | | 12 | 26 | 4 | 16 |
| B-61 | | 24 | 38 | 4 | 16 |
| B-83 | | 24 | 38 | 4 | 16 |
| Nuclear guided: | | | | | |
| AGM-69 (SRAM) | | 24 | 38 | 8 | 20 |
| AGM-86B (ALCM) | | 8 | 22 | 8 | 20 |
| Conventional gravity: | | | | | |
| MK-82 | | 84 | 128 | 27 | 51 |
| MK-84 | | 24 | 38 | 8 | 18 |
| | | | B-52 | B-1A | |
| Historical perspective: | | | | | |
| B-52 aircraft requirement established | | January 1946 | | | June 1970, ¹ |
| 1st flight | | April 1952 | | | December 1974. |
| B-52D delivered to SAC | | June 1956-December 1957 | | | |
| B-52E delivered to SAC | | February 1959-February 1961 | | | |
| B-52H delivered to SAC | | May 1961-October 1962 | | | |
| B-1A DSARC III | | | | | December 1976. |

¹ DSARC II (full-scale development).

Planned programs:

B-52G IOC for ALCM/OAS, (one squadron), 1982.

B-52H with ALCM carriage, 1986.

B-1B IOC (15 aircraft to SAC), 1986.

B-1B FOC (100 aircraft to SAC), 1988.

Operational inventory:

B-52D, 78.

B-52G, 127.

B-52H, 96.

B-1A, 4 in non-flyable storage at Edwards AFB, CA.

Components for survival:

Base escape characteristics:

Distance from incoming weapon detonation.

Altitude from incoming weapon detonation.

Aircraft hardness from multiple nuclear effects.

Base location relative to Soviet SSBNs.

Range: Increased SIOP range allows for more flexibility in timing, circumnavigation of threat areas, target coverings, etc.

Penetration characteristics B-1B vice B-52:

Reduced radar cross-section (B-52 RCS is 100 times that of the B-1B):

Reduces engagement opportunities.

Provides more ECM choices.

Speed and altitude.

Dilution effects of ALCM.

COST SUMMARY

[In billions of 1981 constant dollars]

| | Present force extended | All B-1B 1986 (IOC) |
|--|------------------------|---------------------|
| R. & D. | 0-1 | 2-3 |
| Procurement | 4-6 | 35-36 |
| Existing force modifications required. | 28-33 | 7-12 |
| Operation and support | 53-60 | 42-55 |
| Total ¹ | ² 85-100 | 86-106 |
| (Fiscal year 1982-2000) | ² (105-125) | |

¹ The ranges reflect different force structure decisions that might be made over the next 20 yrs, especially the precise retirement profile for the B-52's as cruise missile carriers.

² It should be noted that around the year 2000 the B-52 will exhaust its structural life and have to be replaced at a cost of approximately \$20 to \$25 billion in fiscal year 1981 dollars. Thus, these costs should be included.

Note: ATB costs are classified. Further breakdown of these figures is available to cleared personnel only.

A COMPARISON OF B-52/B-1 BOMBER FORCES¹

[Costs shown in billions of fiscal year 1981 dollars]

| | Present force extended (376 PAA) | B-1B only (200 PAA) |
|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------|
| Bomber: | | |
| O. & S.: | | |
| B-52 | 30.3 | 9.6 |
| FB-111 | 3.2 | 1.2 |
| B-1 | 0 | 15.2 |
| Missile (CM/SRAM) | 3.9 | 3.8 |
| Mods: | | |
| B-52 | 27.4 | 6.3 |
| FB-111 | 1.2 | .5 |
| Tanker (KC-135) O. & S./Mods. | 20.1 | 15.3 |
| Procurement (aircraft and missiles): | | |
| R. & D. | .7 | 3.4 |
| Production | 6.6 | 36.6 |
| Total | 93.4 | 91.9 |

¹ Hypothetical force structure for comparison purposes only (fiscal year 1982 through year 2000).

B-52/B-1 COST COMPARISONS

Unclassified comparisons of the cost of extending the present force of B-52s versus the President's combined B-1/ATB program are not possible due to the classified nature of the ATB program.

A comparison of the B-1B portion of that package and the B-52 can be done on an incremental basis.

The operation and maintenance (O&M) costs through the year 2000 of the President's program is over 6 billion (FY 81\$) less than the O&M cost of extending the present force of B-52s and FB-111s. O&M comparisons are:

Present Force (O&M): 60 Billion.

President's Program (O&M): 54 Billion. Since the President's program replaces the aging B-52 with modern state-of-the-art equipment, many aircraft modifications are avoided. The President's program avoids approximately 20 billion dollars (FY 81\$) of these modifications. This 20 billion cost avoidance is approximately equal to the cost of acquiring the B-1B force planned by the President. Modification comparisons are as follows:

Present Force (Mods): 28 Billion (FY 81\$).

President's Program (Mods): 8 Billion (FY 81\$).

RATIONALE FOR A B-1B/ATB PROGRAM

B-52 effectiveness rapidly declining: Poor base escape characteristics: Increasingly vulnerable to SLBM threat. Incentive for Soviet first strike.

Vulnerability to nuclear effects.

Vulnerability to forward defenses: Long range fighters and SuAWACS.

Age (structural life ends approx. year 2000).

B-1B operational in 1986:

Near term response to redress strategic imbalance.

Provides survivable, enduring, recallable, strategic force.

Provides effective means to penetrate defenses well into the 1990s.

Provides Cruise Missile carriage well into the next century.

Improve conventional air power: Range/payload exceeds B-52. Greatly improved penetration. Near term capability.

ATB available in early 1990s:

Allows development to proceed at fastest prudent pace.

Available before B-1B penetration capability is at risk.

Provides highly effective approach to penetrate into the next century.

Bomber Force Costs:

Modernization of the B-52 will range between 85B and 100B (FY81\$) thru the year 2000 depending on the modernization and retirement schedule of the B-52. New plane needed in approx 2000 at cost of 20-25 billion (not included in above range).

"B-1B only" force would range between 86B and 106B (FY81\$) thru year 2000 depending on the retirement schedule of the B-52. Advantage of ATB lost. Allows early retirement of costly B-52 force.

"ATB only" force would cost essentially the same as a combined B-1/ATB program depending on IOC thru the year 2000. Cost of waiting for ATB pays for the B-1B.

Combined B-1B/ATB program. Provides cost competition between the B-1B and ATB. Allows early retirement of costly B-52 force.

Impact on Soviet Defense Expenditures:

B-1B plus ATB place maximum stress on defenses:

B-1B will stimulate massive Soviet investment:

Soviets will spend several times the cost of our bomber program for air defense in this decade.

Defenses optimized for low altitude.

ECCM retrofits.

B-1B and ALCM will be extremely difficult to defend against despite massive investment in defenses.

When ATB is available:

Soviets must maintain defenses against E-1B.

Limits resources available to develop new systems against.

Combination of B-1B, ALCM and ATB will drive Soviets to massive investment in defenses, diverting resources from other forces.

Despite enormous investment, defenses not likely to be successful.

Risk:

B-1B plus ATB minimizes risk of program execution:

ATB provides incentive to control B-1B performance, cost.

B-1B provides incentive to achieve ATB performance, cost.

ATB only program yields potentially unacceptable risks:

Leaves US dependent on B-52 for more than ten additional years.

Possibility of ATB development problems: Known risk areas of unconventional design.

Unknown risk areas.

Impact on reactive defenses:

Without B-1B, Soviets focus on ATB.

Possibility of dramatic breakthrough.

Summary: B-1B plus ATB Program:

Provides effective military forces into 21st century.

Produces near term response to redress strategic balance.

Provides near term conventional force projection capability and improved support for conventional missions.

Costs the same as B-52 plus ATB force (within estimating uncertainty).

Allows needed time to design and develop an operationally effective ATB.

Avoids risk of depending on aging B-52 force until an effective ATB is developed, produced and available in significant numbers.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, let me emphasize, in terms of costs, what we are doing. We are providing a cost-effective program. It is not possible for us to put in the RECORD a comparison of the total costs because of the classified nature of the ATB program. But a comparison of the B-1B portion and the B-52 can be done and has been given to us by Dr. DeLauer.

The President's program avoids the modification costs on the B-52. The President's program avoids the heavy cost of continued maintenance of the B-52's beyond 1990, in terms of their need as a penetrating bomber. I believe that if we compare the President's program costs, the rationale of the B-1B, and the ATB program, with the maintenance of the B-52's until the B-1B's have been delivered for the penetrating bomber, the Senate will find that we have the most cost-effective program.

The effect of the Senator's amendment is to put into the bill additional money for the ATB.

Mr. NUNN. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a brief question on that point?

Because of our disclosure, I hope the Senator will emphasize and clarify that point, that this amendment is directed at the advanced technical bomber, the so-called Stealth bomber.

Mr. STEVENS. This amendment, as I understand it, is directed at Stealth technologies, and it is my understanding that the sponsor of the amendment intends it to be directed toward the ATB. Does that answer the Senator's question?

Mr. NUNN. That does, and that is exactly the point I was trying to make a little while ago.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, there are other items in the Stealth technologies in the same category that this money is being added to, and that is the difficulty of dealing with it.

I have a letter which is not classified but which has not been released for distribution, so I do not feel right in reading it.

Let me make the same point, and that is the point that there is no intention whatsoever, from the point of view of the Appropriations Committee, to allow the ATB technologies to slip.

On the contrary, they present some of the greatest opportunities for us to show the ingenuity of the American system and our ability to deal with innovation and to adapt it to our needs of anything this Senator has come across.

We are dedicating the maximum amount of money possible for the ATB technologies, consistent with the decision that we must maintain the B-52's until we get the B-1B's delivered as penetrating bombers; and we must be able to utilize, to the maximum extent possible, any of the developing technologies that would enhance the B-1B as it is delivered.

I have said it before—perhaps I am a dreamer—but I am one who believes that

we will see the B-1B, as it goes into subsequent generations, incorporate the product of this fantastic research that is going on in our country. It is research that every American can be proud of, because it is full-scale engineering capability to deal with wholly new concepts.

I am now informed that I can quote from this letter. It is a letter that I believe the Senator from Georgia, the Senator from Texas, and the Senator from Virginia sent in November to the Secretary of Defense, concerning the ATB and whether or not the IOC—that is, initial operational capability—of the advanced technology bomber would be allowed to slip and what steps they were prepared to take to provide the earliest production schedule for the program which was reduced.

Secretary Weinberger wrote back to the three Senators as follows:

Regarding your concerns pertaining to the bomber program, let me assure you that I do not intend to permit the Advanced Technology Bomber Program (ATB) (Stealth) to slip. As I stated in my letter of 10 November 1981, the ATB will serve as an essential element of a mixed force of penetrating bombers and cruise missiles through the 1990s and well into the next century. In accordance with the importance attached to the ATB, we have identified the technical risk areas and have adequately funded them. As soon as technical progress allows, we will move into full-scale development. Funds have been set aside in our out-year planning to fund this program fully and to cover the earliest start of full-scale engineering development that we now forecast to be prudent. We are, in sum, committed to proceed at the fastest prudent pace based on demonstrated technical progress. We intend to hold periodic technical reviews under the sponsorship of the EXCOM to reassess progress and future schedules.

The Secretary goes on to discuss other aspects of the Stealth technology.

However, my point in regard to this amendment is that we have more than enough money in this budget to cover the ATB, the Stealth technologies, the B-1B, and the B-52. As other people have pointed out, this is the largest budget in peacetime, so far as weapons procurement is concerned, that has been presented to the Senate.

I hope the Senate will recognize that this issue has been explored thoroughly. After having started from a position different from that of the authorization committee, we have come back to the point where our committee believes the program that was presented and authorized is the correct one, and that is what is funded here, so far as the bill before the Senate is concerned.

Mr. GARN. Madam President, I support the distinguished Senator from Alaska, the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense.

Senator STEVENS has done an excellent job, in my opinion, in putting this package together to insure that we can have the best possible spread of weapons systems with money properly allocated.

I certainly do not intend to take much time now debating the whole issue of B-1, B-52, and Stealth. As a matter of fact, it becomes rather difficult in the Chamber to be able to talk about the

so-called ATB because of the highly classified nature of it.

In my opinion, there has been far too much talk in public over the last year or two in any event. Still as unfortunate as it is, it is not a secret program, and we have been talking about it so much.

But I do wish to speak briefly about points that Senator STEVENS has made about the options available and specifically one at this point and only one, and I will have more to say when we get to the B-1 amendments.

We are constantly told by some that the B-52 is a viable option well into the 1990's, that the airframe will still be good in the 1990's.

I have no doubt that the airframe will fly in the 1990's. The DC-3 was built in the middle to late 1930's and the airframes are still flying by the hundreds all over the world.

But we have to ask the question about capability. There are lots of old automobiles that still travel the roads of this country but their capability I do not think would be considered in a number of areas equal to the newer models that are out.

But a B-52, as Senator STEVENS pointed out, is a very old airplane. The comment that has been made over and over again is true, that many of the crews who are flying that aircraft were not born when it became operational.

I had not yet gone through flight training when the B-52 became operational. I have had the opportunity to fly the B-52's, and 15 to 20 years ago it was a very fine airplane. It was the best we could produce. But it simply is not anymore. It is not a penetrator in 1981.

At the very best, the B-52 might get a few into the Soviet Union. I doubt if anyone would come out, with the air defenses they have and the tremendously large radar cross sections where the B-52 will simply appear big on the radarscope to our enemy.

And something else is true about all our planes, whether it is the B-52 or whatever it is, and possibly a lot of the old planes I used to fly as an Air Force pilot. The older they get the more expensive they are to maintain.

So when we first of all look at the capabilities of the B-52 and what it will do if it is still around in the 1990's this Senator will not vote for any funds under any circumstances to waste a lot of money on an old airframe that is not capable of doing the job in 1981 that it was designed to do 25 years ago, and to suggest that we should spend billions and billions of dollars to try and make it continue to do that job into the 1990's, is the most foolish military expenditures we could possibly make.

The second point is as to these estimates about how much it will cost to retrofit, upgrade it, and try and put new black boxes on it to make it do that job. I do not care how much money we spend on the B-52 we cannot turn it into a B-1. We can reskin it. We can restring the wings. We can put new engines on it. We can do all sorts of things, but it is still a B-52. We are on the H model now

and as much as I am an advocate of increased military strength to spend more money into the 1990's for an old, old airplane does not make any sense.

Mr. NUNN. Madam President, will the Senator yield for a brief question?

Mr. GARN. I am happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Georgia.

Mr. NUNN. I have a great deal of respect for the Senator's opinion on this subject. We have talked about it many times.

The Senator signed a letter with several other Senators today, and in the letter the Senator says the B-52 is not sufficiently hardened to withstand nuclear blast effects and cannot be modified to do so.

The Senator goes on to refer to the cost comparison of the B-52 taking all the way to the year 2000 versus the B-1/ATB.

I agree with the Senator. I think that that would be a foolish expenditure to try to have B-52's with electromagnetic pulse hardening work.

Does the Senator realize in the cost comparison we received from Dr. DeLauer on the B-52 he includes \$4.9 billion for just that expenditure, and that was not part of the program that anyone had advocated and so in effect it is a strawman simply jacking up the cost of the B-52? Does the Senator realize that?

Mr. GARN. May I say to my colleague from Georgia that I am aware of that and what I was just about to say is that the cost estimates well in the 7 years I have been in the Senate and served on the Senate Armed Services Committee, with the Senator from Georgia, I have yet to see anyone's cost estimates on anything be correct.

Mr. NUNN. I agree with that.

Mr. GARN. That is in 7 consecutive years. So, when we have figures out here in constant this year dollars and inflation rates and all of that I kind of smile that anyone's estimates of being close. Maybe some estimates we get in the ball park.

So my reply is simply I do not doubt that. Everyone tries to make his best case. Those who are opposed to the B-1 will inflate it as far out as they can show the most huge cost overruns and increases they possibly think they can get away with. Those on the other side will try and inflate or deflate the figures as necessary to show the best possible case.

I am not here to argue dollar figures one way or another.

Mr. NUNN. The Senator would agree, then, to spend \$4.9 billion for electromagnetic pulse hardening work on the B-52 would be a foolish expenditure, would he not?

Mr. GARN. I think my statement about not wishing to spend any additional money on the B-52 to make it try to do something in the 1990's certainly covers that particular point rather well so I agree with the Senator.

But again we are looking, I am looking at the total package and not an individual item. But I am willing to bet that even those figures increased to show the best possible case, I am willing to bet anyone in this Chamber or out of this Chamber that we will find that the cost

of maintaining that B-52 through those years if we decided to do that would be more than those estimates, even though we may agree they are sort of padded now, simply from history, my hindsight does tell me when I have seen most everything cost considerably more, whether it is in the social field or military field constantly running on and on and on, that they probably are low. I do not think there is much doubt about that. But I say that from a practical experience standpoint of the cost of maintaining older airplanes I have seen it happen over and over again. The Senator from Georgia remembers the C-124 which I spent a large number of years flying back and forth across the Pacific. We were hand-making parts the last 3 or 4 years of operation of that because they were not in production anymore. The C-124 is about the same vintage as the B-52, not too much difference, the old Boeing Stratocruiser, the old fighters, and so on, and the cost when we have no production facilities remaining but we continue them far beyond their original intended service life they become very costly.

So I think on just from the standpoint of the maintenance figures by any hindsight we want to apply we want to keep that B-52 going through the year 2000 I think the costs are going to be far, far beyond what DOD is saying today even if we want to subtract out the \$4.9 billion. That is one of the reasons I am so opposed to attempting to do than on the basis of cost alone, even if I thought it would do some of these functions in the 1990's, but I repeat again we simply cannot turn a B-52 into a B-1 or have the capabilities that it has.

The other point I wish to make, without getting into any classified or technical information, is that Senator STEVENS in this budget has tried to present a very truthful budget by increasing the inflation rate that is shown and by also on the B-1 including a 3-percent cost overrun per year, which from his study showed that that was the average cost overrun in a large number of aircraft purchased over the last several decades.

I think that is a fair thing to do to try and present realistic figures. But, on the other hand, if it is fair to do that for those who propose to go directly to the Stealth and ignore the B-1(D) at this time and say that it will be flying in 1991 or even spend additional money to make it fly faster, I think that is one of those cases where the difficulties of the technology involved to expect to speed that up before 1991 are ridiculous. It is simply not possible. We pour all sorts of money and reach a point of diminishing returns where the money will not produce any faster results.

But again I will be willing to make most anyone a bet that we are not going to have that aircraft until 1995 at the earliest because again if it is fair to apply an average cost overrun it is also fair to apply an average time overrun. It is almost impossible to find a major weapons system that has not had months and years of time overrun from when they were originally supposed to be opera-

tional. The Trident first boat in the water was 2 years after they originally said it would be and they hope to accelerate that program.

I will not take the time of the Senate to go through all of the examples, but I cannot find examples of major weapons systems where they were completed prior to the original time. They have all been late by a factor of years in many cases.

Forgetting what Stealth can do, we are dealing with from a pilot standpoint stability, flyability, and all sorts of new technologies. When we get into the actual testing phase, usually it is necessary to redesign this part of it. They change this. "Well, we goofed on that." You have to add a little fuselage here and change the empennage and so on.

I think just again from the practical standpoint we are looking at a situation where it is going to drift into the middle 1990's.

So to those who say let us go with the B-52 we are giving the choice of spending money on an old outmoded aircraft that will probably be much higher than most people estimate or waiting all the way until the mid-1990's and having nothing capable in between.

So I believe the only responsible position we can take, both from a cost standpoint and operational capability, is the B-1B, not really that I want to make a choice like I want a choice between a Model A or a possible future car model that may be out in the 1990's, and I will not do anything in between except continue to try and upgrade the Model T during those years until we get it. We are really betting on the "to come" in my opinion.

So as I think I said, the distinguished Senator from Alaska, the chairman of the subcommittee, has done an excellent job on balancing out these strategic weapons systems and I certainly hope the Senate will support that position.

Mr. LEVIN. Madam President, I rise in support of the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia and I only wish to make a couple points.

First, in response to the Senator from Utah, we will indeed see the IOC of the Stealth bomber drift into the 1990's if we do not fund it adequately.

One of the purposes of this amendment is to fund it adequately.

I might also point out that I do not know anybody who is supporting the B-52 as an alternative. The alternatives which are going to be offered are an all ATB and a mixed force. The question is which new bomber or bombers, not whether we have a new bomber. There is a critical need for this amendment.

In testimony before the Strategic Air Subcommittee earlier this year, General Ellis stated:

The most pressing requirement is to prepare for the long term, 1990 and beyond. To do this right, we should start now to develop a new technology bomber with the earliest possible initial operational capability (IOC).

That, my colleagues, is the definition of the Stealth bomber.

I would point out also to my colleagues that Secretary Weinberger himself said in public testimony:

Our vigorous ATB program will lead to that plane's deployment under current plans beginning in 1989.

He said that on October 5. Now the IOC slipped several years between October 5 and October 29. Now we are told the IOC is the early nineties. But I repeat that on October 5 in public session the Secretary of Defense said that:

Our vigorous ATB program will lead to that plane's deployment under current plans beginning in 1989.

Finally, Madam President, I would, of course, want to avoid any risk of getting into classified information. There has been enough debate about that already this afternoon, although I might say that I was at the same meetings of the Armed Services Committee in public that the Senator from Georgia was at, and the information about which he spoke earlier this afternoon, to my memory, was information which was discussed in public session before the Armed Services Committee. There was nothing that he said, to my recollection, that was not discussed in public session at the Armed Services Committee.

But I do want to say that while the questions and the proofs as to how we can speed up resolution of design uncertainty of ATB and how we can give ourselves the option of accelerating the IOC is classified, how we can do that and how fast we can do it is classified, it is not classified information that we can speed up resolution of design uncertainties of the ATB and give ourselves the option of accelerating the IOC. That is not classified information. That is the purpose of the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia, the amendment which is before us.

It is the most critical thing which we are about in the entire strategic program of this country, to have a Stealth bomber earlier rather than later. It is the most advanced technology bomber known to mankind. It makes use of American technology, and I hope we will adopt the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. EXON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. EXON. I thank the Chair.

I rise, Madam President, to support the amendment proposed by the Senator from West Virginia. I have listened to most of the debate on this and I fully recognize and realize there are two legitimate sides to this question.

Those of us who are supporting this amendment are simply saying we are convinced that with the addition of \$250 million provided for in this amendment we will indeed, not necessarily have assurance, but the high likelihood we can, move up the IOC on the advanced technology bomber. There are those who do not agree.

But I believe if you would talk to those who are in charge of this program they would likely be with the Senator from West Virginia in simply stating the only thing we could do by not approving this amendment is to make sure that the advanced technology bomber would not come on line sooner than the administration is presently projecting.

December 1, 1981

It seems to me, Madam President, that with the extensive funding we are going to assure ourselves of the best possible defense, and that we would be wise indeed to take the chance of the \$250 million provided for in this amendment, which will indeed allow us to move ahead months, if not a year or more, faster on the IOC for the Stealth advanced technology bomber.

I yield the floor.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, if the committee thought additional funds could be used for the research that is involved, we would have added them. We have not been at all reticent about moving to increase the funds available for the Department of Defense at this critical time.

The plain and simple fact of the matter is there must be continued research. I think my friend from New Hampshire probably has spent as much time as any member of our committee on this, and perhaps he wishes to make a comment about it. But he makes the point to me quite often that there is just a limit to the number of people who can be employed in technology research such as this.

The impacts of those limits have been measured. The money we have in this bill now to deal with these technologies is more than sufficient. There is no question that our committee is dedicated, and that the administration is dedicated, to the concept of pursuing the ATB and related technologies at the fastest prudent pace.

I call the attention of the Senate respectfully to the fact that this is another one of the items that was listed on the "Dear Colleague" letter of the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from South Carolina, "additional funds for acceleration of the advanced technology bomber."

Maybe I am not understanding the situation, but I seem to remember so much rhetoric from people who say we are spending too much for defense, that we brought out a bill that is too big.

Now I think we are going to face a series of amendments, as I have said to the Members of the Senate, to add to the largest bill in history in peacetime. Who is kidding whom? No one is kidding me. If there is some indication that people think they can attempt to make the whole concept of defense into sort of a through-the-looking-glass type of proposition, that somehow or other this bill is not big enough, then I think we need a better explanation.

This money is not needed. The money that is needed is in the bill. There is a sufficient amount of money, as a matter of fact, in the R. & D. account to reprogram funds, and they could come back and get additional approval forthwith in this regard.

I know of no Member of the U.S. Senate who would deny the Department of Defense the moneys that were requested to pursue the concept of the ATB and the technologies related thereto.

I yield to my friend from New Hampshire.

Mr. RUDMAN. Madam President, I rise to oppose the amendment offered by

the distinguished Senator from Georgia and the minority leader.

After listening with some interest to the rather spirited exchange between the chairman of our subcommittee and my friend from Georgia, I rise with some trepidation because unquestionably we are all debating this issue, Madam President, with our hands tied behind our backs.

It is impossible to address the real issues that underlie this amendment without disclosing data which cannot be divulged in open session.

Having said that, let me try to address the salient points of this discussion: First, although the chairman of our subcommittee, the Senator from Alaska, is unable to announce on the floor and to the American people the level of funding in the program this year, let no one think for 1 minute that it is a small, minuscule sum.

It is an enormous sum of money.

Second, although I am sure the Senator from Nebraska is correct when he says that the people involved in this program would like more, I have yet to find anybody from the Defense Department, either civilian, military, or contractor, who did not want more for the particular program that was before the Senate.

Third, I would like one scrap of evidence presented to this Senate today from any responsible contractor who, in fact, is involved in this program to indicate that any additional money, beyond that which is authorized and which will be appropriated in this bill, will contribute 1 minute of increased efficiency toward reaching an early IOC.

Without going into classified material, let me simply say that the broad technical problems facing the Stealth program are far from solved. They challenge technology, they challenge the state of the art, and they challenge the companies that, in fact, are working on them. We best move slowly and carefully lest we find we have in 1990 a boondoggle that costs billions of dollars and will not fulfill the mission.

This debate at this moment has nothing to do with the B-1 or the B-52. It has to do with whether or not what we are spending is enough.

Further, for those of my colleagues who are on the floor and those who are listening in their offices, the greatest service they can do for their constituents would be to partake of the briefings that are available to us on the Stealth program. When they listen to those briefings and ask the right questions, they will come to some conclusions the nature of which cannot be disclosed in an open session of this type.

So I hope that the \$206 billion or \$209 billion, or whatever the figure will finally amount to when this bill is passed today or tomorrow, is enough. There is an enormous amount of money in this appropriation for the Stealth technology and we do not need a dime more. I hope we can defeat the amendment.

Mr. STEVENS. Madam President, I move to table the amendment and I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there

a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from West Virginia. The yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. (after having voted in the affirmative). Mr. President, on this vote, I have a pair with the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. SASSER). If he were present and voting, he would vote "nay." I have already voted "yea." Therefore, I withdraw my vote.

Mr. STEVENS. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD), and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) would vote "yea."

Mr. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. SASSER), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. TSONGAS), and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. ZORINSKY) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber wishing to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 51, nays 40, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 481 Leg.]

YEAS—51

| | | |
|-------------|-----------|----------|
| Abdnor | Gorton | Packwood |
| Andrews | Grassley | Percy |
| Armstrong | Hatch | Pressler |
| Baker | Hawkins | Quayle |
| Boschwitz | Hayakawa | Roth |
| Chafee | Heinz | Rudman |
| Cochran | Helms | Schmitt |
| Cohen | Humphrey | Simpson |
| D'Amato | Jepsen | Specter |
| Danforth | Kassebaum | Stafford |
| Denton | Kasten | Stevens |
| Dole | Laxalt | Symms |
| Domenici | Lugar | Thurmond |
| Durenberger | Mattingly | Tower |
| East | McClure | Wallop |
| Garn | Murkowski | Warner |
| Glenn | Nickles | Weicker |

NAYS—40

| | | |
|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Baucus | Eagleton | Melcher |
| Bentsen | Exon | Metzenbaum |
| Biden | Ford | Mitchell |
| Boren | Hart | Moynihan |
| Bradley | Heflin | Nunn |
| Bumpers | Hollings | Pell |
| Burdick | Huddleston | Proxmire |
| Byrd, Robert C. | Inouye | Pryor |
| Cannon | Jackson | Randolph |
| Chiles | Johnston | Riegle |
| Cranston | Kennedy | Sarbanes |
| DeConcini | Leahy | Williams |
| Dixon | Levin | |
| Dodd | Matsunaga | |

PRESENT AND GIVING A LIVE PAIR, AS PREVIOUSLY RECORDED—1

Harry F. Byrd, Jr., for.

NOT VOTING—8

| | | |
|-----------|---------|----------|
| Goldwater | Mathias | Tsangas |
| Hatfield | Sasser | Zorinsky |
| Long | Stennis | |

So the motion to lay on the table Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD's amendment (UP No. 723) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to consider the vote by which the motion was agreed to.

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

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senator from New Jersey has an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from New Jersey is recognized.

UP AMENDMENT NO. 724

(Purpose: To require the President to submit certain reports to Congress)

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BRADLEY) proposes an unprinted amendment numbered 724.

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

At the appropriate place and the following new section:

"Sec. . . (a) The national security requires a sustained enhancement of our military capability during the 1980s and 1990s. An adequate base of domestic economic power and enduring public acceptance of the cost are essential to a sustained improvement in our military readiness.

(b) The Administration's original forecast of economic and productivity growth, had it proven correct, would have substantially ensured that we could have satisfied these requirements. However that forecast presumed a radical improvement in our economic performance compared with the actual experience of the past several years. Moreover, our most recent experience, as well as the Administration's revised projections, confirm that we will not achieve the high growth levels on which the 1982-86 defense budget was premised. Furthermore, the economy is now in a recession of uncertain magnitude and duration. Because output has fallen, the burden of defense spending on American taxpayers has risen. If this burden grows, it could erode both the economic and the political base for a sustained increase in defense spending. To anticipate this threat and provide a comprehensive framework for Congress to evaluate the Administration's 1982 Posture Statement and 1983 Budget Request, the President shall prepare a report to Congress by January 31, 1982 describing:

(1) How the combination of a three-year tax cut and the projected defense spending increases for the period fiscal year 1982 through fiscal year 1986 will affect inflation, interest rates, and unemployment given low (under 2 percent), medium (2 to 4 percent), and high (over 4 percent) real economic growth rates.

(2) What alternative tax and expenditure policies the Administration will propose and what specific adjustments to our military strategy and programs will be required for the near, medium, and long term if economic and productivity growth continue to fall far below originally projected levels.

(3) The specific adjustments to our military strategy, requirements, and programs that would be needed if inflation in the defense sector is significantly higher than in the economy at large.

(c) A sustained enhancement of our military capability also requires a strategy that efficiently serves our most important national security and foreign policy objectives. This requires recognition that the U.S. no longer has the resources to defend independently all Western interests that will be threatened by Soviet power in the late 1980s and 1890s. We must therefore concentrate improvements in our military capability either on helping allies deter Soviet attacks in Western Europe and Northeast Asia or on defending friends and assets in the Near East. We must also foster progressive redistributions of the burdens and responsibilities for the defense of Western Europe, Northeast Asia, and the Near East. Accordingly, by January 31, 1982, the President shall prepare a report that answers the following questions:

(1) To what extent and in what ways does the Administration intend to allocate additional resources to securing vital allied interests in the Near East?

(2) What are the relative, long-term costs of defending the Persian Gulf region with and without at least one nearby base complex or set of facilities that could support major air defense and maritime operations as well as training, command, control, communication, intelligence, and logistics functions?

(3) How do the requirements for defending the Near East differ from those of Western Europe and how does the Administration plan to design more effective and efficient forces for this region's climate, terrain, and logistical environment to minimize the costs of developing and deploying such forces?

(4) What plans does the Administration have to increase our forward deployment capability by home-porting more ships in foreign bases, by pre-positioning equipment and material, or by building greater logistical facilities near the Persian Gulf?

(5) How does the Administration's long-range defense planning take account of economic competition between America and its allies and the decline in U.S. productivity relative to Japan and Western Europe?

(6) What assumptions does the Administration's budget make about the long-term redistribution of roles and responsibilities between the U.S. and its allies in defending Western Europe, Northeast Asia, the Near East, and their adjacent seas or ocean areas?

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, before I begin my statement on this amendment, which will be lengthy, I yield to the Senator from Arizona for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. DECONCINI. I thank the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. President, due to circumstances beyond my control, it will be difficult for me to offer tomorrow an amendment I have, and I have notified the Policy Committee. I have talked with the manager of the bill, the majority leader, and the minority leader, and I ask unanimous consent that following the conclusion of the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey, my amendment be the next pending amendment.

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

Mr. BRADLEY. Mr. President, the amendment I am offering today is substantially the same one I offered last May when we were debating the first concurrent budget resolution.

I argued then that our national security requires a sustained enhancement of our military capabilities.

I further argued that sustaining a large increase in defense spending requires a sound economy and good prospects for future economic growth.

I suggested that the administration's economic forecasts on which their original defense budget was based would prove excessively optimistic, and I suggested that the tax and expenditure policies premised on those forecasts would lead to high interest rates and rising unemployment.

Finally, I argued that the administration's exclusive reliance on tight money to control inflation would choke off any potential we might have for rapid economic growth in America.

Mr. President, I did not then, nor do I now, share the administration's faith that a supply-side miracle will cause productivity and economic growth rates to surge. I was concerned about how to preserve a consensus for a sustained defense buildup in the face of a recession of unknown magnitude and duration.

One reason for my concern is that rising unemployment means lower output. This, in turn, increases the burden the defense spending imposes on American taxpayers. I feared that this additional burden, at a time when our economic future is uncertain at best, would erode support for defense before our buildup had even begun.

To help us avoid this outcome, I proposed an amendment that would have required the President to do four things: to anticipate, first of all, the implications of both low economic growth and high inflation for the administration's defense policies; second, to consider what alternative economic strategies the administration might pursue should their original forecasts prove incorrect; third, to identify the adjustments to our defense strategy programs and requirements that might be needed, given high inflation and low economic growth; finally, to report these findings to Congress by October 1981.

Mr. President, had this amendment been adopted, it is my belief that Congress would be in a much better position today to manage the appropriation and budget processes. It was not adopted, and I offer it again in the same bipartisan spirit that I offered it last May.

Let me repeat the purpose of the amendment. It is to underscore the importance to our Nation of a sustained enhancement of our military capability. This is necessary both to deter conflict and, should deterrence fail, to win that conflict.

Mr. President, in a democracy as robust and open as ours, sustaining a big defense buildup in the face of strong competition from civilian programs requires several things.

First and foremost, it requires a healthy economy and good prospects for continued economic growth.

If a lot of people are out of work, or if there is a pervasive fear of high inflation, the consensus for allocating the growing share of our resources to defense will rapidly erode.

Experience bears this out. In the past our defense spending has undergone cycles of boom and bust. This pattern has done a number of things.

It has increased cost. It has undermined our defense industrial base. It has impaired the readiness of our general purpose forces. It has interfered with the efficient evolution of our strategic programs, and it has caused friend and foe alike to question the reliability and credibility of our security guarantees.

If we are serious about avoiding past errors and improving our military capability over the long haul, we must act now to foster the vigorous economic growth on which those improvements in defense depend.

Had the administration's economic forecasts been correct, there would probably be no need for this amendment.

But instead of high growth and low unemployment we have a recession. Instead of growth in fiscal 1982 of 5.2 percent, as the administration projected, we are now more likely to have 1.5 percent or 2 percent max. Instead of unemployment at 7.3 percent, as the administration projected, we are more likely in fiscal 1982 to have unemployment at 9 percent. Maybe the tax cuts we have enacted will keep that recession short and shallow. Right now, though, a lot of analysts are betting it will be long and deep.

Let us say it is short and shallow because the tax cuts are coming online in July. What does that signal? It signals the possibility of renewed inflationary pressures.

When the President's budget is fully implemented in 1986, he will have cut taxes by over \$750 billion, raised military spending by over \$180 billion and cut civilian programs by no more than \$130 to \$140 billion.

Even if the President gets all his civilian cuts, most of which are still unspecified, they still are not large enough to do the job.

Were the administration wholeheartedly committed to a sustained improvement in our defense programs the President would have been calling for tax increases not tax cuts. Why did he not? Presumably because he believed in the supply side miracle, that that would produce sufficient revenues for the military buildup and in fact at one point he said that the increased revenues from the tax cuts would provide the revenues to finance the military buildup.

As one of a handful of Senators who voted against the multiyear tax cuts but for the spending cuts, I can say unequivocally that I do not believe in the supply side miracle.

I do not think that we can count on it to finance our buildup in national defense.

Guns, butter, and a balanced budget cannot all be delivered by 1984. Yet so far the administration has shown reluctance to trim its ideology to economic reality, and here I put in evidence, the latest budget resolution coming out of the Budget Committee where the administration refuses to take a position on economic prospects.

The amendment I offer will assist them to do so.

If the budget deficit is to be contained, even at levels previously held unthinkable, either defense will have to be cut or more revenue will have to be raised. Those are our choices.

As I pointed out earlier, cutting non-defense will not give us the numbers. If this amendment is adopted, it will increase the likelihood that our economic policies can accommodate the level of military spending our leaders demonstrate we need.

We should not have to formulate defense policies in terms of what we can afford. The notion that we cannot afford the defense effort our security requires is a dangerous illusion.

We are fortunate that with proper economic policies we can sustain the level of defense spending our military and foreign policy objectives deserve and require. The key phrase though is "with proper economic policies."

I remain skeptical, as I said, that the present combination of tight money and highly stimulative fiscal policy is well designed to promote noninflationary growth. On the contrary, it is likely to lead to a possibly protracted recession followed by increasing inflation. This outcome quite simply will not permit us to maintain the level of defense spending the President and the Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committees say we need.

My distinguished colleagues on these committees have already voiced fears similar to those I have expressed today. In fact, in the report of the Senate Armed Services Committee to accompany the 1982 defense authorization bill, S. 815, the members stated:

The Committee is convinced that a sustained and increased defense effort is required. Moreover, it is the commitment to defense programs—not to a defense funding level—that is essential.

In this regard, the committee is concerned about the potential impact of underestimates in inflation on the execution of defense programs. The President has embarked on an ambitious economic recovery program intended to curb the increase in inflation. There is substantial disagreement, however, between the inflation projected by CBO and that of the President. Based on the CBO estimates of inflation, additional spending will be required to execute the President's planned defense programs.

And I emphasize that.

The report says:

Based on the CBO estimates of inflation, additional spending will be required to execute the President's planned defense programs.

The report goes on:

The committee found no basis for accepting the CBO estimates of inflation instead of the President's estimates.

That report was issued last May. Since then, it has become clear that the President's estimates were wrong. This fact is acknowledged by the distinguished members of the Senate Appropriations Committee in their November report to S. 1857 which states:

The Committee has carefully analyzed inflationary trends in the national economy,

particularly as they apply to defense activities and purchases. Two points become vividly clear: the rate of inflation is not slowing to the degree projected in the President's budget, and inflation in defense activities and purchases continues to exceed by a substantial margin the national average.

Although the budget anticipated an inflation rate of 8.7 percent for fiscal year 1981, the final composite figure was actually 13.3 percent. And there is no evidence yet that this rate has slowed markedly.

These developments make it painfully apparent that the optimistic 8.4 percent inflation rate projection contained in the President's September budget is not attainable.

The impact of badly underestimating inflation is severe. It will cut back FY81 program levels by more than \$2 billion and the impact in FY82 will be much the same if steps are not taken now to finance a more realistic rate....

Based on its analysis the Committee is recommending an increase above the President's budget and above the authorization level for FY82 totalling \$1.6 billion, which is the amount needed to finance a 10 percent inflation rate. Even this projection is considered moderate, but it at least presents a more realistic approach to the economic realities confronting the Nation.

What I have to say about the Appropriations Committee's report expressing grave reservations about these economic forecasts is that I commend my colleagues for their realism and their candor in bringing these important considerations to the Senate's attention. But I submit that it is unlikely we will have the votes to expand defense spending to accommodate rising inflation. Rather, we will more likely have to absorb inflation within existing budget levels. It is therefore essential that, as the administration prepares their 1983 budget request and 1982 Defense posture statement, they start thinking about how to bring defense and economic policies in line with reality. This amendment will assist them in that effort.

Unless we face up to the facts now, we are all too likely to gloss over the gap between the programs we say we need and the actual cost of those programs. Nor will we make the tough decision to live within our means by cutting out certain programs and closing down production lines. Instead, we will tacitly acquiesce in a defense budget we know to be underfunded. And we will doubtless cope with this situation the way we have in the past—by shortchanging the readiness of our general purpose forces.

This outcome must be avoided. There already is a serious question about our forces' capacity for a timely, effective and sustainable response to the most likely military threats. The reason is that we have historically underfunded essentials like spare parts, major overhauls, and operation and maintenance activities. And we have subordinated readiness, mobility, and sustainability to weapons procurement. This trend must be reversed, for without readiness, deterrence is a sham.

At the same time, calculated underfunding of defense in the past is no excuse for overfunding in the future. To strike the right balance we must search systematically for the defense policy and programs that are appropriate for the United States at a time when there is

fierce internal competition for resources and fierce economic competition from abroad.

This amendment will assist that search. It requires the administration to anticipate the implications for military spending of low or zero economic growth. And it calls on them to articulate a strategy for defense, premised on a sharply focused analysis of the tough choices we must make if we are to sustain our military commitments over the long haul. What are these tough choices?

First, these choices are forced upon us because the economic and military fat that used to give the United States a protective layer has virtually disappeared. It is a fact of life that the division of responsibility among the NATO allies was predicated on quite different political and economic circumstances than exist today or for the foreseeable future.

When the alliance was formed, America did not need allies; they needed America. At the end of World War II, the United States had a virtual monopoly of the world's productive capacity and monetary reserves. Whereas the rest of the world, including Soviet Russia, appeared hopelessly devastated by the war, the United States emerged from it immensely strengthened. By the end of the Vietnam war, the situation had radically and fundamentally changed.

This fundamental change in the relative economic strength of the United States, Western Europe, and Japan makes it imperative that we reassess our roles in, and responsibilities for, the defense of Western Europe, Northeast Asia, and the Near East. This reassessment should take place before we become committed to a particular set of defense programs. And the conclusions of that reassessment should guide our defense strategy and our military requirements.

In addition to shifts in the economic balance among the allies, our defense strategy must also reflect a recently and belatedly discovered priority, namely the need to secure a sustained flow of oil from the Persian Gulf region to the industrialized democracies. Our economic circumstances mean that we will be hard pressed to independently defend all Western interests that will be threatened by Soviet expansion or local wars in the 1980's and 1990's.

Thus, we will need a strategy that concentrates improvements in our military capability either on helping allies deter Soviet attacks in Western Europe and Northeast Asia or on defending friends and assets in the Near East. In making this choice, we need to recognize where our comparative advantage lies and where we have a unique role in defending our collective security interests.

Implementing the choice requires a long term strategy based on agreement with our allies for a redistribution of responsibilities for the defense of Western Europe, Northeast Asia and the Near East.

But before we can decide on the optimal allocation of our defense resources, we need to know how the problem of, and requirements for, an adequate defense of the Near East differ from those of West-

ern Europe and Northeast Asia. We also need to know what the alternative costs are of defending this area with and without at least one nearby base complex or set of facilities.

This issue is fundamental to our strategic choices. The region's remoteness from the United States and major allies, and its relative proximity to the U.S.S.R., may make it impossible to compete with the Soviet Union in the Near East at an affordable cost unless we secure facilities to support major air defense and maritime operations in the area.

These are the kinds of questions my amendment poses to the administration. There will be some in this body who will argue that the amendment is out of place or redundant. When I offered it last May, the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee assured me if I would just read the report accompanying the 1982 DOD authorization bill all my questions would be answered. I did read that report. But it did not talk about fiscal and monetary policy. Nor did it plan for the contingency that our economy would be in recession this year and perhaps much longer. And the programs, that legislation authorized, were based on inflation estimates that the Appropriations Committee now recognizes are invalid. So I believe this amendment is appropriate and useful in focusing the administration on the real problems we face in sustaining a sound defense buildup.

Others will argue that the amendment is redundant because we are already getting information on allied and Japanese contributions to our common defense. But I am not talking merely about how much each of us spends relative to the others. I am talking about the development of an American strategy premised on U.S. leadership and on a frank appraisal of where we have a unique advantage in defending common interests of our allies and ourselves. This is essential if we are to be perceived as strong and credible by our friends and by our adversaries.

Some in this body may say "no, do not offer the amendment at the outset of TNF negotiations with the Soviet Union." These critics will tell me I am undercutting the President. On the contrary, by facing up to reality we will be strengthening the President's hand. Whether the TNF talks succeed or fail, Europe must play a larger role in determining her own defense. And America must do more to defend those areas beyond Europe's reach.

What have we done so far to secure vital allied interests in the Persian Gulf? Not much. We have agreed to sell AWACS and F-15's to Saudi Arabia and we have created the rapid deployment joint task force—at least on paper. But we still do not have a strategy for allocating additional resources to this region. The Appropriations Committee recognizes this. The report states once more:

To date, the joint task force nature of the present RDJTF has failed to create both plans and organization necessary to meet the threats which the United States may face in Third World areas throughout the 1980s.

If my amendment is adopted, the administration will be forced to address

these questions before we are locked into programs and procurement contracts that do not most efficiently promote our main security objectives.

Mr. President, in closing, let me just add America is virtually unique among Western democracies in that most other countries the elected representatives debate the underlying concepts of their defense budgets and programs. They deal with foreign policy and with broad issues of military resource allocation. The technical decisions as to which weapons systems will most efficiently implement the policies are left to the experts.

In the United States, however, particularly in Congress, debates focus on weapons systems. No one seems willing to debate the underlying concepts. My amendment, I hope, will be the first step in redressing this dangerous imbalance.

Finally, it is worth repeating that the defense budget cannot be isolated from the economy as a whole. How much we spend for defense and the way we allocate our defense dollars have large economic implications. If, for example, we divert the bulk of the Nation's R. & D. to defense while the Japanese are free to commercialize the results, our competitiveness will deteriorate rapidly. In the long run, both countries will suffer and the world will be much less stable.

So far, we have resisted putting our defense programs in context. This amendment is a small but important step in remedying that situation. I would hope that my colleagues would support it and I hope the chairman of the committee will see its merit and that we might engage in further discussion after he has had a chance to study this proposal.

(Mr. CHAFEE assumed the Chair.)

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President—

Mr. BRADLEY. If the Senator will yield, I wonder if he would respond to the No. 1 question, which is what happens to our defense programs if inflation is higher than expected, and how will he in the Appropriations Committee and we in the Senate begin to make the choices that are going to be necessary to fully fund the levels we have approved but the programs we have approved? Further, what kind of strategy backs that up?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I have high regard for the Senator from New Jersey, but to answer his question would be to assume the capability of speaking for the Armed Services Committee, the Budget Committee, the Finance Committee, the Governmental Affairs Committee, the Joint Economic Committee, and that I would be prepared to amend the Constitution of the United States with a rider on the defense appropriations bill.

The Senator's amendment would require the President of the United States, by January 31, 1982, to prepare a report that answers a series of questions: What additional resources we are going to allocate to the Near East; what the long-term costs of defending the Persian Gulf are; what we plan for a more effective and efficient force in the region of the Near East; what plans the administration has to increase deployment capa-

bility by home porting of more ships in foreign bases; how the administration's long-range defense planning takes into account economic competition of America; and what assumptions the administration's budget makes about the long-term redistribution roles and responsibilities as far as Western Europe, East Asia, the Near East, and the adjacent seas or ocean areas.

Very frankly, Mr. President, I am prepared to debate the provisions of the appropriations bill that is before us. This amendment, in my opinion, is not an appropriations amendment. It is legislation on an appropriations bill. If the Senator wishes to debate the concept, perhaps he would want to have a separate joint resolution.

With as much comity as I would like to be known for in the body, I have to tell my friend there is no alternative but to ask that the amendment be tabled, and I do move to table the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table.

Mr. STEVENS. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey. The yeas and nays have been ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. SASSER), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. TSONGAS) and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. ZORINSKY) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. SASSER) would vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber wishing to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 56, nays 36, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 432 Leg.]

YEAS—56

| | | |
|---------------|-----------|----------|
| Abdnor | East | Nickles |
| Andrews | Garn | Packwood |
| Armstrong | Gorton | Percy |
| Baker | Grassley | Pressler |
| Bentsen | Hatch | Quayle |
| Boschwitz | Hatfield | Randolph |
| Burdick | Hawkins | Roth |
| Byrd, | Hayakawa | Rudman |
| Harry F., Jr. | Heinz | Schmitt |
| Chafee | Helms | Simpson |
| Cochran | Humphrey | Specter |
| Cohen | Jepsen | Stafford |
| D'Amato | Kassebaum | Stevens |
| Danforth | Kasten | Symms |
| DeConcini | Laxalt | Thurmond |
| Denton | Lugar | Tower |
| Dole | Mattingly | Wallop |
| Domenici | McClure | Warner |
| Durenberger | Murkowski | Weicker |

NAYS—36

| | | |
|--------|-----------------|----------|
| Baucus | Bradley | Chiles |
| Biden | Bumpers | Cranston |
| Boren | Byrd, Robert C. | Dixon |

| | | |
|------------|------------|----------|
| Dodd | Inouye | Mitchell |
| Eagleton | Jackson | Moynihan |
| Exon | Johnston | Nunn |
| Ford | Kennedy | Pell |
| Glenn | Leahy | Proxmire |
| Hart | Levin | Pryor |
| Heflin | Matsunaga | Riegle |
| Hollings | Meilacher | Sarbanes |
| Huddleston | Metzenbaum | Williams |

NOT VOTING—8

| | | |
|-----------|---------|----------|
| Cannon | Mathias | Tsongas |
| Goldwater | Sasser | Zorinsky |
| Long | Stennis | |

So the motion to lay on the table Mr. BRADLEY's amendment (UP No. 724) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion to table was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I know that the Senator from Arizona is to be recognized and that he has an amendment. Are there other Senators with amendments they would like to get in line here, so to speak, following the amendment of the Senator from Arizona?

UP AMENDMENT NO. 725

(Purpose: To express the sense of the Senate that the MX missile system should not be based in or near areas with high population density)

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Arizona (Mr. DeConcini) proposes an unprinted amendment numbered 725.

On page 28, line 19, insert the following:

The purpose of the MX missile system is to provide the United States with a survivable counterforce strategic weapons system to counter the growing technological and numerical advantages of the Soviet Union's strategic arsenal;

It is the sense of the Senate that basing the MX missiles in or near areas of high population density is inimical to the counterforce goals and other purposes of the MX missile system and unnecessarily exposes civilian populations to risk; and,

The Senate urges the Department of Defense to avoid high population density areas either for interim basing sites for the MX missile or in its selection of a permanent basing mode.

Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, there have been years of discussion and study over the proper and most effective method of basing the MX missile. The legislation before us today provides money to carry forth that study and evaluation process. President Reagan recently announced that his administration would move forward with a limited MX deployment while a final decision on the ultimate basing mode was made.

I must confess a certain disappointment that the new administration did not feel yet able to make a final basing decision. However, I also believe that it is critically important to the security of the Nation to deploy MX as rapidly as possible. If that means making do with an interim basing mode, then we should move ahead quickly.

However, I am greatly disturbed by some preliminary indications emanating from the Department of Defense that the interim basing of MX might involve using existing Titan sites located adjacent to densely populated areas. This seems to me, Mr. President, to be totally counterproductive.

The MX missile represents a new phase in American strategic thinking; a departure from the concept of mutual assured destruction which relied almost solely on a countercity or countervalue strategy to deter Soviet aggression. In the years since MAD first came into prominence, we have discovered that the Soviet Union not only believes that a limited nuclear war is possible, but has constructed a nuclear arsenal based upon that assumption.

Because the Soviets are building a strategic force capable of waging a counterforce nuclear war—that is, an attack limited to military targets which specifically exempts civilian populations centers—the United States is forced to deal with that possibility. Not to do so would subject our Nation to nuclear blackmail. The MX missile, thus, serves two interrelated purposes.

First, its great accuracy and payload make it an ideal weapon to target against hardened Soviet military targets.

Second, its basing mode should make it either capable of withstanding a first-strike or so costly in terms of an expenditure of Soviet missiles to eliminate it that it is effectively survivable.

Logic dictates that in basing the MX we should not sacrifice either of these capabilities. Unfortunately, if the MX is based adjacent to urban areas, its effectiveness in bringing the United States into a new strategic era will be almost entirely undermined. By basing it—even on an interim basis—next to cities, we insure that a counterforce exchange is automatically escalated into a countervalue or countercity exchange. And while no one wants to contemplate such awful scenarios, it must be done.

If the MX is to be housed on an interim basis in renovated existing silos, they should be located as much as possible in remote areas. It serves absolutely no purpose to locate them next to urban areas. Simultaneously, of course, it also exposes the inhabitants of those areas to potentially greater danger. In the event that a catastrophe should occur, we must be mindful to take steps in our planning to minimize the total number of casualties.

My amendment which is structured as a sense of the Senate resolution is simple. It merely urges the Department of Defense to take this important factor into account and to develop basing modes for the MX—interim and long term—which are as removed as practicable from high density population areas. It is not binding, but it does provide some guidance from Congress to the Pentagon planners. Clearly, if overwhelming technical considerations dictate that the MX must be based near urban areas, then my amendment would not prevent this from being done.

Mr. President, I hope the managers of the bill will accept this amendment,

because I do not believe it is anything to which anyone can violently object.

The area of some of the Titan missile silos has grown very rapidly, and we find them in very densely populated areas. There are alternatives for the basing of these missiles, and this sense-of-the-Senate resolution would instruct the Pentagon planners to give this careful consideration.

In the case of the Titans, they are to be removed, as indicated, by the Department of Defense and the Secretary of Defense; and if other missiles are to be placed there, it seems to me that the consideration of the population density should be paramount in any such decision.

I yield to the Senator from Alaska.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, my good friend from Arizona does have an interesting amendment; but if the same rationale applies to strategic systems, I do not know what any President, as Commander in Chief, could do to deploy our systems and to maintain the options that are necessary.

Not only do we have the Titan silos under study, but also, we have the whole question of the MX.

I understand the Senator's interest, from a geological point of view and a geographical point of view, as he well knows, because of my own personal knowledge of the area in which he lives; but there is no way we could agree to take this amendment to conference. It would yield, I am afraid, to additional restrictions upon the Commander in Chief in terms of deployment of our strategic arsenals.

I hope the Senator will not press the amendment. It is a sense-of-the-Senate amendment. This is really not a proper place for the amendment. If we want to have a debate on a sense-of-the-Senate resolution dealing with the whole question of counterforce and strategy concepts, I think we should do it another time. It is not technically legislation on an appropriation bill. It is just a sense-of-the-Senate amendment.

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

Mr. STEVENS. I yield.

Mr. DECONCINI. I say to the distinguished Senator that when the Titan missiles were deployed, it was 19 or 20 years ago, and at that time it was the policy of the Pentagon obviously not to place them near populated areas. With the growth of many of these areas, we see a change—not in the decisions of the Defense Department but in a population decision, in a geographic location. The statistics have altered what now exists—our populated centers with these missiles nearby.

And my amendment is not a mandate. I am not trying to step into the decision process that that requires and I thought about that because many people in the State that this Senator represents feel very strongly that they want to be strong and supportive of national defense and a new missile system, but they also have some real concerns when there are alternatives and there are many alternatives that are yet to be formally decided by the Defense Department for the deployment of the MX.

In the case of southern Arizona we are talking about an immediate population area of over 500,000 people. Some of these Titan missile bases now border on the city limits. They are surrounded by subdivisions and schools and there are areas that these MX missiles could be placed in either the Minuteman II silos or perhaps Titan silos that are not near populated areas. All the ones in Arizona are in fact, with the exception of three, very near populated areas and those that are not are within 10 or 15 miles.

I just cannot quite agree with the distinguished Senator from Alaska that this is an area that we should be involved in unless we are going to have a big debate about counterforces and what have you.

So I am prepared to vote on the amendment, and I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second on the request for the yeas and nays on the amendment?

There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to table the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to lay on the table the amendment of the Senator from Arizona.

On this motion the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. STEVENS. I announce that the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) are necessarily absent.

Mr. CRANSTON. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. SASSER), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. TSONGAS), and the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. ZORINSKY) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. SASSER) would vote "nay."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAYAKAWA). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 35, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 433 Leg.]

YEAS—57

| | | |
|---------------|-----------|----------|
| Abdnor | Glenn | Nunn |
| Andrews | Gorton | Packwood |
| Armstrong | Grassley | Percy |
| Baker | Hatch | Pressler |
| Bentsen | Hatfield | Quayle |
| Biden | Hawkins | Roth |
| Boschwitz | Hayakawa | Rudman |
| Byrd, | Heinz | Schmitt |
| Harry F., Jr. | Helms | Simpson |
| Chafee | Hollings | Specter |
| Cochran | Humphrey | Stafford |
| Cohen | Jepsen | Stevens |
| D'Amato | Kassebaum | Symms |
| Danforth | Kasten | Thurmond |
| Denton | Laxalt | Tower |
| Dixon | Lugar | Wallup |
| Domenici | Mattingly | Warner |
| Durenberger | McClure | Weicker |
| East | Murkowski | |
| Garn | Nickles | |

NAYS—35

| | | |
|-----------------|------------|------------|
| Baucus | Exon | Melcher |
| Boren | Ford | Metzenbaum |
| Bradley | Hart | Mitchell |
| Bumpers | Heflin | Moynihan |
| Burdick | Huddleston | Pell |
| Byrd, Robert C. | Itouye | Proxmire |
| Chiles | Jackson | Pryor |
| Cranston | Johnston | Randolph |
| DeConcini | Kennedy | Riegle |
| Dodd | Leahy | Sarbanes |
| Doyle | Levin | Williams |
| Eagleton | Matsunaga | |

NOT VOTING—8

| | | |
|-----------|---------|----------|
| Cannon | Mathias | Tsongas |
| Goldwater | Sasser | Zorinsky |
| Long | Stennis | |

So the motion to lay on the table Mr. DeConcini's amendment (UP No. 725) was agreed to.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. SCHMITT addressed the Chair. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

VIPER

Mr. SCHMITT. Mr. President, the committee in its report has addressed the concerns which have been expressed over the time about the Viper program. I want to mention the outstanding efforts of Senator RUDMAN in this matter.

This program has encountered problems, major cost increases and delays in schedule. In the past, the committee has refused to allow the Army to proceed with production due to these problems.

On July 8, 1981, six members of the Appropriations Committee wrote to General Meyer urging the Army to conduct a competitive analysis of comparable systems which are currently available or could be available in the very near term. To date the Army has not conducted such analysis to the satisfaction of the committee. I ask unanimous consent that the letter to General Meyer be printed in the RECORD.

The letter has been signed by Senators STEVENS, RUDMAN, PROXMIRE, D'AMATO, ANDREWS, and myself.

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

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, D.C., July 8, 1981.

Gen. E. C. MEYER,
Chief of Staff, U. S. Army, The Pentagon,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GENERAL MEYER: The preponderant advantage in battlefield armor enjoyed by Soviet and Warsaw Pact forces unquestionably represents a significant challenge to Western security objectives in Central Europe. Efforts to modernize U.S. and allied armored capabilities and upgrade those systems designed to counter or neutralize this threat have met with varying degrees of success. In the area of light anti-armor capabilities, however, concern has been raised about the adequacy of our modernization programs, particularly with respect to the cost-effectiveness of systems under development and their ability to meet or exceed the performance criteria originally established.

In this regard, we wish to express our deep concern over the developmental problems experienced by the Army's Viper anti-tank rocket system. Testimony before the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee has led to dis-

turbing questions about Viper's recurring technical defects and unbridled cost escalation, problems which compound the substantial slippage in its IOC date even as the Soviet threat expands. Doubts about Viper's suitability as a replacement for the LAW system (initially fielded in 1962) have grown accordingly.

With respect to cost, the Army testified last year before the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee that each Viper round could be purchased for \$308. The per-round cost estimated cited this year is \$619, and some cost projections hover in the \$800-\$1000 range, if and when Viper enters the production stage. Total program costs are now anticipated to be approximately four times greater than originally predicted.

Reflecting this concern, House-Senate conferees on the FY 1981 Supplemental Appropriations bill agreed to add report language which placed stringent restrictions on the Army, requiring prior Congressional approval from both the House and Senate Appropriations Committees before a production contract on Viper could be signed. This measure underscored the conferees' fear that the Army would make a "premature and unjustified" decision to field Viper before all mechanical deficiencies had been satisfactorily resolved and program costs brought under control.

We understand that the Viper anti-tank rocket is designed to be the infantryman's weapon of last resort against the battlefield armor threat. As such, we were distressed by the findings of the General Officer In-Process Review of December 1980, which highlighted Viper's shortcomings and fueled additional skepticism about the system's adequacy to perform the light anti-armor role. More recently (March 1981), a Viper round exploded on its gunner and all testing was temporarily suspended.

The significant improvements which Viper was touted to incorporate over the LAW system are still highly problematical. Indeed, test results since 1975 support the conclusion that Viper will be unable to achieve its original battlefield mandate. For example, it is our understanding that, contrary to initial performance specifications, a Viper system deployed today would have virtually no chance of penetrating the frontal armor of a Soviet T-72 tank sufficiently to ensure a "kill." Moreover, the anticipated vast reduction in the firing signature (i.e. noise, flash, smoke, overpressure, etc.) which would disclose a gunner's position to adversary forces has failed to materialize. It has been reported to us that Viper's signature even exceeds that of the LAW system. Yet even with this performance record and an apparent relaxation of the requirements which would qualify Viper for preliminary production, we understand that overall Viper costs will be approximately five times greater than those of the system it would ostensibly replace.

At the same time that the Army has experienced ongoing difficulties with the Viper development program, several of our allies have made substantial progress with their own anti-tank weapons. For example, systems such as West Germany's Armbrust, which has been in production since 1978, may offer a potentially more cost-effective alternative for light anti-armor missions according to the operational requirements which the Army has itself defined. We understand that efforts have consistently been made over the past three years to generate interest within the Army to test this system pursuant to determining its adequacy for this critical role.

In view of the significant advances achieved by some of our allies in the field of light anti-armor weaponry, we strongly urge you to conduct a competitive analysis of systems such as Armbrust which might respond more effectively to the threat confronting our forces. Although it is essential that the Army and other military services be per-

mitted sufficient latitude to develop new weapon systems, we likewise believe that sound procurement policies and a prudent sensitivity to cost growth warrant the testing of alternative foreign systems whose operational capabilities for a given mission may surpass those of U.S. prototypes.

The Army's paramount obligation is to provide our combat troops with the most reliable and technically proficient systems at affordable prices. We sincerely hope the Army will take due account of this verity throughout the remainder of the Viper development program.

We would appreciate receiving a full report from you on all issues affecting this program. Thank you for your attention to our concerns.

Sincerely,

TED STEVENS,
HARRISON SCHMITT,
ALFONSE M. D'AMATO,
WARREN B. RUDMAN,
WILLIAM PROXIMIRE,
MARK ANDREWS,

U.S. Senate.

Mr. SCHMITT. Recognizing the need for a new, light antiarmor weapon for the Army at this time, the committee has provided production funds for Viper in this bill. It has also included language approving the use of fiscal year 1981 funds for production of Viper. This approval, however, does not indicate that the committee is no longer concerned about the problems encountered in this program, nor has the committee's desire for a full competitive analysis of alternate systems diminished.

The report language specifically directs the Army to commence testing of all available light antiarmor systems, foreign and domestic beginning within 90 days of contractor notification of availability. The results of such tests shall be reported to the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate within 60 days following completion of the tests. This language provides for initial production of Viper and, at the same time, it meets the concerns of the committee in finding the best available light, antiarmor weapon at the best cost.

This Senator, however, did have a concern whether the Army would, in fact, comply with the report language since the Army has refused in the past to conduct a shoot-off of any competing systems of Viper. As a result of this concern, I was in contact with the Army and expressed these concerns to them. The Army has assured me that they intend to comply with the report language. In a letter dated November 30, 1981, Assistant Secretary of the Army J. R. Sculley assured me of the position of the Army on this matter. I ask unanimous consent that Secretary Sculley's letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY,
Washington, D.C., November 30, 1981.
Hon. HARRISON H. SCHMITT,
Committee on Appropriations, U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR SCHMITT: The United States Senate Committee on Appropriations Report No. 97-000, Department of Defense Appropriation Bill 1982, expresses concern over the VIPER program and provides specific language for the Army to commence testing all

available light anti-armor systems, foreign and domestic, beginning within 90 days of contractor notification of availability and expression of desire to test and that the results of all such tests shall be reported to the Appropriations Committee of the House and Senate within 60 days following completion of the individual tests.

The Army shares the Committee's interests and concerns that the most cost effective system must be selected to provide a quality weapon for our soldiers. The Army is prepared to implement the Committee language.

The conduct of a comprehensive test and evaluation program involves the selection of candidate system, development of test standards and plans, appropriate and equitable contractual arrangements with the foreign/domestic participants, and actual testing and analysis. Currently, the Army is only in the initial stages of developing plans and procedures for the envisioned program. Funding requirements have not yet been budgeted but will be developed after the program is structured.

Subsequent to determination of the final Conference report language, the Army will proceed to develop an estimate of the test effort, as well as the associated funding required. We will keep you informed of our progress and funding requirements and would seek your assistance in resolving the funding associated with the test program.

Sincerely,
J. R. SCULLEY,
Assistant Secretary of the Army (Research, Development and Acquisition).

Mr. SCHMITT. It is this Senator's understanding that the Army shall develop plans and procedures for the competitive analysis and report to the Committee these plans as well as any costs involved for the analysis. It is also this Senator's understanding that the Army will not attempt to change the committee's language during the House-Senate conference on this bill.

Again I want to recognize the outstanding efforts of the Senator from New Hampshire on this issue. It is extremely important. It is particularly related to the general philosophy of trying to match Soviet armor tank for tank or personnel carrier for personnel carrier; we will make those systems as obsolete as we possibly can through the use of modern antitank and antiarmor weapons.

Mr. RUDMAN. Mr. President, I want to say briefly that I thank the Senator from New Mexico for adding what I think is a very constructive addition to the language that we had already worked with in our report. I think it is vital that the Army proceed with these tests and not spend enormous amounts of money for weaponry that may be obsolete in the near future. I am delighted that this is now part of the record. I am sure this will mean that the Army will have a better weapon when these competitive tests are completed.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

UP AMENDMENT NO. 726

(Subsequently numbered amendment No. 643.)

(Purpose: To provide funding for increased Army and Air Force active strength levels)

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The bill clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) proposes an unprinted amendment numberd 726.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that further reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

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

The amendment is as follows:

Beginning on page 2, line 1, strike out through line 12 on page 3, and insert the following:

"TITLE I—MILITARY PERSONNEL

MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Army on active duty (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; \$14,130,781,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, NAVY

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Navy on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere), midshipmen, and aviation cadets; \$10,453,767,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, MARINE CORPS

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Marine Corps on active duty (except members of the Reserve provided for elsewhere); \$3,151,526,000.

MILITARY PERSONNEL, AIR FORCE

For pay, allowances, individual clothing, subsistence, interest on deposits, gratuities, permanent change of station travel (including all expenses thereof for organizational movements), and expenses of temporary duty travel between permanent duty stations, for members of the Air Force on active duty (except members of reserve components provided for elsewhere), cadets, and aviation cadets; \$11,730,381,000."

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my staff, Mr. Mike Joy and Mr. Bob Sneed, be granted the privilege of the floor during consideration of these two amendments.

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

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, for the distinguished manager of the bill and others who are interested, this is the bill relative to the Army and Air Force end strengths. I am adding some \$77 million to the bill for the purpose of restoring the end strength cuts made in the Army and the Air Force.

The original request, Mr. President, and program called for total manpower levels of 786,000 personnel in the Army

and 586,800 in the Air Force. These levels were reduced in an effort to effect so-called defense savings in the fiscal year 1982 budget and represents, Mr. President, part of the much publicized agreement reached in August between Mr. Stockman and Secretary Weinberger.

Right to the point, Mr. President, the President has asked for this particular manpower level in March that I am seeking to restore. And right to the point on this particular manpower level, I say to the Senator from Virginia, who has been a leader in the realm of the manpower and full strength for both the Army and the Air Force, these are the levels attested to by the Secretary of Defense before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee—stating that we are now trying to flesh out the rapid deployment force and it would take, over a 5-year period, an additional 100,000 personnel.

What they actually represent, these levels—the 780,000 level in the Army, for example—is a reversal of a manpower policy and a defense posture that had been carefully considered as a minimum force necessary to man our Armed Forces and meet our commitments worldwide.

In the spring of the year, Gen. Edward C. (Shy) Meyer, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, announced a plan to flesh out what he termed the hollow army. This plan involved adding to the force structure four divisions—two Active and two Reserve. This would have brought our total strength to 18 active divisions—we currently have 16, Mr. President—and 10 Reserve divisions—we currently have 8—for a total of 28 divisions. That is 28 proposed divisions, Mr. President, to meet the threat of the Soviets.

Mr. President, while we were to have the 28 proposed divisions, the Soviet threat currently is one of 173 divisions. Admittedly, of course, our divisions number some 17,000 and their's is a lesser amount of around 12,000. But their 173 divisions total approximately 1,825,000 men. We have now proposed, in the defense appropriation bill, 780,000. In other words, 6,000 were cut in the defense appropriation version that is now before the Senate from the Army and some 6,000 from the Air Force.

Mr. President, when General Meyer unveiled this plan, it was much ballyhooed by those in the administration as providing a signal that we meant business. That signal, however, was short-lived because, by late summer, the four-division increase began to look like a one-division decrease, or a swing of five divisions in 5 months.

What kind of signal was that, Mr. President? What sort of determination does that demonstrate?

For example, the Senator from Ohio (Mr. GLENN) will soon offer an amendment relative to steaming hours in the Indian Ocean. Here we are trying to put on a front. We have strong talk, but rather than following through, as many of us have begged and prayed and hoped for over so many years, that is what is finally going to occur under the leadership of President Reagan, is a setback

on readiness and we will have a cutback on the steaming hours in the Indian Ocean. We have withdrawn one aircraft carrier. We have backed down on the equipment. And now on the manpower proposal, at the last minute, even though they are still testifying for it—still testifying for it in November—it is cut back by some five divisions. Why in Heaven's name, one would ask, would you pick that method of cutting the budget?

My answer is in how the defense dollars are spent. Procurement dollars are spent at a rate of about 20 cents a year. Actually, in the first year, you can put in quite a bit of procurement dollars, and they have a minimal effect on the budget—8 cents of the procurement dollar to be expended in the first year. But in order to get a dollar-for-dollar reduction, you really have to go to manpower. In procurement, to get \$1 reduction, you must cut five. In operation and maintenance or manpower dollars, they generally spend at a ratio of nearly one to one.

Therefore, the easy way, when you get into the dispute between the budgeters and the need for national defense and national security—the easy way to effect budget cuts is to cut the programs which not only have the highest spend-out rate but also have little or no constituency.

Let us face it: Operation and maintenance is not manufactured in any State. Readiness, drilling, training, firing the guns, the weaponry, ammunition—those kinds of things do not have a State or district. If the manpower cuts do not result in a base closure, then who's to care? That is exactly the situation we have.

In 1964, pre-Vietnam, our military manpower stood at 2.6 million. In 1964, we had approximately 972,000 Army personnel, as indicated in a table I will have printed in the RECORD. And in 1960, for example, we had 871,348 in the U.S. Army. That is when we even had the missile gap; the end of Eisenhower; the beginning of Kennedy. Everyone was laid back. We were having world peace. There were no problems. I think they found two little islands to fuss about, called Quemoy and Matsu. The Senator will remember those. We had a more powerful Army, and the threats were far less than today.

In fact, in 1962, the Army had an authorized strength and a full complement of about 1,164,000. Now, we are down to the 780,000 level.

As the prophet Paul said in his letter to the Corinthians:

If the sound of trumpet be uncertain then who shall prepare himself to the battle?

This defense budget has been characterized by that uncertain trumpet.

We are legislating here in the absence of a 5-year plan, without a clear sense of direction and with a vacillating force structure.

Senators have been concerned, and we can see the great number of amendments hitting the floor relative to readiness. Our distinguished chairman of the Senate appropriations subcommittee, the Senator from Alaska (Mr.

STEVENS), generally speaking, has done an outstanding job. He tried his best to fill up the particular commitments we had, and we worked closely, but then we never did get a 5-year plan from the Defense Department. They would never come forward with that green book, the procurement annex, so that we could look and find, as appropriators on the Appropriations Committee, exactly where we were headed.

In contrast to that, having given clear signals all during the early part of the year and in the summer about increases in defense, what they then began nibbling away at was readiness and our manpower.

The highly touted fleshing out of the hollow army is now dismissed by the Defense Department with the following two sentences. All you have to do is look at the DOD green book, to get into its lingo. We have a green book entitled "Highlights of Fiscal 1982 Budget Revisions, June of 1981 and September of 1981, with Strategic Program Changes."

I quote from the book:

Activation of new units planned during FY 1982 will be delayed to reflect revised phasing of Army's manpower program. Deactivation of a separate brigade is also planned.

For those of you who have difficulty with Pentagonese, as I do, let me provide a translation. In plain English, what that means—and the distinguished Presiding Officer, the Senator from California (Mr. HAYAKAWA), likes these interpretations, having been a college president—is less capability. That is exactly what that Pentagonese means.

How does the Air Force plan to meet its reduction in planned end strength? I quote from the same document:

In addition, the amended budget anticipated an increase in the standards used to determine manning of specific units. We now plan to phase in the increased standards beginning in FY 1982 with full implementation by 1985.

I say to the Senator from New Hampshire that that requires no translation. That simply means lower standards. That is Pentagonese for delay or lower standards.

So the crux of the issue is that we are asked to reduce end strength, resulting in less capability and lower standards.

Does the majority leader want to obtain a time agreement for voting on this amendment? I have another amendment relative to ammunition, on which I can present the argument this evening, and we can have a rollcall vote tomorrow. Is that the wish of the distinguished majority leader?

Mr. BAKER. I thank the Senator for yielding to me. I think we are on the brink of getting an agreement to stack votes. We are not ready yet.

I express my appreciation to the Senator from South Carolina for his cooperation tonight.

What I am trying to arrange with the minority leader and other Senators is to have three or four amendments debated tonight and stack them tomorrow, with the votes to occur at 10 o'clock in respect to those amendments.

I might say that there will be motions to table, I am sure, against all or part of the amendments. The request I make will be with relation to the amendment rather than voting on the amendment.

Mr. HOLLINGS. The Senator mentions motions to table. I would not show my hand that way.

Mr. BAKER. I find that if I say these things today, I do not have to worry about them tomorrow.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I understand. I will continue.

Mr. BAKER. Will the Senator continue?

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I am offering an amendment which I say would add \$77 million.

There are further compelling reasons why the amendment to increase active strength level should be supported.

The proposed reductions in active end strength would severely compromise the need to develop the rapid deployment force that is so important in protecting U.S. interests outside the NATO region.

Any cut in the Army and Air Force manning levels can mean only one thing, nonsupport for the rapid deployment force concept or the belief that U.S. interests outside of NATO are of a very low priority.

I wish to recite that phrase just one more time for emphasis because everyone watches the United States. Cutting the Army and Air Force end strengths would mean either the nonsupport for the rapid deployment force concept or the belief that U.S. interests outside of NATO are of very low priority.

We have all kinds of movements of peoples and populations and countries and commitments. And, over in Europe we have seen the recent move relative to the peace movement as a result of our delays actually in engaging in the strategic arms reduction talks. We also could mislead and alarm people unnecessarily by this particular phrase in this particular cut in the Army and Air Force manning levels. If we cut forces, it means nonsupport of the rapid deployment force concept or the belief that the U.S. interests outside of NATO are of very low priority. Let us not go back on our commitments.

We need to build and maintain a credible rapid deployment force. We do not have anything out there now but an aircraft carrier and some very brave sailors and pilots and a few folks manning an AWACS in Saudi Arabia. But other than that, there is really no rapid deployment force and it has not approximated one. We have been cutting back ever since the beginning of this particular administration, although it was my belief that under this administration we were going to finally flesh out our defense hollowness.

Building and maintaining a credible rapid deployment force—I emphasize "credible"—without cutting back on NATO commitments will require an increase of roughly 100,000 troops to the active end strength of our forces.

That can best be done over a 5-year period. But that add-on is for the Air Force and the Army only. At this time

we do not have the requirements included in this debate necessary for the Navy and for the Marine Corps, since the DOD has so much trouble getting its act together to define them.

But, here Secretary Weinberger is cutting 12,000, rather than commencing with the RDF. This exercise is almost like the budget process. No one could balance the budget this year. But at least we wanted to aim it in the right direction toward lesser or smaller deficits.

No one can put in the 100,000 troops overnight without a draft. But at least we could put in these nominal increases rather than cutting back the brigade and closing down Fort Ord and other things of that kind like taking a brigade from the readiness disposition over in NATO.

This increase in end strength must be accomplished in order to provide the required active support of the Rapid Deployment Force.

Combat strength of the active forces, if the RDF is constructed in a balanced manner, might have to be increased by at least one air mobile and possibly an additional mechanized division to insure the present NATO force balance once the RDF is committed. Five-year acquisition and personnel costs for this increase could range up to \$10.2 billion.

Mr. President, should the size of the RDF increase as Secretary Weinberger proposed in his testimony before Congress in September we might possibly add another two Army divisions, one mechanized and one infantry, with their required support increments. These 5-year costs would be approximately \$9.4 billion.

In addition, a minimum of four tactical fighter wings may be required for the Air Force to maintain the current Soviet-to-NATO combat aircraft ratio and still provide tactical fighter air support for the Rapid Deployment Force. The 5-year costs for increased air capability is approximately \$5.6 billion.

I should emphasize that these additional forces are for the Air Force and the Army requirements only. As I have stated they do not include the Navy and Marine amphibious requirements. I do not believe anyone has a complete understanding of our amphibious needs at this time.

And it is a sad commentary over the entire Defense Establishment that while we are actually trying to make up an adequate budget to keep our commitments and maintain our national security that we cannot have the information since the Pentagon does not have it. You ask the Pentagon and they will not give it to you. But in this particular case we got a little bit of cooperation out of the Army in a roundabout way and we were totally stonewalled by the Air Force. They acted like I was a Communist or a member of the Soviet Senate or something else trying to increase the Air Force strength to the particular level.

If you want to see a clampdown, not discipline, but lock-jawed government and a lock-step group that headed off not knowing where they were going because they cannot tell you, you ought to

see the Pentagon today and the administration today and my Republican majority, I say most respectfully, today. They have already said, "Go ahead and make your arguments. There will be motions to table," because we do not believe, I guess, in readiness. "We have enough of our readiness and we are not going to consider what you think may be necessary for readiness."

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

Mr. HOLLINGS. I yield.

Mr. BAKER. With great regard and due respect to the translation of the Senator from South Carolina I respectfully suggest that is not an exact translation of what I said. What I said was, as I recall it, that if we got an agreement to stack these votes the agreement would be in such a form that tabling motions might be made.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Oh, might be made.

Mr. BAKER. They will not be bound to vote on the amendments. Obviously if the weight and burden of the logic stated by the Senator from South Carolina is so irresistible that we find we should vote on the merits I am willing to do so. But I thought it best to advise the Senator from South Carolina at least to the remote prospect that we are going to table it.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the distinguished majority leader. I understood him to say that motions to table would surely be made. But I appreciate that clarification and I will continue with what I hope may be some persuasion because this is taken in all seriousness.

We had to take on our last President. Those interested in manpower will remember how they had the *Nimitz* incident where on Memorial Day we had the Commander in Chief meet there and say we were going to have increased pay. He said how terrible a thing it was that they were only getting paid as much as a cashier at McDonald's—at least I think that was the expression. That was on Sunday and by Tuesday morning with community leaders he said that increases for defense for pay were robbing social programs.

So we are not talking in a partisan fashion, but we continue in the struggle that the distinguished Senator from Georgia, Senator NUNN, and many others have been making over the years to put reality and credibility in our force structure, in our national defense.

Now, Mr. President, the costs for real U.S. commitment to the development and maintenance of a rapid deployment force capability and thus a commitment to its interests around the world will be substantial. At a minimum we may have to spend \$20 billion over and above the budget projections of the Department of Defense, and these costs exclude our amphibious needs. The commitment to the rapid deployment force means more and, I say again, more Army and more Air Force personnel, not less.

While I favor getting started right now in enhancing our capability, I realize we cannot add today all the personnel and equipment needed to fully complement the rapid deployment force.

We must have a 5-year program to do so.

Mr. President, this amendment to increase our active strength keeps us on the track for showing our resolve in this matter. To accept the personnel cuts proposed in the bill weakens our credibility significantly.

Mr. President, I refer to one other matter because I understand there will be debate on another amendment, and I do not know that many of my colleagues would join issue to any extent, and I do not want to be cut off. I want to emphasize the particular situation with respect to end strength.

For example, I have already pointed out pre-Vietnam in 1960, for example, 871,000 rather than the 780,000; in 1962 1,064,647 in the Army rather than 780,000. I am going to ask unanimous consent that we include in the RECORD a table which has the Army actual strengths between 1960 and 1982, and the authorized strengths for both the Army and the Air Force for the last 10 years.

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

ARMY AND AIR FORCE END STRENGTHS

| | Army | Actual | Authorized ¹ | Air Force ² |
|------|------|-----------|-------------------------|------------------------|
| 1960 | | 871,348 | | |
| 1961 | | 856,853 | | |
| 1962 | | 1,064,647 | | |
| 1963 | | 974,070 | | |
| 1964 | | 971,384 | | |
| 1965 | | 967,049 | | |
| 1966 | | 1,197,468 | | |
| 1967 | | 1,440,120 | | |
| 1968 | | 1,567,900 | | |
| 1969 | | 1,509,637 | | |
| 1970 | | 1,319,734 | 1,325,000 | |
| 1971 | | 1,124,000 | 1,124,000 | |
| 1972 | | 811,000 | 811,000 | 721,000 |
| 1973 | | 801,000 | 801,000 | 687,000 |
| 1974 | | 783,000 | 783,000 | 637,000 |
| 1975 | | 784,000 | 784,000 | 608,000 |
| 1976 | | 779,000 | 779,000 | 581,000 |
| 1977 | | 782,000 | 782,000 | 566,000 |
| 1978 | | 771,000 | 771,000 | 569,000 |
| 1979 | | 758,000 | 759,000 | 555,000 |
| 1980 | | 777,000 | 777,000 | 554,000 |
| 1981 | | 781,000 | 780,000 | 566,000 |
| 1982 | | 780,000 | 780,000 | 580,800 |

¹ Actual and authorized strengths were identical, 1960-69.

² Air Force authorized and actual end strengths are approximately the same.

³ Original authorized level of 776,000 was revised downward to 759,000.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I thank the distinguished Presiding Officer.

In 1979 we had an end strength authorized at that particular time of 776,000. Now you will see that the Army was some 18,000 shy at 758,000.

If you want to see what they really did just before the 1980 election, trying to balance the budget and cut back savings dollar for dollar, on the one hand, and trying, on the other hand, if you please, Mr. President, to give the unwarranted credibility to the volunteer army by saying that we met the end strength, when it was 776,000. But, they changed the numbers. David Stockman is no innovator. Actually Secretary Clifford Alexander of the Army led the way in putting in different figures into the computer so the actual and authorized strengths were nearly the same—not 18,000 apart.

Now, when David Stockman started in January and it came out with a \$40 billion deficit, he said:

I just went to the computer and changed the figures we put in and got what we wanted.

Well, history will show that Secretary Alexander led the way in 1979 with the Army's end strength figures. He put into the computer 759,000 as the revised end strength. This revised it downward.

Then we look at the statement of the distinguished writer regarding military personnel matters, Charles C. Moskos, in his article "The Force Levels of the Volunteer Force," and quoting from him:

The Gates Commission "estimate" was not achieved and, indeed, was a gross economic miscalculation. In 1972, the year preceding the all-volunteer force, the total active-duty strength stood at 2,323,000. The startling trend, the one which has not received much public attention, however, is the gradual but consistent decrease in the year-by-year level of military personnel under the all-volunteer force from an active-duty strength of 2,253,000 in 1973. The force stood at 2,069,000 in 1978 and was scheduled to be further reduced to 2,049,000 in 1979.

In brief, under the all-volunteer concept the active-duty force has been reduced by 204,000 personnel in the period between 1973 and 1979. There is reason to believe that although pressure to reduce force levels will continue, the breaching of the 2 million figure will generate intense political debate. Over the short run, because of lowered manpower goals and the dramatic increases in military pay, the armed forces have been able to "make the volunteer force work." In addition they have been assisted by high levels of youth unemployment and the new emphasis on recruiting and utilizing women.

Of course, there is no disparagement of women here. But we really wanted to take a hollow army and get to the cutting edge. And we were going to have what we talked about as more readiness and less quartermaster and equipment of that kind of support and more force levels. And, if you want to get right down to the particular point, we really have got about 10 percent of the force level structure being female.

So, yes, the All-Volunteer Force is making it with respect to the unemployment; making it with respect to the adequate pay levels initiated by the Nunn-Warner amendment, and making it by supplementing and having what we call our manpower, also our female power, which is outstanding in its own right, but not in the combat nature of a rapid deployment force in the Persian Gulf or the frontline at NATO.

With that having been said, Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I am almost prepared, I think, to offer a unanimous-consent request with one last item to be checked with the minority leader. But it appears at this time there will be no more votes this evening. I am prepared to say there will be no more record votes tonight.

The agreement I will propose, if it is cleared, is that there be 20 minutes of debate on these two amendments, 10 minutes on each amendment to be equally divided to begin at 9:40 in the morning, and the rollcall votes to occur

back to back in relation to the amendments at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

As I say, final clearance, the final clearance process, is being completed at this time, and if it survives that clearance process, I will make the request shortly.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, does the distinguished majority leader intend, when he says back to back on the manpower amendment and the ammunition amendment to follow, that we would have 10 minutes on either side commencing at 9:40?

Mr. BAKER. I suppose I would add the first vote be 15 minutes and, as we frequently do, the second back-to-back vote will be 10 minutes.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I could put down the argument, then relative to the ammunition amendment?

Mr. BAKER. If the Senator from South Carolina would be agreeable we can stay in session so that the bulk of that debate can be conducted yet this evening.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Very good.

Mr. RUDMAN. Mr. President, the Senator from South Carolina has made some very compelling points, but I think there are a few that have been overlooked. First, the authorization was set by the Armed Services Committee. The bill came on the floor and no amendment was offered at that time changing end strength. The pay bill came on the floor and no amendment was offered at that time.

The present bill before us increases Air Force strength by 10,500, in accordance with their request. It keeps Army strength static, which also was the Army's request. As a matter of fact, the authorizing committee made those reductions at the request of those services.

Of course, the argument has been made here today and has been made many times before that the end strength of the services has been declining. That is obviously true. But that statement has to be taken in measure with the times at which that end strength was higher.

The fact of the matter is that generally, with increased use of technology by the armed services, the total forces, as we might have experienced in Vietnam, the Korean war and, certainly, in World War II, have been declining and probably will continue to in a number of areas.

The committee feels that \$209 billion or \$208.8 billion contained in this defense appropriation bill is a rather high state of readiness. One might debate where these funds might go, but the fact is that the Armed Services Committee held hearings, had discussions with the services and, in fact, came out with these strengths.

So, unfortunately, although I often find the Senator from South Carolina and his logic irresistible, I do not find it irresistible on this particular argument.

I understand that we will stack votes tomorrow and thus, Mr. President, I am going to in respect to the vote coming tomorrow move to table this amendment at this time.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, if the Sen-

ator will withhold that for just a moment.

Mr. RUDMAN. I withhold.

Mr. BAKER. What I would like to do is to make sure we exhaust debate this evening on two amendments and then make the tabling motion, if indeed there is a tabling motion, prior to the hour of 10 o'clock tomorrow. In that way we can still provide limited time for debate in the morning that I mentioned earlier.

Mr. RUDMAN. I withdraw that.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire has done an outstanding job and is most experienced in the defense field, and I have the highest regard for him. I would only counter by stating that necessarily—and the staff would point this out—there is no authorizing amount for funds associated with military personnel levels.

You put in the military personnel account dollars and those dollar amounts would include pay and allowances, bands, travel, and everything like that, but the appropriation bill before us funds the military personnel accounts and that is what my amendment changes.

Now I was prepared, Mr. President, to present amendments of this kind in the Appropriations Committee. And our distinguished chairman was under a crunch to finish the bill. He did a magnificent job. I hated to see the abuse given to the appropriations process, when Senator HATFIELD led the way this year in streamlining, if you please, the appropriations process; actually melding together the relations between the Budget Committee and the Appropriations Committee so there were not hours on end of wrangle and disagreement that had been experienced before, because I have been on both the Budget and the Appropriations Committee.

We were ready, willing, and able, in early September, to debate and pass—and the RECORD will show that we were ready, willing, and able to pass—appropriations bills and it was at the request of the administration that we did not pass these appropriations bills.

Now, having responded to their requests, they now beat on the head of the disgraceful Congress. I saw the President on national TV. He said it was disgraceful the way we did business. Well, he is the one who authored the disgrace, I can tell you that, because he asked for it. He asked for it also on the budget, and we will get to that with respect to the budget resolution.

The Senator from Oregon had an MX amendment. I had one with respect to the Iowa battleship. I had others with respect to the attack submarine, the end-strength levels, the supply of ammunition and various ones. We all agreed we would take the bill to the floor under the pressure of time and get it to the floor so it could be debated and considered at that time.

So that is why I do not think we ought to look at the needs of our national security on whether or not we were prompt and diligent Senators at the authorizing level or at the appropriations level. The issue is now before the full body. It is one of the most impor-

tant issues that we will ever confront, and that is readiness.

Everybody gets wound up. I have been asked 15 times about the B-1 amendment. Everybody gets interested. The B-1 encompasses \$40 billion—and the B-1 encompasses 135 contractors. And that means the B-1 encompasses 135 constituencies, and there are all kinds of forces and movements around interested in a large amendment of that kind.

But where is there something for readiness? Who is going to argue manpower and strengths to flesh out our forces or who is talking to our posture in NATO when they our allies do have a draft and they do have readiness and they do have a commitment?

On the one hand, all you want to do is talk about nuclear war and how we will nuke them and we can have limited nukes and this and that and everything else. And when you come down and say if you move 1 inch further in the Gulf area that will mean war and get on national TV and then you actually pull the aircraft carriers out, you cut the steaming out, you cut the end strength, you do not flesh out what your own Chief of Staff calls a hollow Army.

Mr. RUDMAN. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLINGS. Yes, I yield.

Mr. RUDMAN. Did I understand the Senator from South Carolina to say that there was not an authorized end strength presently?

Mr. HOLLINGS. The appropriations bill does not have an authorized end strength. It has a funding amount.

Mr. RUDMAN. I may be incorrect, but I want to point out to my friend from South Carolina that the conference report and our report contains in section 401, 780,300 for the Army; 554,600 for the Navy; 192,100 for the Marine Corps; and 589,800 for the Air Force. It says that those are authorized strengths for active duty personnel as of September 30, 1982. I want to make that observation. I believe that is the law and would be the law if this bill were adopted.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Not necessarily. The authorization bill has an end strength. And that is difference. I had to learn the same thing.

But the bill before the Senate itself does not have an end strength. And the only way to effect that, of course, is the amount itself. And it has been complied with before.

In fact, we had cuts in the end strength and had a similar debate just a couple of years ago relative to a 25,000 manpower cut in the end strength of the Army.

Be that as it may, the substance of the issue before the body is, will we actually put meaning and credibility to the rapid deployment force? Will we flesh out what the Chief of Staff calls a hollow Army, or will we go in the other direction?

We thought, under President Reagan, we would start increasing. I am saddened to see these cuts and decreases, particularly at this time.

Mr. BAKER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I believe the request I am about to make has now been cleared by the minority leader.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after debate is concluded on the Hollings amendment dealing with manpower, the Senate proceed to the consideration of a second Hollings amendment dealing with armaments and that it be in order at this time, with one show of hands, to order the yeas and nays on both amendments and that the votes on those two amendments be postponed until tomorrow at 10 o'clock, to occur back-to-back, the first to be a 15-minute rollcall and the second to be 10 minutes. There will be votes in relation to these amendments, with the full expectation that there may be a tabling motion; and that, Mr. President, there be 10 minutes of debate, equally divided on each of the two amendments, to occur tomorrow beginning at 9:40 in the morning, and that the control of the time on the amendments under this order will be in the usual form.

I put that request, Mr. President.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, would the majority leader be willing to put my steaming time amendment in there after those votes?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon has been recognized.

Mr. GLENN. I am sorry. My apologies.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I would ask that the majority leader not place that request before the Senate at this time and perhaps have a brief quorum call to discuss a few points.

Mr. BAKER. There is an ominous ring to the Senator's voice and a terrible look in his eye, Mr. President. Taking account of that, and the courtesy I owe him, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. STEVENS. Will the Senator withhold that request?

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I withhold the request for the time being.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, in a prior discussion with the Senator from Georgia, I alluded to the problem of classification. We have now studied the record to which the Senator has referred us. I find that I was in error; that the Department of Defense had, in fact, used in open session a reference which the Senator has used. I was in error in indicating that that statement that was made by the Senator from Georgia had gone beyond the scope of classification. I regret that error.

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, let me thank my friend from Alaska. He has a very difficult job in managing this bill. The classification on some of these programs, of course, is very sensitive. I have been very careful. I know he has been careful and I certainly appreciate him clarifying that for the record.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, is it the desire of the managers of the bill, the majority leader or the distinguished Senator from Alaska, that I now com-

mence the second amendment to save a little time?

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, let me amend one part of my request. I ask unanimous consent that the first Hollings amendment be temporarily laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the second Hollings amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

UP AMENDMENT NO. 727

(Purpose: To provide funds to meet the Army's requirements for ammunition)

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) proposes an unprinted amendment numbered 727.

On page 18, line 4, strike "\$2,338,400,000" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$2,486,400,000."

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, for the fiscal year 1982, the Army's stated requirement which went to the Department of Defense for ammunition hardware was for \$2,138.1 million, but the budget request by the Department of Defense to the Congress for ammunition hardware was \$1,976.6 million or the request was under requirements by the amount of \$161.5 million.

The House appropriation allowance, Mr. President, for ammunition hardware is \$2,088.5 million, whereas the Senate appropriations bill before the body here as reported, allows for an amount of \$1,990.4 million. So the Senate appropriations for ammunition is \$97.9 million under the House. The Senate appropriations under the requirement requested by the U.S. Army is \$147.5 million.

Our amendment is to restore what the Army said it needed in the spring of the year. But, the requirements are geared to a 60-day war reserve requirement and I should emphasize to my colleagues that the Army's mobilization plans call for a 180-day supply. The shortfall in ammunition needs are significantly under the 180-day supply.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a table not only for the ammunition hardware requirements I have just stated verbally, but also for fiscal year 1982-86, the Army requirement for ammunition hardware in each of those years, plus the 5-year DOD plan, showing, of course, the difference between the plan under the requirements.

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

ARMY AMMUNITION HARDWARE REQUIREMENT

| | Amount (millions) |
|--|----------------------|
| Fiscal year 1982 | |
| 1. Army stated requirements for ammo hardware..... | \$2,138.1 |
| 2. Budget request for ammo hardware..... | 1,976.6 |
| Request under requirements..... | 161.5 |

| | Amount (millions) |
|---|----------------------|
| 3. House appropriation allowance for ammo hardware..... | 2,088.5 |
| 4. Senate appropriations allowance as reported..... | 1,990.6 |
| Senate appropriations under House..... | 97.9 |
| Senate appropriations under requirement..... | 147.5 |

[In billions of dollars]

| | Fiscal year— |
|------|--------------|
| 1982 | 1983 |
| 1984 | 1985 |
| 1986 | |

Fiscal year 1982-86

| | | | | | |
|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Army requirements for ammo hardware..... | 2.1 | 2.5 | 3.2 | 4.4 | 5.5 |
| 5-Yr DOD plan..... | 2.0 | 2.4 | 3.2 | 4.0 | 4.8 |

Difference—Plan under requirements. —.1 —.1 —.4 —.7

1. Cumulative 82-86 shortfall \$1.4 billion.

2. The requirements are also geared toward a 60 day war reserve requirement. The Army's mobilization plans call for a 180 day supply. Thus, the shortfall is significantly under the 180 day need.

3. To move to a 90 day reserve supply would add an additional \$8.4 billion to ammo hardware requirements.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I know this can be boring to some people, but I am going to get to the real meat of this situation in just a second.

(Mr. BOSCHWITZ assumed the chair.)

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, the schedule for 1982-86, for the 5-year period, will find the Army requirement under the DOD plan is shortchanged. There is no better expression. It is shortchanged by \$100 million in 1982, \$100 million plus in 1983, over \$400 million in 1985. The request is satisfied in 1984. In 1986 there is a \$700 million shortfall. So the cumulative 1982-86 shortfall is \$1.4 billion.

The reduction in the Army's ammunition hardware requirements in the Senate bill includes roughly \$50 million in training ammunition needs. As a matter of fact, the procurement of training ammo in the fiscal year 1982 budget is nearly \$300 million below the Army's real need. The \$148 million addition to the Army's ammunition hardware budget will greatly enhance the overall Army training program.

I will give you an idea of what the screaming need for ammunition is. Whenever they need money in the DOD, this is the particular budget they go to.

I will never forget when Mr. Eliot Richardson was Secretary of Defense and he came over with my good friend, Lt. Gen. George Seignious, the adviser to the Joint Chiefs of Staff or the director of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. We were in the Appropriations Committee and they were asking for \$500 million for a particular project.

There was a question among the majority. I was supporting the continuation of funding, but I was in the minority. The majority said we were not going to give the money. Just to put it bluntly, the Secretary said, "Well, I will get it anyway." They would just take it out of the ammunition budget.

That is what happened to the ammunition budgets over the many years.

We found at one time intelligence activities in the ammunition budget. We found at other times different commitments made out of the ammunition budget. Now with all the other needs, the ammunition budget is the one which really has been cut back very severely.

I ask unanimous consent that at this particular point in the Record there be printed a table of the recommended increases as requested by the Army for ammunition totaling \$200.4 million. But, Mr. President, we are only asking for \$148 million. We have cut that back. This was their request in the spring of this year.

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

| P-1 BLIN | Quantity (thou-sands) | Amount (millions) |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|
| 29 Cartridge, 105 mm, TP-T | 14 | \$2.7 |
| 30 Cartridge, 105 mm, DS-IP | 19 | 4.4 |
| 3 Cartridge, 5.56 mm, blank | 41,703 | 4.9 |
| 5 Cartridge, 7.62 mm, all types | 16,697 | 8.9 |
| 27 Cartridge, 4.2 in filum | 36 | 4.6 |
| 58 Rocket, 2.75 in (HE) | 104 | 16.3 |
| 11 Cartridge, 20 mm, all types | 664 | 3.1 |
| 61 Signals (smoke pots) | 19 | 4.1 |
| 51 Mines, practice, and inert | 77 | 7.0 |
| 52 Demolition munitions | 1,631 | 7.0 |
| 61 Signals (filum, grnd, W/S, para.) | 30 | 7 |
| (Subtotal training items) | | (63.7) |
| 31 Cartridge, 105 mm, APFSDS-T | 6 | 5.3 |
| 28 Cartridge, 105 mm, HEAT-T | 29 | 13.0 |
| 58 Rocket, 2.75 in (smoke) | 47 | 15.3 |
| 36 Projectile, 155 mm, ADAM | 8 | 29.7 |
| 37 Projectile, 155 mm, RAAMS | 16 | 23.1 |
| 16 Cartridge, 25 mm, APDS-T | 36 | 1.9 |
| 15 Cartridge, 25 mm, HEAT-T | 37 | 2.0 |
| (Subtotal \$159,000,000) (reduction) | | (159.0) |
| 39 Charge, propelling, 155 mm, G.B. | 494 | 41.4 |
| Grand total | | 200.4 |

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, that refers, of course, not only to power support detonators; I could go right on down through tank ammunition and various other matters—M-16 ammunition for the rifle, and what-have-you. We get to the real crux of it, and that is with respect to training. We get into readiness. The training in the Army relates in a sense to crew training and teamwork. In other words, working as a crew.

I noticed a good bit of James Fallows' book, National Defense, had to do with the comity of personnel from the community. The commitments that a man made in battle were not necessarily in his mind patriotically, that he was going to receive the Medal of Honor or that he was really doing something at that particular point for his country no, more than anything else, he was doing something for his comrade—the person he knew, the person he had worked with, the person he had trained with, the person he had learned to depend upon and who, in turn, could depend upon him.

When it comes to ammunition, you engage in crew training and teamwork, and you have a problem with the turnover of personnel. They call it personnel turbulence in the Army. That amounts to a turnover every 5 to 6 months. And you need to fire frequently in order to maintain the crew proficiency as well as the individual performance. Let us go to what happens because of the shortages. And you can see this illustrated by the very dramatic articles—maybe by tomorrow, I will find those by John Fialka—

that appeared in the Washington Star, that former great evening newspaper here in Washington, D.C.

He wrote a series of articles last year or previously about the exercises of NATO and the failure of our troops to come up to competition with the other troops in NATO. And the cause is basic. It goes right down to the very abstract of ammunition. It has no constituency; it is a readiness measure. There are no contractors sitting out in the hall. I have never seen one who asked me to put in this type amendment. But the truth of the matter is that the Army has been begging for this. Let me illustrate.

We can go right to the field artillery. After a battery adjustment is made and they prepare to fire for effect, they would like to have, regularly speaking—all six guns fire together. But, Mr. President, as the result of a lack of ammunition, actually, they allow, after going through all of that training in the field artillery, one gun to fire and the other five simulate fire.

Mr. President, this really detracts from crew training. This really detracts from individual performance. If I wanted, as a Senator, to make a logical argument about drugs and the use of drugs in the front at NATO and why we have such an increase there and such a problem there, I could say it goes right to the matter of the lack of ammunition.

How does it occur? There is no man happier than a 19- or 20-year-old when he is firing his weapon. Go in the field and ask the commander. He will say, "Well, the morale is high, but we do have problems."

You ask the individual soldier, and the soldier will say, "Fine, If I can fire my weapon."

He is gung ho. He is not over the hill like some of us here, in the U.S. Senate, who are glad to simulate firing and simulate what the country needs and what the country stands for. That is one big act of simulation. Close down the Government—that is a big simulation we had the Sunday before last.

If you want to tee off a guy and ruin his morale and turn him to drugs from restlessness and the folly of it all deny him the ability to realistically train. He will say, "I was going to come in here and be a fighting man in the Army but when I come into the field to fire my gun, I go over and make believe fire." And the problem continues.

It is similar with tanks, Mr. President. The same turbulence—personnel turnover—there. They fire what they call table 8, which is a realistic firing pattern, where they move, fire and then go into defilade and then continue to fire from different positions. They first fire at a fixed target; the tank crew moves again to another defilade in behind and then on to a moving target. This pattern is called firing table 8. It is necessary, to maintain any kind of crew efficiency. They try to do it two or three times a year. The real requirement is for a minimum of three times a year. But now, as a result of lack of ammunition, they normally can only engage in this once a year.

Sometimes it is actually twice a year from what I can determine but none

actually engages in it three times a year. So the table 8 firing practice for tank crews to really perform their duties is limited due to a drastic shortage in ammunition.

Let us review the situation with the TOW, for example, the terminal optical wire-guided missile—which is an anti-tank missile. Can you imagine having this fine missile? I say it is fine from the standpoint that you have to expose yourself to fine it. And then a little trailing wire follows the missile and you have to stand behind the wire as it continues on to zoom on the target. You do not duck up and fire and duck back down. It is a rather dangerous exercise. So they have training crews that go through a lot of simulation.

Then they have competition and they have it in the east coast and the west coast and down the south of Texas and everywhere else. They come with competitive crews to fire this TOW missile.

You know what, Mr. President? When they go to the competition, the one honor graduate gets to fire one. The rest of them all go through simulation and they never fire a TOW missile.

The reason for only one firing would be, if we had someone discussing this, is that the TOW costs between \$5,000 and \$9,000 apiece. But people out there who are talking about waste, fraud, and abuse when they come to the floor of the Senate understand what the cost is for national defense. We have to survive. We need ammunition. Let us discuss the Redeye, the antiaircraft heat-seeking missile. All the training for Redeye is simulation. The troops walk through the woods saying, "Bang, bang." That is all they can do. They have competing teams and they train. But only the top training team gets to fire and they fire one Redeye antiaircraft missile. You have to be almost Johnny on the spot to inspect the troops and find them firing. And they talk about readiness.

The Soviets know this. I wish all those people who were anxious about secret weapons would get to the biggest secret of all kept from the American people. And that is what finally, the Chief of Staff, Gen. Shy Meyer, had to call "A hollow Army" because he is embarrassed. He is a fighting man. He knows of these restrictions.

His needs are reviewed by some OMB Director who tinkers around with all the computers. They can find \$16 billion for big oil, they can find leasing their losses for Ford to lease to IBM or Occidental, \$14 billion, or a \$27 billion kitty over a 5-year period. They can find it for oil companies and all. But for the fighting man, when we are trying to keep up his morale and keep the crews together so they can fire the TOW missile, fire the Redeye antiaircraft missile, and give them true readiness, along comes another ammo cut and all of our troops might as well go through a penny arcade. People who cut ammunition ought to buy those things I see advertised on TV for kids by Atari.

Just buy them one set and send them to the officers to put them in the barracks, and let them bam, bam, bam with all these simulating machines. You and

I know better. Simulation is good, but you must have actual practice.

We have mechanized infantry in Grafenwohr, Germany. Last year, members of the budget staff visited there, and watched a crew training. That was in October, at the beginning of the fiscal year. In the first month of the fiscal year they fired 70 percent of their ammunition. They were out of ammunition, for all practical purposes for the rest of the year, and could only sit around. Maybe they found time to travel to the Alps or somewhere else to go, or whatever it was, because all the ammunition was used up. Show them a Senator visiting—anything to have them stand around and look soldiering. They could not actually perform as troops.

So what you have, in essence—and the Fralca articles showed this—is a very low state of readiness.

The commanders in the field cannot come up here and testify and say, as a captain of a company, "My company is no good." They have immediately lost their ability to command. They cannot come up, as a brigade commander or a chief of staff, and say, "We are not ready."

He says, finally, that it is a hollow army—a matter of personnel, ammunition, and everything else. It is all on paper. The Russians know it, and they know it in spades, and they understand it. Yet, we tinkertoy around here and commend ourselves on the biggest defense budget we have had in the history of the country. Well, we have the biggest deficits we ever had in the history of the country. That is bothering me more than anything else.

However, I can show you many, many places to save this money, and we will have an amendment whereby we can allocate savings from just one piece of weaponry over the next 5 years, \$40 billion.

So let us not talk about mammoth budgets or the biggest defense budget or that this would bust the budget. That is absolute tommyrot. I will debate the budget with you whenever you are ready. I am for readiness here and now.

Clauswitz said, I say to the Senator from Alaska, that a nation fights the war it is prepared to fight. We are not prepared in the Indian Ocean, so we will not fight in the Indian Ocean. We are not prepared in NATO, so we will not fight a conventional war in NATO. We are prepared with our nuclear submarines, our Minuteman and Titan missiles, our B-52 bombers, all for nuclear war.

In spite of the fact that we have 345 B-52's, 63 FB-111's, and hundreds of F-16's, F-15's, F-18's, A-6's, A-7's, and bombers—bombers, bombers, bombers—the request of the chairman of the subcommittee here is, "Give me one more bomber at \$400 million a copy, or \$40 billion in 5 years, so I can be"—what? prepared even further for nuclear war.

No one contemplates using a B-1 excepting in nuclear war. I can tell you that if we have a nuclear war the most inefficient way to drop a piece of ordnance on Moscow would be by a manned penetrating bomber. You would already have, of course, your ICBM's

SCLM's, ALCM's, cruise missiles—I could go down the list—and after all those, before you put a manned crew on a bomber, in a nuclear exchange. It might become a situation where you have a Piper Cub trying to find civilization.

Yet, overprepared for nuclear war, they would table this amendment and make us unprepared for conventional war.

I say to those who are interested in peace, those who are frightened, as I am, by nuclear holocaust, let us become realistic and get on a talking basis, a credible basis, if you please, with our NATO allies.

If we can get on that basis with them in conventional warfare, we will not have all these peace demonstrations. If we get a draft, not just military power, to demonstrate our willpower, so that when the Commander in Chief commands them we all move forward together, that will cost less rather than more. And, I will go along with it.

I have introduced a bill on the draft, and I have been assured of hearings on December 5, and I hope everyone will attend. We will not get it through this year, but we will have an education session, in many ways, to strengthen the Army, strengthen the United States of America, within the budget and even for less.

We are not here as stark, raving hawks, demanding more for the DOD. On the contrary, we are trying to make a wise allocation, and the wisest allocation after manpower—and I have already talked about that particular amendment—is for readiness itself.

And about the biggest need we have in readiness is the ammunition I have listed here. That is the embarrassment. We can find a billion dollars, if you please, for the All Volunteer Force and run around promising to show them how to travel and see the world.

Well, we have spent over a billion dollars to try to get them into the Volunteer Army. Why do we not just cut that and get a draft started and give me \$148 million out of the savings so that soldiers can act like soldiers?

I thank the distinguished manager of the bill.

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I will respond to the Senator's remarks in the morning. It is my understanding that there is an agreement to have divided time in the morning.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

(The following proceedings occurred earlier and are printed at this point, by unanimous consent.)

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, I believe it may be possible to report on the request I made earlier.

Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that after debate is concluded on the pending Hollings amendment, which is the ammunition amendment, that it be in order with a single show of seconds to ask for the yeas and nays on both amendments. I further ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that when the debate is concluded on this second amendment today, that the vote on both the Hollings amendments be deferred un-

til the hour of 10 o'clock tomorrow, with a vote to occur first in relation to the first Hollings amendment, that is to say the manpower amendment, where the rollcall will be 15 minutes in length, followed immediately without intervening motion, appeal, or point of order, by the vote in relation to the second Hollings amendment, which is the ammunition amendment, and the rollcall on that amendment will be 10 minutes in length.

I further ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that at 9:40 tomorrow there be a period for further debate on each of these two Hollings amendments of 10 minutes each to be equally divided and controlled, with the time under this order to be in the usual form, and that in any event the votes occur back to back as contemplated herein beginning at 10 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, would it be possible to—

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, could I make sure that in each case on each amendment the request was for a vote in relation to the amendment? That is my intention.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wanted to ask the majority leader if he objects to including in his unanimous-consent request the taking of a steaming amendment immediately after those votes he has requested.

Mr. BAKER. Would the Senator be in a position to suggest a time limitation that we might have on the steaming amendment?

Mr. President, let me get this request at this time because we have worked hard to get it. That will help me on the commitment I have made that there will be no more rollcall votes tonight. Then I would respectfully suggest that the Senator from Ohio and any other Senator who is interested confer with us further on how we might sequence this or other amendments after these two rollcalls which will be stacked if this request is granted.

Mr. GLENN. I withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BAKER. I thank the Senator from Ohio and all Members who have made it possible for us to arrange for the orderly consideration of this bill beginning in the morning.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, has there been a period for the transaction of routine morning business today?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, there has.

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

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

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR HARRY F. BYRD, JR.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, yesterday, our colleague HARRY F. BYRD, JR., announced that he would not seek reelection to a fourth term.

I must confess that I have mixed feelings about Senator BYRD's decision. After a lifetime of public service including 18 years in the U.S. Senate, Senator BYRD and his wife, Gretchen, who has been his partner in serving the people of Virginia, have earned the right to have time for themselves. They have given far beyond the call of duty. I wish them both much happiness.

At the same time, the retirement of HARRY BYRD will be a great loss to the Senate and to the country. In an age in which self-gratification has too often been a major motivation, HARRY BYRD has truly sought to serve and to give of himself. I have never known a person in public life who was less self-serving and more sincerely patriotic than HARRY BYRD, JR.

In an age in which pragmatic relativism is the rule, HARRY BYRD is a man of unyielding principle. His integrity is universally respected by political friends and foes alike.

Throughout his career in the Senate, he has warned of the dangers associated with excessive Government spending. He understood far earlier than most that even the U.S. Government could face a liquidity crisis. With interest payments on the national debt running as high as \$100 billion per year and Government borrowing bidding up interest rates to levels that bankrupt small farmers and businessmen, all of us would do well to listen more carefully to the warnings sounded by Senator BYRD of Virginia. It is tragic that they were not heeded earlier.

HARRY BYRD, JR., deserves to be known as a gentleman as well as a statesman. How much better our country would be if more people practiced his unfailing courtesy and his demonstrated respect for each person with whom he has contact. His career is proof that a decent and good person who refuses to sacrifice either his principles or his humanity can succeed in Government and public life.

I am grateful that I have had the chance to come to know HARRY BYRD, JR., and to serve with him in the U.S. Senate. His character and high standards are a challenge to me to do my best to be a good public servant. Those who come to the Senate after his retirement will miss the very rewarding experience of serving with him. We can only hope that enough of the spirit of HARRY BYRD, JR., will have rubbed off on each of us, that it will be a continuing part of this institution of Government.

There have been many outstanding men and women in the lines of the Byrd family extending back to the earliest colonial days of Virginia. None has had a clearer sense of public duty or a more unselfish desire to serve than HARRY BYRD, JR.

VOLUNTARY VITAMINS ACT OF 1981

Mr. HAYAKAWA. Mr. President, today, I want to share my thoughts with you about Federal Government regulation of vitamins and minerals. Quite simply, I believe that people should be allowed freedom of choice regarding their dietary needs. Such regulation is an unnecessary intrusion into the lives of our citizens.

Recently, I joined Senator HATCH in sponsoring S. 1277, the Voluntary Vitamins Act of 1981. This landmark legislation would insure the freedom to voluntarily decide whether or not to consume vitamins and mineral supplements.

The enactment of S. 1277 will fundamentally change the regulatory powers of the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) over vitamins, minerals, and other nutrients sold for dietary purposes. It requires that such supplements be regulated as food, not as food additives or drugs, without compromising the FDA's authority to protect consumers from fraud and deception in labeling such foods.

There is an interesting history behind the development of this legislation. In 1962 the FDA proposed regulations requiring that most vitamins and mineral combinations and potencies should be obtained only with a doctor's prescription. Congress received hundreds of thousands of letters from irate consumers opposing the FDA's proposal. In response, Senators WILLIAM PROXMIRE and Richard Schweiker introduced a resolution to block the FDA's proposed rules and restrict its authority in regulating vitamins and minerals. Unanimously enacted by the Senate and House in 1976 the Proxmire-Schweiker bill amended the Food and Drug Act to include, for the first time, a definition of "foods for special dietary uses."

In March of 1979, the FDA attempted to reverse this clear congressional intent of the Proxmire-Schweiker resolution. A proposal was issued to regulate vitamins and minerals as "Over-the-Counter" (OTC) drugs, if they were offered for use in the prevention or treatment of a vitamin or mineral deficiency. The FDA attempted to prevent controversy by making the regulation appear to be conditional, and applicable only to those supplements used to treat deficiencies. Are not all vitamins and minerals used to replace some deficiency in our diets? The constituents noticed this ironic twist, and responded with the same level of opposition as they had expressed to the earlier FDA proposal. Once again, Senate and House offices were overwhelmed with negative reactions from the folks back home. Clearly, they would not stand for such Government intrusion into their right to determine their own diets.

To his credit, the new Commissioner of the Food and Drug Administration, Dr. Arthur Hull Hays, Jr., assured the Senate shortly after taking office that he would rescind the over-the-counter regulations proposed in 1979. He plans to make a formal announcement of this re-

scission in the Federal Register before the end of this year.

Dr. Hayes is obviously a unique exception to his predecessors in demonstrating commonsense and leadership in directing the FDA. Unfortunately, Dr. Hayes will not remain in office forever. Therefore, I believe that we in Congress have a responsibility to provide statutory protection for the kind of regulatory policy Dr. Hayes has initiated. Mr. President, we are public servants, elected to serve the people, not to regulate them. We need to insure this relationship through the passage of S. 1277. It would remove the FDA's option to regulate, as either drugs or food additives, any vitamins, minerals, and other food supplements used to treat a dietary deficiency.

It certainly seems peculiar to me that we give people credit for being smart enough to elect us to office, but question their judgment when it comes to taking care of themselves. S. 1277, the Voluntary Vitamins Act of 1981, is long overdue.

NEW YORK STATE RESOLUTION CONCERNING IRISH UNIFICATION POLICY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD Resolution No. 1207, which was adopted by the New York State Legislature, and which has been received by the Office of the President pro tempore.

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

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION—ASSEMBLY NO. 1207

Whereas, The members of the New York State Legislature, being for the most part not of Irish ancestry, have viewed the English Government's lack of response to the recently ended Maze Prison hunger strike, the ultimate protest against injustice, with increasing horror; and

Whereas, This Legislative Body believes that the time has come for Americans of all ethnic backgrounds to take notice of the urgent human appeal that is the message of these Irish martyrs and patriots; and

Whereas, The United States purports to have a special relationship with the United Kingdom which should also imply a special responsibility for the actions of the United Kingdom; and

Whereas, Certain responsible groups in the United Kingdom, although not in the seats of power, have urged that the Government of the United Kingdom adopt an explicit policy that Northern Ireland be united under the jurisdiction of Free Ireland over a reasonable period of time, most likely a decade; and

Whereas, The announcement of an explicit unification policy, the unification itself however to take place through a gradual process over a number of years, would assuredly have the effect of initiating the processes of psychological as well as political and economic adjustment to this inevitable occurrence; and

Whereas, Those who prefer to avoid action using as a cloak for their real motivation the false excuse that the particular dilemma of Northern Ireland is forever insoluble should have been confounded by the recent example of the Rhodesian solution; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Government of the United States shall express to the Govern-

ment of the United Kingdom our firm conviction that an Irish unification policy must be implemented if the United Kingdom wishes to retain its status as a nation which lays claim to a reasonable standard of civilization, and to a special relationship with the United States, this conviction to be expressed in increasingly concrete terms, both diplomatic and economic, as time passes; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this Resolution, suitably engrossed, be transmitted to the Honorable Ronald Reagan, President of the United States, to the President Pro Tem of the Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of State and to each member of Congress from the State of New York.

GUAM EXPRESSES SUPPORT FOR NATIONAL TUITION TAX CREDIT LEGISLATION

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two resolutions, Resolutions Nos. 192 and 201, that were adopted by the 16th Guam Legislature and which have been received by the Office of the President pro tempore.

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

RESOLUTION No. 192

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam:

Whereas the 1981 Packwood-Moynihan Tuition Tax Credit Bill would establish a federal tax credit for tuition paid by parents who send their children to a non-government school; and

Whereas, an additional feature of the 1981 Packwood-Moynihan Tuition Tax Credit Bill is a refund provision for those parents who do not earn a taxable income but do pay tuition for their children to attend a non-government school; and

Whereas, the 1981 Packwood-Moynihan Tuition Tax Credit Bill would apply to college, vocational, secondary and elementary tuition; and

Whereas, under present law, parents who exercise their basic right to send their children to a non-government school are being doubly taxed and are not afforded relief as proposed by the 1981 Packwood-Moynihan Tuition Tax Credit; and

Whereas, November 1981 has been declared "National Tuition Tax Credit Month" to draw attention to the proposal that tuition tax credit legislation is urgently needed to remove the unfair burden of double taxation placed upon parents who exercise their basic right to educate their own children according to their own moral, religious and cultural values; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the Sixteenth Guam Legislature of the territory of Guam does support passage of federal tuition tax credit legislation with refund provisions as proposed in the 1981 Packwood-Moynihan Tuition Tax Credit Bill and urges the Congress and the President to accept this legislation that would eliminate tax penalties which now exist for those parents who pay tuition to send their children to non-discriminating, non-government schools whose curriculum corresponds with religious, moral and cultural values embraced by the families; and be it further

Resolved, that the Speaker certify to and the Legislative Secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the President of the United States of America, the Honorable Ronald Reagan; to the U.S. Secretary of Education; to the Speaker of the United

States House of Representatives; to the President of the U.S. Senate; to all members of the U.S. Congress; to the Honorable Antonio B. Won Pat; to His Excellency Bishop Felixberto C. Flores; to the Administrators of each nongovernment schools within the territory; and to the Governor of Guam.

RESOLUTION No. 201

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam:

Whereas, the Congress of the United States has under consideration H.R. 3517; and

Whereas, if enacted, H.R. 3517 would grant permanent resident status to nonimmigrant aliens who have been long-term residents of the Virgin Islands; and

Whereas, the persons who are the beneficiaries of H.R. 3517 are ones who entered the Virgin Islands under a temporary worker program authorized by Section 101(a)(15)(H)(ii) of the Immigration and Nationality Act; and

Whereas, the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives of the Congress has recommended enactment of H.R. 3517 by a vote of 20-0 and noted in a report to the House:

In 1975, a study by the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration, Citizenship and International Law concluded that there was a moral obligation to provide permanent residence status to H-2 workers and their families who have become established members of the Virgin Islands community and that legislation to regularize their status should be enacted. The study also recommended the temporary-worker program be tightened up; and

Whereas, the situation of many aliens in Guam is exactly parallel to that of those in the Virgin Islands in that the H-2 workers and their families came to Guam at a time when the territory was in need of their construction skills and the work these persons performed has been of material help in the stimulation and development of the island's economy; and

Whereas, the unlimited flow of nonimmigrant workers into Guam could now injure the island's fragile economy because it might result in the displacement of local workers; and

Whereas, H.R. 3517 seems to provide an equitable solution to the issue of how to grant permanent residency to a limited class of long-term "temporary" workers without creating an unending flow of new aliens into a small American territory, it being noted in the summary of H.R. 3517:

The bill expresses the sense of Congress that longstanding residents of the U.S. Virgin Islands with H-2 status have contributed to the development of the islands, are an integral part of the society there, and should be allowed permanent residence status. The bill also recognizes the need for Congress to prevent any further influx of aliens into the islands by limiting the ability of adjusted aliens to file immigrant visa petitions for their relatives.

The bill allows aliens admitted to the Virgin Islands as temporary workers, who have lived on the islands continuously since June 30, 1975, to have their status adjusted to that of permanent residents. Adjustments of status must be made within one year of the bill's enactment. The adjustment is also applicable to the alien spouse and minor children if they meet the residency period requirement. Adjustments would be denied to aliens found to be excludable from U.S. residence under the conditions of the Immigration and Nationality Act.

The bill provides the Secretary of State with discretionary authority to limit the number of immigrant visas that could be issued to alien spouses or unmarried children of individuals whose status is adjusted under the bill. Married sons, daughters,

brothers, and sisters of aliens who become permanent residents pursuant to this bill would be unable to obtain visas unless it could be shown that denial would cause exceptional hardship. The bill prohibits the preference system restrictions contained in the bill from being applied to the administration of any other immigration law. The bill terminates the temporary-worker program in the U.S. Virgin Islands. It authorizes a joint report by the Departments of Health and Human Services; Education; Housing and Urban Development; Labor; and Interior, the Attorney General, and the Virgin Islands Government on the social and economic impact of the bill on the Virgin Islands. Findings must be reported to Congress and the President within one year of the bill's enactment; and

Whereas, the Legislature is of the opinion that the same solution should be applied to Guam as is being proposed for the Virgin Islands; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the Sixteenth Guam Legislature does respectfully request the Congress of the United States to amend H.R. 3517 to allow the Immigration and Naturalization Service to process for permanent residence those aliens who entered Guam as defense parolees or H-2 workers prior to 1977 and who are still within the island at the time H.R. 3517 is enacted into law; and be it further

Resolved, that those aliens be permitted to sponsor for permanent residency only their spouses and children who would enter the United States prior to attaining their 18th birthday; and be it further

Resolved, that the Speaker certify to and the Legislative Secretary attest the adoption hereof and that copies of the same be thereafter transmitted to the President of the United States; to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress; to the Attorney General of the United States; to the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service; to Guam's Washington Delegate; and to the Governor of Guam.

STATE RESOLUTIONS CONCERNING MIA'S AND POW'S IN VIETNAM

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, as the President pro tempore, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues resolutions passed by the States of Massachusetts and Pennsylvania which concern POW's and MIA's in Vietnam.

These resolutions are further proof of a growing interest throughout our Nation over the continuing tragedy of those Americans who are still unaccounted for after the Vietnam war. For years, I have urged a renewed emphasis on resolving this situation, especially for the families, relatives, and friends of those who are still listed as POW's and MIA's. Anything less than a full national effort to resolve this tragedy is not acceptable.

Mr. President, I command the distinguished members of the General Assembly of Pennsylvania and of the State Senate in Massachusetts for their worthy resolutions. In order to share the sentiments of these concerned State legislators with my colleagues, I ask unanimous consent that these two resolutions be printed in the RECORD.

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

HOUSE RESOLUTION No. 20

Whereas, Article VIII, section (a) of the peace accord which ended the Vietnam Conflict provided that the United States and

Vietnamese governments would, on the date of United States troop withdrawal, exchange prisoners of war and complete lists of information on all military personnel who died in captivity or were found dead by the enemy; and

Whereas, There are still nearly 2,500 Americans still unaccounted for by the Indochinese governments (specifically Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia), even though there have been approximately 1,000 siting reports of captured Caucasians, of which 300 are based on reliable first-hand information; and

Whereas, The Vietnamese government has, to date, only returned the remains of 72 United States soldiers who died in captivity and, who along with the Cambodian and Laotian governments, have provided a dismal record of cooperation toward the full accounting of all Americans still unaccounted for; and

Whereas, Fundamental humanitarian principles are violated by the continuing lack of cooperation from the Indochinese governments; therefore be it

Resolved (the Senate concurring), That the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania memorialize the President of the United States, Congress and the Department of Defense to continue to place a high priority on securing the fullest possible investigative accounting of Americans listed missing in action (MIA), prisoner of war (POW) or killed in action (KIA) body—not recovered and; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the President of the Senate, the appropriate committee chairmen in both chambers of Congress, the Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs of staff.

RESOLUTIONS REQUESTING THE GOVERNOR TO PROCLAIM THE MONTH OF NOVEMBER, NINETEEN HUNDRED AND EIGHTY-ONE AS P.O.W.-M.I.A. AWARENESS MONTH

Whereas, More than seven years after the end of the participation of the United States Armed Forces in the Vietnam war there remains approximately two thousand, five hundred Americans still unaccounted for and missing in action; and

Whereas, There is reliable information that justifies our belief that a number of the Americans still unaccounted for are still being held as prisoners in Southeast Asia, particularly by the North Vietnamese Government; and

Whereas, The withholding of information by the North Vietnamese Government as to the existence of the remains of Americans in Southeast Asia and the existence of living Americans still being held prisoner in Southeast Asia is a violation of the highest order against humanity, causing indescribable suffering to the families of those missing in action or still prisoners of a war long ended; and

Whereas, The negotiations by commissions and other representatives of the United States have lacked the success and the tenacity of purpose which could have forced the P.O.W.-M.I.A. issue in Southeast Asia to have been resolved to the satisfaction of the American people, particularly the families of the P.O.W. and M.I.A. Americans; and

Whereas, We must not allow the efforts by the United States Government to slacken and die by the lessening of public clamor for action on this P.O.W.-M.I.A. issue, remembering that throughout American history our prisoners of war have always been called upon to make uncommon sacrifices; and

Whereas, We must sacrifice for those who have suffered so much in fulfilling their duty as citizens of the United States by our taking the time to renew the public pressure and awareness against our Government's seeming tendency to desert and turn away from a to-

tal confrontation of this problem; therefore be it

Resolved, That the month of November in the year nineteen hundred and eighty-one be proclaimed by His Excellency the Governor, Prisoner of War-Missing In Action Awareness Month; and be it further

Resolved, That appropriate acts of awareness, and individual and group communications to the President and Congress of the United States and other suitable action be taken to spread awareness throughout the Commonwealth thereby increasing the public demand that the Government of North Vietnam complete a full and honest accounting of the identity of all Americans numbered among the twenty-five hundred known by said Government to be dead or alive, who are still in Southeast Asia; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be made known throughout the Commonwealth as a public service by courtesy of the various entities of the news media operating within the Commonwealth; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Governor of the Commonwealth, the United States Secretary of State, the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and the President Pro Tem of the United States Senate.

THE FISCAL YEAR 1982 BUDGET AND THE CITIES—A HUNDRED CITY SURVEY

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, since this administration took office last January, it has pushed through the largest package of budget and tax cuts in our history, and we now hear that more spending cuts will have to be made.

Before we are forced to make new cuts, we should fully understand what we have already done. Because these cuts were made through an unusual use of the reconciliation process, many Senators did not have the opportunity to carefully review the cuts they were asked to vote for.

As the reports from various sectors come in, it is more and more obvious that we have sliced through the fat, and severed muscle from bone in many places. The U.S. Conference of Mayors has recently completed a survey of 100 cities and has issued a report entitled "The FY 82 Budget and the Cities." This survey details the harsh impact this year's budget cuts are already having, and warns of greater dangers from future cuts.

According to this survey, 61 percent of the cities responding have already laid off workers, and 13 percent more say they will do so soon. Forty-one percent of the cities say they have already or will soon increase taxes. Sixty-four percent of the cities said they will reduce services. For instance, Little Rock has had to end its street resurfacing efforts; St. Paul Minn., has had to eliminate 20 policemen; and Toledo now collects garbage only once every 2 weeks. These cuts threaten the safety, security, and health of all citizens, and more cuts mean that these threats will multiply.

Fully 63 percent of the responding cities said they will have to defer work on capital infrastructures, such as waste water drainage, city waterlines, and sewer projects. We can defer such infrastructure repairs, but at some point we must make them if our Nation's cities

are to survive. The longer we wait the more it will cost. Such deferrals are a clear example of the penny-wise, pound-foolish approach to budget reductions that was embedded in much of the administration's 1982 program.

So that my colleagues may better understand the impact these cuts have on real people and real places, I ask unanimous consent that the Conference of Mayors survey be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE FISCAL YEAR 1982 BUDGET AND THE CITIES INTRODUCTION

Recently-enacted federal budget cuts are imposing immense burdens on city budgets, resulting in massive layoffs, service reductions, tax increases, and postponement of needed capital investments. FY82 cuts in federal spending have fallen disproportionately on grants to state and local government, with cities forced to absorb major reductions in housing, transit, employment, and other programs. Nor is this the first cut which cities have faced. For three consecutive fiscal years since FY80, cities have had to adjust to major reductions in federal aid.

Federal budget cuts have resulted in the following service cuts at the local level:

Reductions in school services;

Major cutbacks in employment and training programs;

Elimination of park and recreation programs;

Crippled housing efforts;

Reduced police, fire, and sanitation services;

Sharp reduction in street, road, and bridge maintenance;

Cuts in city programs to serve the poor;

Reduced transit service at a higher fee;

Rapidly deteriorating urban infrastructure;

Deferral of purchases of garbage trucks, buses, and other city-owned equipment, and reduced maintenance;

Dirtier water; and

Reductions in community and economic development programs.

A survey of one hundred American cities, conducted by the U.S. Conference of Mayors from November 3-10, 1981, indicates that federal cutbacks in key urban programs have already caused cities to reduce substantially the services they provide to urban residents. They predict that further cuts, such as a 12-percent across-the-board cut proposed by the Administration, will have major adverse effects on cities and city residents.

The survey asked cities to indicate how they have been affected by federal cuts in public transportation, housing and community development programs, public assistance, wastewater treatment programs, education, CETA, parks and recreation programs, and public works. (See Appendix I for a list of the cities surveyed and Appendix II for the list of questions used in the survey). Questions also included how the cuts are hitting urban budgets now and how potential cuts may affect them in the future.

The picture that emerges is stark. Sixty percent of cities are laying off workers; 41 percent have raised or will soon increase taxes; and a substantial majority have reduced services substantially and deferred capital spending to try to absorb federal cutbacks. Cities variously warn that they are already at the "bare bones level" "cut to the marrow," and stress the seriousness of the cuts on their continued ability to meet the needs of their people. Cities emphasized the leadership they are exhibiting by raising taxes at the local level, by mak-

ing the difficult choices, and by trying valiantly to overcome the barriers they face.

As one official from a city in the South stated, the goal of the city as a "life-enhancing residential community, and as a viable economic entity," is severely threatened by federal withdrawal of funds. And, a city official from the far West observed, "Cities touch people more closely than any other level of government. These cuts mean the loss of amenities and services that people take for granted. We are paring our essential services to the bone. Where do we go from here?"

The U.S. Conference of Mayors will continue to survey the nation's cities on a periodic basis to assess the impact of budget cuts and related economic policies on those cities.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors is committed to working with the Administration and the Congress toward policies to enhance the nation and its cities. It is the hope of the Conference that the information such as that found in this survey will make a positive contribution to the federal policymaking process.

FEDERAL BUDGET CUTS AND THE FISCAL CONDITION OF CITIES

The FY 82 federal budget cuts have caused large and immediate budget adjustments by cities. A significant majority have already made decisions to increase taxes, lay off workers, postpone capital spending, and reduce services. The details are highlighted below.

City Worker Layoffs: Sixty-one percent of all cities have had to lay off workers as a result of federal budget cuts. An additional 13 percent say they will soon do so. These layoffs have a particularly adverse impact on city revenues, welfare burdens, city services, and crime rates.

1a. [Have you] laid off workers?

| | Number | Percent |
|-------------------------|--------|---------|
| Yes ----- | 59 | 61 |
| No ----- | 25 | 26 |
| Not yet, but will ----- | 13 | 13 |
| Total ----- | 97 | 100 |

While the number of layoffs varied by the size and fiscal condition of cities, some cities were forced to reduce their work force by as much as 20 percent, including York, Pennsylvania and Youngstown, Ohio.

Layoffs by cities

| City: | Number, if given | Percentage, if given |
|----------------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| Allentown ----- | -- | 1-2 |
| Anchorage ----- | -- | 3-4 |
| Austin ----- | 45 | .5 |
| Baltimore ----- | 1,000 | 2.89 |
| Berkeley ----- | -- | 1-2 |
| Billings ----- | 55 | 7 |
| Buffalo ----- | 1,400 | 10 |
| Cedar Rapids ----- | 4 | -- |
| Charleston, W. Va. ----- | -- | .5 |
| Corpus Christi ----- | 360 | 3 |
| Dallas ----- | 50-75 | -- |
| Des Moines ----- | 20-25 | 1 |
| Detroit ----- | 124 | 5 |
| Duluth ----- | *15 | -- |
| El Paso (fewer than) ----- | 10 | -- |
| Ft. Wayne ----- | 10 | -- |
| Gulfport ----- | 30 | 10 |
| Las Vegas ----- | 100 | 7 |
| Lincoln ----- | 23 | 2 |
| Little Rock ----- | 63 | 5 |
| Long Beach ----- | 12-13 | -- |
| Los Angeles ----- | 2,100 | 7.6 |
| Louisville ----- | 796 | -- |

| City: | Number, if given | Percentage, if given |
|-----------------------|------------------|----------------------|
| Madison ----- | 45 | 3 |
| Manchester ----- | 200 | **10 |
| Memphis ----- | 220 | 2 |
| Miami ----- | 954 | -- |
| Nashville ----- | 325 | 5 |
| New Bedford ----- | 100 | -- |
| Norfolk ----- | 31 | 1 |
| Portland, Me. ----- | 190 | 15 |
| Portland, Oreg. ----- | 52 | -- |
| Providence ----- | 425 | -- |
| St. Louis ----- | ***1,068 | 12 |
| St. Paul ----- | 150 | 4 |
| Springfield ----- | 250 | 10 |
| Tampa ----- | 699 | 13.5 |
| Toledo ----- | 254 | 8 |
| Wilmington ----- | 45 | -- |
| Winston-Salem ----- | 40 | 2 |
| York ----- | 5 | 20 |
| Youngstown ----- | 212 | 20 |

*Positions eliminated.

**Through layoffs and attrition.

***Includes 401 positions eliminated through attrition.

NOTE.—42 Cities of the 59 that have experienced layoffs gave a number that could be cited; 5 others gave a number, but asked that they not be quoted directly. These layoffs include CETA workers and other city employees.

Layoffs recognize no regional boundaries, as the figures below indicate.

Regional distribution of cities with layoffs

| Region: | Number | Percentage |
|-----------------------------------|--------|------------|
| New England ----- | 6 | 10 |
| Midwest ----- | 17 | 29 |
| Southwestern U.S. ----- | 4 | 7 |
| South ----- | 13 | 22 |
| Far West (including Alaska) ----- | 9 | 15 |
| Mid-Atlantic ----- | 10 | 17 |
| Total ----- | 59 | 100 |

In describing its layoffs, Louisville indicated that it "has been forced to lay off approximately 703 CETA employees who were placed in various city departments and outside agencies. In addition, approximately 93 general fund positions in various city operating departments were eliminated largely because of a 12 percent reduction in the city's fiscal year 1981-82 payments. These included positions in the parks patrol unit, school crossing guards, and sanitation workers."

Tax Increases: Despite restrictions on city revenues, many cities are responding to federal budget cuts by raising local taxes. Of the 96 cities responding, 40 (41 percent) have raised or will raise taxes, and 1 (1 percent) tried, but failed.

Twenty-seven cities specified the kind of tax increase adopted, with some adopting more than one increase.

Types of tax increases

Number of cities

| Tax increases: | Number of cities |
|-------------------|------------------|
| Property ----- | 18 |
| User fees ----- | 11 |
| City income ----- | 3 |
| Utility ----- | 2 |
| Sales ----- | 1 |

Ten cities, surveyed and responding to this question, already have a sales tax; 18 have an income tax; and 11 have both a sales and income tax. It is important to emphasize, however, that revenue-raising through sales, income taxes, and other methods, are prohibited in a number of states. Currently, 40

states do not allow local governments to levy income taxes, and local sales taxes are not allowed in 24 states. Limitations on property taxes, such as Proposition 2½ in Massachusetts, further hamstring the revenue-raising capacity of cities.

Service Reductions: In order to cope with federal cutbacks many cities have had to reduce city services. Ninety-three cities responded to this question. Of these, 64 (69 percent) stated that they have had to, or will soon, reduce services; 29 (31 percent) reported that they have not, although some noted that they were already cut to the bone and could not cut any more.

The types of services cut and the number of cities indicating reductions in these areas are as follows: (It is important to remember that one city could cut in more than one area.)

| Service area cut: | Number of cities |
|---|------------------|
| Park and Recreation ----- | 20 |
| Health and Human Services ----- | 14 |
| Public Works ----- | 10 |
| Sanitation ----- | 9 |
| Across the board in all departments ----- | 9 |
| Fire Protection ----- | 8 |
| Police Protection ----- | 8 |
| Libraries ----- | 7 |
| Streets and Bridges ----- | 7 |
| Training and Employment ----- | 7 |
| Environment ----- | 3 |
| Arts ----- | 2 |
| Mass Transit ----- | 2 |
| Some, not specified ----- | 1 |

Many cities have been forced to reduce services in several areas. For example, Berkeley, California, noted that their cuts have been across-the-board, but noted that the federal aid cuts have had a particularly adverse impact on personnel levels in the fire department, police station closings, reduction of police-administered staff, and have resulted in nearly a two-thirds reduction in community social services.

Boise noted that their reductions have affected library hours, recreational programs, and street lighting. Although it has a growing population, Boise has added only three policemen, and no firemen, to their city staff. In Little Rock, city officials have eliminated street resurfacing for lack of funds; their situation has been exacerbated by voter repeal of a \$3 million road tax. In addition, Little Rock officials have been forced to consider the closing of fire stations.

Manchester has reduced its park maintenance, street sweeping, and refuse collection. Nashville has reduced fire code inspections, the juvenile court budget, health department staff, sanitation, social services for the elderly and deinstitutionalized persons, parks, recreation programs, libraries, jails, and workhouses. Pawtucket has reduced public works and such social services as pedestrian crossing guard programs for the elderly.

One Sun Belt city is reducing cash assistance to the indigent, vacant lot weed control, drainage maintenance, parks and recreation, health, the arts, and air pollution control programs. In addition, it has reduced family planning monies; programs for women, infants, and children; and community services. The city official noted that, "These cutbacks are necessary despite some increases in local revenue sources that we have generated and corresponding budget increases, because the city has not been able to keep pace with its service needs."

St. Paul has closed three recreation centers, reduced library hours from five days to four a week, eliminated 20 police positions, and four firefighter positions, and the rest of its cuts are spread throughout the city departments.

Toledo has reduced garbage collection from weekly to every two weeks. It has virtually eliminated park and recreation activities, and has completely eliminated its con-

sumer protection program. The city has not increased its police force since 1979, with reductions there being made by attrition. Springfield has cut all departments except public safety.

Deferral of Capital Spending: The Urban Infrastructure: The street, sewers, and bridges of many cities have not been adequately maintained or repaired. Sixty-three percent of the cities have deferred capital spending as a result of federal budget cuts or plan to do so.

These cities range across all regions of the country: Akron, Allentown, Baltimore, Berkeley, Billings, Boise, Buffalo, Cedar Rapids, Charleston, SC, Cleveland, Dade County, Denver, Des Moines, Detroit, Duluth, El Paso, Fargo, Flint, Gulfport, Kansas City, MO, Lincoln, Long Beach, Los Angeles, Louisville, Manchester, Memphis, Minneapolis, Nashville, Omaha, Pawtucket, Pittsburgh, Richmond, Rockford, St. Louis, St. Paul, Salt Lake City, San Jose, Seattle, Springfield, Winston-Salem, Yonkers, York.

(Five cities requested anonymity.)

Nine cities stated that they have not yet had to defer capital spending, but that they will have to do so soon. These are Burlington, Charleston, West Virginia, Dayton, Hartford, Indianapolis, Little Rock, Miami, Portland, Oregon and Tucson.

Denver stated that it had "almost totally" deferred capital spending, particularly affecting expansion of libraries, badly needed bridges, and wastewater drainage.

Cities most frequently cited deferral of capital spending for street and bridge projects. Other deferrals have hit parks and recreation programs, building inspection and code maintenance, fire and police stations, water projects, sanitation, mass transit, and libraries.

Asked to indicate whether or not any "major urban infrastructure plans had been deferred," 62 cities responded with an indication of impact on their infrastructure efforts. Of these, 63 percent stated that they will defer such major undertakings.

Cities that have deferred major infrastructure plans: Allentown, Austin, Berkeley, Boise, Buffalo, Charleston, SC, Dade County, Denver, Des Moines, Detroit, Duluth, Fargo, Flint, Kansas City, MO, Louisville, Manchester, Memphis, Nashville, Oakland, Omaha, Pawtucket, Providence, Richmond, Rockford, St. Louis, St. Paul, Salt Lake City, Toledo, Warwick, Wilmington, Winston-Salem, Yonkers, Youngstown.

Examples of such major infrastructure deferrals include Allentown, which has deferred a sewer run-off system; Berkeley, which has deferred road repairs, street sweeping, and all equipment maintenance and replacement; Boise, recreation and park maintenance; Buffalo, street resurfacing, street lighting, a sludge transfer plant which is required by the Environmental Protection Agency, and an updating of city water lines; Charleston, South Carolina, many equipment purchases, including garbage trucks and street sweepers; Des Moines, a major sewer project, which has been in planning for several years; Duluth, storm sewer construction; Louisville, city incinerator repairs; Manchester, transportation centers; Memphis, major street repairs; Omaha, two fire stations, three senior citizen centers, and water and sewer projects; Rockford, road expansion in industrial areas; and Youngstown has deferred buying any new fire equipment and noted that they "can't repair all the bridges and streets that need repairs."

One point is clear—the impact of budget cuts respects no limits. It hits all cities, and affects all services within a city, and reduces the quality of life of all of a city's residents.

The sections which follow spell out in some detail the urban services affected by federal budget cuts.

GENERAL REVENUE SHARING

Cities use general revenue sharing funds for a wide range of municipal services ranging from fire protection to street lighting. City officials in 60 percent of the cities responding said they would be forced to lay off workers if their general revenue sharing allocations are cut, with the number of layoffs in the cities interviewed ranging from a half dozen workers to more than 75. At least one-quarter of those responding said they would have to also increase taxes in the face of such a cut, and 70 percent said city services would be significantly curtailed.

Those services affected by such cutbacks include police and fire protection, street lighting, parks and recreation, sewer construction, major infrastructure work, sanitation services, street maintenance, and health and human services. Birmingham reports there would be a reduction or elimination of the Neighborhood Participation Program. Tampa uses revenue sharing for 19 percent of its police department budget, and would face serious cutbacks in police service with a 12 percent revenue sharing cut.

Over 25 percent of the cities predict they would have to increase property taxes if revenue sharing is cut. Many other cities would be unable to raise taxes because of taxpayer resistance, state restrictions, or taxing authority or strict tax restrictions which have been adopted.

The keystone of the Reagan Administration's "New Federalism", general revenue sharing has become an integral part of city budgets. It is clear that any cut in this program, which is widely supported by local officials, will have a major adverse result on city services and tax rates.

STATE BLOCK GRANTS

A major thrust of the FY82 budget proposals was the development of state block grants to replace categorical programs formerly run by the federal government. These block grants in health and human services, education, and community development for small cities are pointed to by the Administration as harbingers of its "New Federalism." Many cities expressed misgivings about direct state entitlement through block grants without adequate safeguards for city involvement in the development of allocation plans and priorities for the use of these funds. Our survey bears out the concerns which were expressed prospectively by so many cities.

State block grants (percent of those responding):

55 percent said the state has not consulted with them or offered an opportunity to participate in the state's decision-making process.

38 percent said they have not been able to get information from their states about the implementation of the block grants.

58 percent said they expected to lose money as a result of the block grants. Only 1 community surveyed thought the block grants would mean an increase in funds.

42 percent said their state was opting to take over the Small Cities CDBG program, and 27 percent said they were doing it poorly, or had some complaints about the process. Fully 53 percent didn't know how the state was carrying out this transition.

Many of the cities contacted said that consultations with the state had occurred only after decisions had been made and a program drawn up. This was true in states as diverse as California, Tennessee, Nebraska, and Maine. Many communities said communication had begun only after they had initiated it. Other cities said they had met with genuine lack of response even after initiating contact themselves and seeking information from the states. Respondents blamed their troubles with the states on confusion at the state level about the programs and their

responsibilities; historic bad relations between the city and the state; and state legislatures with strong rural and antiurban biases.

Many cities expressed strong doubts that their needs would receive the same attention from their states as they have from Washington. One major reason for this apprehension is a widespread belief that states will disproportionately cut the share of funds going to urban areas in order to provide coverage of some kind in every part of the state. In Washington State, for instance, the Human Services Department is anxious to maintain a basic level of services everywhere in the state. Reduced overall funding means that areas like Seattle will receive less funding than in the past so that rural areas can receive some service at all. Needs-based allocations, believe, will not be adopted by states. Rather, the effort will be to serve every possible constituency, particularly the strong rural-suburban contingents which dominate many state legislatures.

EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

Severe cuts in employment and training programs funded under the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act are having a very negative effect on city economies at a time when national and city unemployment rates are extremely high. The national unemployment rate at 8 percent and rising, translates into double-digit rates in many cities and 50 percent rates for minority teenagers.

In response to the Administration's elimination of all public service jobs under CETA Title IID and VI in FY82, cities have laid off all of their CETA employees—a total loss of 300,000 jobs from the CETA system.

Resulting costs to individual cities in dollars and services are immense and diverse. Of the 65 cities reporting direct financial effects due to the elimination of CETA, 42 percent are paying unemployment compensation, and 8 percent welfare. One northeastern city will spend approximately \$20-25 million on unemployment compensation for former CETA employees, based on 2,000 people getting \$130/week for 34 weeks. Columbus, Ohio is spending \$40,000-\$50,000 per month for unemployment compensation. Baltimore anticipates losing \$27 million in wages, which multiplies to a \$60 million drain on the economy because of lost wages. Only eleven percent of those cities surveyed felt there would be little direct cost to their cities, and only 20 percent said the county, state, and/or federal governments are paying the costs.

The stark reality of being newly unemployed in a recession economy is the prospect faced by former CETA employees. Some—but not all—former CETA employees have been hired by the city government in 52 percent of the respondent cities, other governments in 26 percent, private industry in 47 percent and nonprofit organizations in 5 percent. Fully 10 percent of the cities said none of their former CETA employees had found employment.

In Anchorage, 18 of the 80 employees laid off are now on the city payroll. Buffalo city government had hired 100 and private industry 380, of the 1,400 laid off. In Corpus Christi, 253 of the 362 terminated have been hired by the city government. Detroit city government has picked up 1,000 of the 1,124 laid off from CETA. Two hundred of the 760 laid off in Fort Wayne have found other jobs. In Fresno, the city has hired 40-50 of the 250 unemployed. In Los Angeles, of the 5,000 laid off, 63 are working for the city, 300 for other governments, and 800 for private industry.

Of the 10,330 laid off in New York City, 5,350 have been hired by the city, 39 by other governments, and 347 by private industry. Less than 5 percent of Pawtucket's

115 former CETA workers have found new jobs. None of Savannah's 83 public service employees has been re-employed. Approximately 40 of Waterbury's 205 laid-off CETA employees are working for the city. Five hundred of Seattle's 523 are working for the city now. And, in Toledo, 125 of the 694 are working for the city and other governments and none in private industry.

Of the 71 cities reporting the termination or cuts in services, 30 percent have reduced or eliminated parks and recreation programs, 25 percent health and human services programs, 20 percent street and bridge maintenance and construction, and 17 percent training and employment projects, most affecting youth. Maintenance and security in city housing projects will be cut in over 10 percent of the cities surveyed. Health and human services affected include day care, transportation and food programs for the elderly, alcohol and drug abuse centers, youth counseling, rape crisis centers, minority advocacy, displaced homemaker programs, and health delivery services. Aid to community-based organizations, which provide many of these services, will be eliminated in 13 percent of the cities surveyed. In Atlanta, at least 10 community-based organizations have closed so far and the termination of the CETA program will have "a significant negative impact on the city." According to an official in Cedar Rapids, the program was "killed without regard to its effectiveness. PSE was our best program." Public service employees represent "20 percent of Miami's current work force—it will be a severe loss to the city." Eight percent said some programs in all public services will be terminated and many large urban cities, like Detroit, which must pick up all the costs of the terminations of employees and services, feel it will mean "disaster" for their communities, especially for the poor and minorities.

Mayors and county officials are now working for reauthorization of a national employment and training program that will continue the direct federal-city relationship established in 1973 under the Nixon Administration's Comprehensive Employment and Training Act. Many cities surveyed stressed that the direct federal-city link has worked well for them and that they want to see it continued.

One person with over eight years of experience as a city employment and training director made the following observation: "under the Nixon Administration, we worked out a compromise to provide a way by which all cities and counties with a population over 100,000 could tackle their employment and training issues directly in concert with the federal government. Thus, in 1973, we agreed after months of negotiation that while there is a role for all governmental levels, the best system is one in which cities work with the federal government directly, without any intermediary barriers. That direct system works, and we have to keep it."

Many city officials expressed apprehension about a fundamental restructuring. As one official of a Midwestern city said, "Look, we are really hard hit by all these cuts and by our unemployment. We have just laid off more than 500 city workers and eliminated 300 more vacant positions from city rolls that we needed to have filled. It was bloody and painful and hard to say 'get lost' to people, some of whom had thirty years in with the city. In addition to our having to lay off city workers, we are dealing with a huge unemployment problem here. Remember, when you see an eight percent unemployment figure nationally, that translates into 15 or 20 percent or higher unemployment in cities, and in some instances, among our minority youth population, for example, we have unemployment over 40 percent."

The survey question on layoffs of public service employees produced a broad range of observations, not only about Public Service Employment (PSE), but also about the employment and training system in general. The picture that emerges is that cities across the country feel serious apprehension about the effects of federal cutbacks on urban employment and training programs in this country. When recent proposals to shift responsibility for employment and training from the local to the state level are added to the discussion of federal employment and training cutbacks, local officials expressed even more alarm.

COMMUNITY AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

Since 1974, Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) have provided cities around the country with a flexible source of funds for infrastructure improvements, neighborhood development, housing rehabilitation, and targeted delivery of services to low- and moderate-income people. Proposed funding for the program in FY82 was equal to FY81 levels, despite the addition of some 35 new SMSA's to the program. Also, other complementary programs such as Section 312 rehabilitation loans, Section 701 planning grants, and low-income energy weatherization were substantially reduced or terminated, and the burden of providing these services pushed into the CDBG program. The FY82 budget legislation on the program translated to an effective cut in real dollars of 10 percent for all entitlement communities, compared to allocations in FY81. Cities surveyed said that this cut is having an immediate effect in this way:

Community development block grants (percent of respondents):

35 percent of the cities surveyed said that the FY82 cuts in CDBG already enacted have had a substantial effect.

72 percent said that a further 12 percent cut would have a disastrous or substantial effect.

Surveyed cities said that services under CDBG have already been curtailed as a result of projected funding cuts. Nearly all the cities contacted said that CDBG cutbacks will mean across-the-board reductions in activities such as capital improvements in distressed neighborhoods; reduction in the amount of housing rehabilitation; cutbacks in services such as special transportation for the elderly in target neighborhoods, and elimination or reduction of street paving and repaving programs in deteriorated areas.

An additional 12 percent cut in FY82 funding for CDBG was viewed by most cities as particularly serious. Atlanta, for instance, said that it would be "disastrous." "In addition to a general deferral of programs now underway, there will be no other place to make up the lost funds—all the pots are empty now." The city pointed out that there is little hope of aid from its state, particularly given its rural bias and the stiff competition from rural areas for scarce funds. Boston said further cuts would be "devastating" "—these (funds) are the city's principal development tools." Buffalo pointed out that CDBG funds are the key to its economic development efforts to increase its revenue base and become more self-sufficient. One southern community commented, "We've been given ten new things to do with this program and one-half the money." El Paso commented that all social service programs would be cut by at least \$200,000. Another southwestern city stated that a further cut would mean that existing commitments from previous years would have to be broken, leaving some projects unfinished in target neighborhoods.

Another major thrust in city programming since 1974 has been economic development. The adoption in 1977 of the Urban Development Action Grant (UDAG) program spurred even greater attention to this vital area. Pro-

gram funding through the Economic Development Administration (EDA) also provided cities resources which they could use to leverage private sector investment to create jobs and reduce dependence on public assistance. The UDAG program was cut by 26 percent in FY82 from FY81 levels; EDA was proposed by the Administration for elimination. The UDAG program appears headed for an additional 12 percent cut in the second round of Congressional budget reductions.

Urban economic development (percent of respondents):

31 percent said the cutback in UDAG has had a substantial effect in their communities.

38 percent said reductions in EDA were having a substantial effect.

45 percent said further cuts in UDAG would have a disastrous or substantial effect locally.

51 percent said the elimination of EDA would have a disastrous or substantial negative effect on their communities.

The City of Knoxville summarized many comments by calling UDAG cuts "self-defeating." Thanks to the program, that city has "totally revitalized our downtown."

In Dayton, the EDA cutbacks will mean that a \$1 million revolving business loan fund to help businessmen in the city stay in business there, will not be funded completely. Ft. Wayne will be forced to cut staff in the city working on economic development projects because of the withdrawal of EDA support. Portland, Maine's effort to revitalize its waterfront for private investment and jobs may be lost entirely if EDA funding is cut off. Salt Lake City might have to abandon a downtown development project because of the EDA cuts. Youngstown, which has lost 10,000 jobs since 1977, needs loan guarantees from EDA to attract new industries and help those there now to expand.

ASSISTED HOUSING PROGRAMS

In the March revisions to the FY82 budget, housing assistance funds were proposed to be cut by nearly 30 percent. This reduction in funding affected cities' ability to use Section 8 subsidies in existing, rehabilitated, and newly constructed housing, and to develop publicly-owned and operated low-rent housing. Subsidies for the operation of low-rent public housing also were slated for cuts, and public housing authorities were notified to expect no more than 85 percent of the funds to which they were entitled by the Administration's own Performance Funding System. Cities across the country are feeling the impact of these cuts.

Assisted housing programs (percent of those responding):

57 percent characterized the cuts already enacted as having a disastrous or substantial effect in their communities.

70 percent said an additional 12 percent cut would cause a disastrous or substantial impact in their communities.

Particularly serious were the comments of many respondents—many of whom asked not to be identified by name—that further cuts in housing funds could easily lead to the bankruptcy of local public housing agencies. Many communities said that further cutbacks in public housing operating subsidies would lead to the closing of substantial numbers of public housing units. One southern jurisdiction pointed out that it has a waiting list of 27,000 people already for public housing, and its housing authority is close to bankruptcy. The City of St. Paul characterized a further cut in housing assistance as "devastating," pointing out that without additional federal assistance, the city's efforts to encourage the development of smaller, more energy-efficient homes will be hampered. This will mean further waste in energy and space in the city, while putting increasing pressure on the existing housing stock.

City after city noted that vacancy rates

are below 3 percent, in many cases hovering between 1 and 2 percent. Cities as diverse as Corpus Christi, San Jose, and Springfield, Missouri, all pointed to low vacancy rates as a major problem which cutbacks in federal housing assistance will exacerbate.

While cities share responsibility with states and counties for public assistance programs, a large number of cities surveyed expect to be negatively affected by cuts in federal income support programs.

More than 33 percent of the cities said they have a public assistance or general assistance program for the indigent, with the remaining cities reporting that counties, states or non-profit agencies are responsible for these programs.

Where cities provide assistance programs, the three most common are general assistance, emergency services, and medical assistance programs. Because one-fourth of the program's clients are on Medicaid and/or Medicare, reductions in federal support for these programs will cost the city revenue. For the past 25 years, one southwestern city has been giving assistance to those ineligible for state aid. Already feeling the pinch, the city says, "we have reduced our program by consolidating staff and making smaller amounts available for cash assistance. The future focus will probably be on home energy costs and homemaker services."

Some 58 cities stated that cutbacks in federal income support programs are resulting in calls from or on behalf of the poor. An increase in calls and inquiries from the poor was experienced by 40 cities surveyed. Another 18 said public assistance agencies were calling to ask the city for help or money for the poor. Thirty-nine cities felt calls were being placed to county officials responsible for administering public assistance programs.

"The impact is immediate," says Atlanta. "People are asking for help." And, in Knoxville, "people are contacting the city because they don't know where to go now." Calls are up 30 percent in one southwestern city and up 20 percent in Baltimore. New Bedford projects "calls will really hit the city if unemployment increases."

Almost all cities that fund local assistance programs expect federal cutbacks to result in increases in the city's public assistance budget. Cities that won't have increases say it is because there isn't any more local money available. Cities relying on states and counties to operate assistance programs foresee a ripple effect that will end up taking a bite out of the city budget.

In Madison, the city's public assistance budget is expected to jump 15 percent in fiscal year 1982. Providence has had a first quarter budget increase to \$2 million, up from \$1.5 million.

In Baltimore, the city projects changes in the food stamp income eligibility standard may mean \$1.1 million in lost income to some 20,000 of Baltimore's working poor and households with high expenses relative to income. For the city, there will be more stress placed on emergency services.

Cincinnati's health department is facing "a real crisis" with the loss of approximately \$3.5 million in federal grants. Hard hit will be programs directed to mothers and infants, immunizations and rat control.

Many cities anticipate a domino effect where, as the providers of last resort, they will be obligated to step in and aid the indigent. In Columbus, Ohio, the county funds the general assistance program for the poor, but federal cutbacks will place a greater burden on city social services. "If the county can't handle the needs, the city may have to develop new programs," predicts Corpus Christi. Buffalo reports the county operates public assistance programs, but reductions in federal funds may make the county increase taxes, "thereby creating an adverse impact on the city's ability to raise sufficient

revenue for city programs. There's already a gap between county expenditures for public assistance and county revenue to provide them." And, in Texas, the state has made heavy cuts in day care and nursing home services, forcing El Paso to compensate by increasing its budget for these.

Many cities also make contributions to private, nonprofit agencies. Of the 90 cities which make such contributions, donations total \$1 million annually. These city dollars support a wide range of activities which include social and health services, cultural, educational, and recreational programs, legal services, and economic development. Additionally, some cities contribute in-kind services to their private, non-profit agencies. A total of 11 cities indicated that their contributions will be reduced in FY82. Berkeley will have to cut their contributions by 60 percent and Denver by 50 percent. Fresno will have to take the extreme measure of eliminating the city's contribution to the private sector.

Combined cutbacks in availability of city general assistance funds and in contributions to private, non-profit agencies, when viewed in combination with cutbacks in federal and state programs that directly assist the poor and disadvantaged, paint a picture of great hardship and significantly decreasing assistance for the poor and the working poor.

EDUCATION

Education services are being reduced in most cities across the country. Layoffs are rampant. School lunches cost more. These are the impacts now—and the impacts in the coming months.

Reduced Services: The most dramatic impact of the federal cuts in education has been in the reduction of services, as indicated by three-fourths of the 62 responding cities. Even more significant are the areas cited as most frequently receiving the cuts—Title I programs for the disadvantaged, bilingual education, and programs for handicapped students.

And it does not appear that new local dollars will be available in many cities to make up this slack in reduced services. Forty percent of the cities responding said that school taxes would be increased to offset the federal cuts. State laws prohibit many other cities from even considering this option.

In view of the large numbers of disadvantaged and handicapped children presently served by special programs, as well as the increasing numbers of non-English speaking immigrant and refugee children, the federal cuts in special services could portend serious problems. For example, Dade County alone has an influx of 16,000 new students from Cuba and Haiti whose special needs cannot be met. The availability of special services has given school systems large clientele of special needs students who will have to be educated within the regular curriculum.

Since it is doubtful that the regular education programs of school systems can respond to all the needs of children served by special programs, city social service and health agencies will be called upon to assist. And, cities also may have to cope with more frustrated youths who become school dropouts as a result of the diminished capacity of public school systems.

Layoffs: Layoffs also were a frequently cited result of the federal cuts. Nearly two-thirds of the responding cities indicated that reduced federal funds had necessitated employee cuts across all categories of school personnel.

Other Effects: Other effects cited by 14 of the 40 responding cities were school closings, service fees for recreation, and fewer auxiliary staff members such as counselors, tutors, and aides. Los Angeles schools have suffered a severe setback in integration efforts be-

cause federal funds for this purpose have been cut from \$15 million to \$7 million.

Future Impact: In discussing the future impact of federal cuts, several cities indicated it was too early to predict effects. However, reduced services were again cited as the primary target area by 95 percent of the respondents. In the words of the Director of Finance for the East Baton Rouge Parish School Board, "Title I special programs will evaporate." More layoffs were predicted by 75 percent of the 33 respondents. School closings, increased taxes, and other stringent measures, were indicated by 65 percent of the responding cities. Atlanta summed up its situation by stating that "the effects will be traumatic."

School Lunch Program: The school lunch program will suffer in many cities with increased costs and prices resulting in decreased participation in several cities. For example, in Baltimore, 4,918 children have dropped out of the school lunch program. As a result, some schools may not be able to continue their programs. Of 54 cities providing information about the impact of the cuts on their school lunch program, almost a third said the effect was disastrous, another third said substantial, and the remainder indicated moderate effects.

INDUSTRIAL REVENUE BONDS

Tax-exempt Industrial Revenue Bonds (IRBs) have played an increasingly important role in city economic development efforts in recent years. Cities report that this tool has been particularly helpful in working with small businesses which need funds at reasonable interest rates to expand and increase employment. The Administration has proposed curtailing or even ending the tax-exempt status of these bonds for small issues. Cities surveyed said this would have a serious negative effect on their economic development efforts.

Industrial revenue bonds (percent of respondents):

64 percent of those surveyed said they used IRBs.

79 percent said that an elimination of IRBs would have a disastrous or substantially negative effect on their cities.

34 percent said requiring a 5 percent match for issuance of the bonds would make their use impossible.

Cedar Rapids reported that, "it would stop all expansion in the city" if IRBs were eliminated. "All the economic growth of the last two years (in Cedar Rapids) depended on IRBs. The effect would be dramatic." A southern city said that a job creation effort involving 11,500 jobs in depressed parts of the city would be halted if IRBs were terminated. Garland, Texas reported that "it would have a substantial effect. There have been about 8 projects here receiving IRB assistance, all small issues."

Requiring cities to match IRBs with local funds would virtually end the program in most areas, according to survey respondents. Berkeley said it would make it "impossible" for the city to participate in the program. Cedar Rapids said that state law would prohibit it from matching the funds at all. Duluth said that "budget constraints make any match impossible." Gulfport said "the city would stop issuing them" if a match were required. Indianapolis said such a requirement would have a "chilling effect."

TRANSPORTATION

The nation's cities are enduring difficulty across the board in meeting basic urban transportation needs including public transit, streets, roads, and bridges. And the situation is likely to get more difficult in the months ahead.

Public Transportation: Fare increases—both recent and projected—and the common thread running through most urban public transportation systems, combined with rider-

ship declines and reductions in service. The summary figures below graphically illustrate the dilemma.

Public transportation and cities (percent of respondents):

Sixty percent have had fare increases in the last six months.

Fifty-three percent expect another fare increase in less than a year.

City officials are concerned that additional cuts in federal operating assistance will result in cuts in service, decline in ridership, and increased fares. With further cuts in the capital program, the most likely impact would be deferred purchase of new equipment along with generally deferred maintenance.

Public transportation can be the victim of a vicious cycle. Budget cutbacks yield higher fares, which lead to declining ridership, which results in deferred maintenance and service cutbacks, further impairing services.

But more than an economic cycle, federal transit budget cuts mean real impacts in cities. Public transportation serves a largely dependent population—the poor and the elderly, in particular. Yet fares are approaching \$1.00—one way—in cities across the country.

Transit also serves an independent population—those who can afford to make the choice between transit and other modes. As fares rise and service shrinks or declines, this group might return to their automobiles—which means a far greater amount of street congestion, energy waste and dirty air in cities.

Cuts—particularly in operating assistance—mean that just as transit is poised to make major gains, cities will have neither the resources to expand nor to properly maintain their public transportation resources.

The U.S. Conference of Mayors has argued that in addition to the overall level of federal resources, it is critical to look at the uses of those dollars. The Administration's proposal to phase out operating assistance would make the federal transit program highly inflexible—available for capital only. The Conference has proposed an adequately funded flexible block grant approach so that local officials, within broad limits, could tailor federal resources to meet local needs.

Streets, Roads and Bridges: Transportation is a basic component of the urban infrastructure. Unless cities can reverse the decline in the infrastructure, any possible economic growth in the future will either fail to develop or surely bypass them.

By all accounts, the urban transportation infrastructure is in serious disrepair, as the figures below indicate.

Streets, roads and bridges (percent of respondents):

56 percent have decreased their budgets for streets, roads and bridges in this fiscal year.

65 percent indicated that the situation is deteriorating.

Local budgets for streets, roads, and bridges which are declining, will get worse should the Administration's proposal to eliminate the Federal Aid Urban System (FAUS) go forward. The FAUS program is the only federal effort specifically targeted to meet the surface transportation needs of local government.

It is important to note that city budgets in the infrastructure area are not decreasing because of federal largesse, either current or anticipated. Rather, decline in this budget account is the direct result of the need for Mayors to divert funds to the pressing day-to-day service needs of police, fire, and sanitation, to name a few. Added to this are the revenue and expenditure ceilings under which many cities must live.

Finally, the street, highway, and bridge budgets of cities are uniquely tied to the bond market. Conditions in these markets, sensitive to federal tax policy and interest

rates, are now making city participation in the bond market difficult.

Clearly, cities want to do the necessary job in the transportation infrastructure area, but are pressed for funds from all sides—federal, state and local. As noted, the ability to do much more at the state or local level to raise new revenues is limited. One possible answer is enhancement of an existing national user tax—the federal tax on gasoline. This source could be raised and sufficiently targeted to have an extremely positive impact on meeting street, highway, bridge and public transportation needs without further denting the federal budget.

WATER QUALITY

Progress in cleaning up urban water is headed for a halt in cities across the country unless the federal government soon resumes its funding of the Wastewater Treatment Construction Grants Program.

The construction grants program has paid for 75 percent of the costs for states and localities to meet federal clean water mandates. The Administration, with Congressional approval, has withheld funding pending revision in the basic clean water law. But, while Congress works toward a new law, cities are left with massive sewerage treatment plants uncompleted. City reaction is summarized below.

Wastewater treatment construction grants: The Effect of Zero Funds for FY82 (percent of respondents):

9 percent say it has had a disastrous effect.

23 percent say it has had substantial effect.

16 percent say it has had moderate effect.

Nationally, some 30 states across the country have either ceased, or will soon cease, program operations because federal funds have run out.

What cities currently face in the clean water field is a classic case of federal mandates but no federal resources. But, what makes this situation far more serious and severe is that many cities are under federal court order to meet the clean water mandates. The court orders, and Congressional action, make no allowances for the absence of planned-on resources.

Major cities have also suffered because the program is administered through the states and large-scale projects have often not received adequate attention on state priority lists.

Because these wastewater plants are essentially construction projects, they will also suffer by the increased costs brought about by inflation, if and when construction finally resumes.

Many cities report that because of the withdrawal of federal funds, urban residents will be forced to pick up the costs of completion through higher user fees. These costs have been inflated by mandated requirements and technologies.

Because sewerage capacity is such a basic element of the urban infrastructure, many cities fear that the program moratorium will also have a negative impact on their community and economic development plans—there is no growth and development without the proper sewer facilities.

Finally, to the extent that cities attempt to complete federally mandated projects with more local funds, it will require diversion from other important city projects.

The Wastewater Treatment Construction Grant program has historically been a roller coaster of both funding and regulations, and as such, has continuously presented a major challenge for cities to handle. This latest funding crisis, however, puts the cities as never before, on the receiving end of arbitrary federal decisions and places urban environmental programs in jeopardy.

URBAN PARKS AND RECREATION

Mayors are being forced to curtail local expenditures for these efforts by a wide mar-

gin. Cities understand the importance that parks and recreation access contributes to community and economic development and the quality of life in cities. But as funds grow increasingly scarce, cities are forced to both reduce all budgets across the board and divert funds to public safety functions such as police, fire and sanitation. Moreover, the public service employees who performed many critical tasks in the parks and recreation areas are now gone. The figures below illustrate the severity of the problem.

Urban parks and recreation (percent of respondents):

65 percent have made or plan to make reductions in the cities parks and recreation budget.

\$1.1 million is the average dollar reduction.

13 percent is the average percentage reduction.

The federal government has never played a large role in the financing of urban parks and recreation systems, although those cities, which have received small funding from the Urban Parks and Recreation Recovery Program (UPARR) or the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF), have found that it can play a crucial role in helping to turn a city around.

But when UPARR or LWCF are cut, or when other federal programs are cut, one way or another the city parks and recreation department will be among the first to bear the impact. And this is displayed in very human terms.

One major city will have to soon close 10 of 52 recreation centers—a twenty percent elimination of a system. Many programs in many cities designed to keep youth off the street have had to start late and prematurely end. One big city is literally closing its parks and recreation department for one-half of the year.

The bottom line for city park and recreation efforts is a lower level of services. Some cities report that they will attempt to go to the bond market or adjust local tax sources to compensate for lost park funds, but expect difficulty in doing so. The elimination of the federal Land and Water Conservation Fund and the reduction of the Urban Parks and Recreation Recovery Program increases the burden.

The dramatic and swift reduction and decline in the overall park and recreation effort of all levels of government will hit hardest at those with the least recreation choices—the poor and the elderly. Parks and recreation resources should also be considered part of the urban infrastructure—to the extent they continue to decline, the prospect for the city as the foundation of economic growth is also diminished.

Many cities are now working hard to support their park and recreation systems through a variety of means including contributions of dollars and human resources from the private sector and volunteers. The future of parks and recreation opportunities in cities will rest on a complex partnership between a variety of participants, anchored by city governments, but including the state and federal governments and the private sector.

APPENDIX I

List of all cities surveyed:

1. Akron, Ohio.
2. Allentown, Pennsylvania.
3. Anchorage, Alaska.
4. Ann Arbor, Michigan.
5. Atlanta, Georgia.
6. Austin, Texas.
7. Baltimore, Maryland.
8. Baton Rouge, Louisiana.
9. Berkeley, California.
10. Billings, Montana.
11. Birmingham, Alabama.
12. Boise, Idaho.
13. Boston, Massachusetts.
14. Buffalo, New York.

15. Burlington, Vermont.
16. Cedar Rapids, Iowa.
17. Charleston, South Carolina.
18. Charleston, West Virginia.
19. Cheyenne, Wyoming.
20. Chicago, Illinois.
21. Cincinnati, Ohio.
22. Clearwater, Florida.
23. Cleveland, Ohio.
24. Columbus, Ohio.
25. Corpus Christi, Texas.
26. Dade County, Florida.
27. Dallas, Texas.
28. Dayton, Ohio.
29. Denver, Colorado.
30. Des Moines, Iowa.
31. Detroit, Michigan.
32. Dubuque, Iowa.
33. Duluth, Minnesota.
34. Elizabeth, New Jersey.
35. El Paso, Texas.
36. Erie, Pennsylvania.
37. Fargo, North Dakota.
38. Flint, Michigan.
39. Fort Wayne, Indiana.
40. Fresno, California.
41. Garland, Texas.
42. Gulfport, Mississippi.
43. Hartford, Connecticut.
44. Indianapolis, Indiana.
45. Kansas City, Missouri.
46. Knoxville, Tennessee.
47. Las Vegas, Nevada.
48. Lincoln, Nebraska.
49. Little Rock, Arkansas.
50. Long Beach, California.
51. Los Angeles, California.
52. Louisville, Kentucky.
53. Madison, Wisconsin.
54. Manchester, New Hampshire.
55. Memphis, Tennessee.
56. Miami, Florida.
57. Minneapolis, Minnesota.
58. Nashville, Tennessee.
59. New Bedford, Massachusetts.
60. New Haven, Connecticut.
61. New Orleans, Louisiana.
62. New York, New York.
63. Norfolk, Virginia.
64. Oakland, California.
65. Omaha, Nebraska.
66. Pawtucket, Rhode Island.
67. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
68. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
69. Portland, Maine.
70. Portland, Oregon.
71. Providence, Rhode Island.
72. Richmond, Virginia.
73. Riverside, California.
74. Rochester, New York.
75. Rockford, Illinois.
76. Rockville, Maryland.
77. St. Louis, Missouri.
78. St. Paul, Minnesota.
79. Salt Lake City, Utah.
80. San Antonio, Texas.
81. San Diego, California.
82. San Francisco, California.
83. San Jose, California.
84. Santa Barbara, California.
85. Savannah, Georgia.
86. Seattle, Washington.
87. Springfield, Missouri.
88. Syracuse, New York.
89. Tacoma, Washington.
90. Tampa, Florida.
91. Toledo, Ohio.
92. Tucson, Arizona.
93. Warwick, Rhode Island.
94. Washington, D.C.
95. Waterbury, Connecticut.
96. Wilmington, Delaware.
97. Winston-Salem, North Carolina.
98. Yonkers, New York.
99. York, Pennsylvania.
100. Youngstown, Ohio.

APPENDIX II

100 City Survey, Follow-up, November 1981

City:
Contact:
Phone:

Questionnaire

The U.S. Conference of Mayors is conducting a survey of 100 cities which we intend to use in our lobbying efforts here in Washington, D.C. We intend to make public information you and other cities provide, so if there is any need for confidentiality at any point in the survey, please let me know.

I want to ask you several questions on the impact of the FY82 budget cuts on your city:

1. What budget adjustments has your city made in FY82 as a result of cuts in federal aid?

(a) Laid off workers? Percent of workforce? If so, how many?

(b) Increased taxes? If so, which taxes? Do you have a city income or sales tax? Does your state allow you to levy one?

(c) Cut services? If so, which?

(d) Deferred capital spending? If so, which projects in particular? Were any major urban infrastructure plans deferred?

2. If your general revenue sharing allocation is cut by 12 percent in FY82, what budget adjustments would your city have to make?

(a) Lay off workers? If so, how many? And what type?

(b) Increase taxes?

(c) Cut services? If so, which services?

3. When was your most recent transit fare increase?

Do you expect another fare increase before Oct. 1, 1982?

Has ridership declined as a result of your last fare increase?

Do you expect ridership to decline before Oct. 1, 1982?

What would be the likely effect on your transit system of an additional 12 percent cut in federal operating assistance for FY82?

(a) Increased fares?

(b) Cutbacks in services?

(c) Declining ridership?

(d) Other (explain)

What would be the likely effect on an additional 12 percent cut in federal capital assistance in FY82?

(a) Deferred maintenance?

(b) Deferred purchases of new equipment?

(c) Other (explain)

4. As you know, federal subsidized housing programs have been cut by nearly 50 percent in FY82. What effect has this had on your own local housing efforts?

(a) Substantial

(b) Some

(c) Little

(d) None

What types of programs?

What will be the result of an additional 12 percent cut in your housing allocation?

5. What has been the effect in your community of federal cutbacks in FY funding for Community Development Block Grants, UDAG and EDA?

What will be the effect if CDBG and UDAG are cut by another 12 percent and if EDA is eliminated?

6. Does your city use industrial revenue bonds? If so, what would be the impact on your local development efforts if small issue IRBs were eliminated by the Treasury Department?

If the city were required to put up 5 percent of its own funds to match the IRB?

7. Does your city have some sort of public assistance or general assistance program for the indigent? As a result of cutbacks in federal income support programs—food stamps, AFDC, unemployment compensation, Medicare, etc.—have you received more calls and inquiries from the poor?

Do you expect the city's public assistance budget to increase?

8. So far in FY82, no funds have been appropriated for the EPA wastewater treatment program. What has been the effect of this on your city's water and sewer programs?

Are you under court order to make improvements?

9. In implementing the new block grants, has your state consulted with your city and has your city been allowed to participate in the decision-making process? Explain:

Have you been able to get information from your state about the implementation of the block grants?

How have services in your community been affected by the block grants? What do you anticipate will happen?

(a) City will lose money?

(b) Funding about the same?

(c) City will gain funds?

Is your state administering the small cities portion of the Community Development Block Grant? What is your general impression of how well they are doing, whether or not you are a small city?

(a) Very well.

(b) Some complaints (explain).

(c) Poorly.

10. What impacts have the FY82 budget cuts in education already had on the school system in your city?

(a) Lay-offs

(b) Reduced services? Explain.

(c) Increases in school taxes?

(d) Other (e.g., school closings due to budget cuts)

What do you anticipate will be the future impact of the FY82 budget cuts on the school system in your city? (please respond in the same areas)

What has been the effect of FY82 budget cuts on your school lunch program?

11. How many CETA public service employees have been laid off since March, 1981? Which services provided by public service employees have been eliminated?

How many of those public service employees who were laid off have been hired by the city government? By other governments? By private industry?

What kinds of costs have the city had to incur by the removal of PSE workers from the city payroll (e.g., unemployment compensation, welfare, etc.?)

How much were they?

12. In FY82, have you made or do you plan to make, any reductions in your city's parks and recreation budget? By how much?

13. In FY82, what is happening to your local budget for streets, roads, and bridges?

14. Does your city make contributions to private, non-profit agencies? If so, how much?

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

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

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC-2277. A communication from the Architect of the Capitol transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on all expenditures from moneys

appropriated to him for the period April 1 through September 30, 1981; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-2278. A communication from the Clerk of the U.S. Court of Claims transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of the court's judgment order in *re The Pyramid Lake Tribe of the Pyramid Lake Reservation v. The United States*, No. 87-C; to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-2279. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) transmitting, pursuant to law, a secret listing of contract award dates for the period November 15, 1981 to February 15, 1982; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2280. A communication from the Director of the Defense Security Assistance Agency transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report on a proposed foreign military sale to Australia; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2281. A communication from the Director of the Defense Security Assistance Agency transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on a proposed foreign military sale to Saudi Arabia; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2282. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Facilities, Environment, and Economic Adjustment transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on nine construction projects to be undertaken by the Army Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2283. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Facilities, Environment, and Economic Adjustment transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on seven construction projects to be undertaken by the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2284. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "DOD Can Increase Revenues Through Better Use of Natural Resources It Holds in Trust"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC-2285. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to eliminate the requirement of review and approval of plans and location for bridges and causeways over certain navigable waters of the United States; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2286. A communication from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Territorial and International Affairs transmitting, pursuant to law, audit reports for Guam/TTPI/NMI and American Samoa; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2287. A communication from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled "Annual Report on Outer Continental Shelf Shut-In or Flaring Wells is no Longer Needed"; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2288. A communication from the Administrator of the Energy Information Administration transmitting, pursuant to law, reports on sales of refined petroleum products and sales of retail gasoline for August 1981; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC-2289. A communication from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations, Department of State, transmitting a Process-Verbal of Rectification of the text of the Convention on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources, 1980; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2290. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of State for Congressional Relations transmitting, pursuant to law, an agreement between the American Institute in

Taiwan and the Coordination Council for North American Affairs, relative to certain aeronautical equipment and services; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC-2291. A communication from the Secretary of the U.S. Postal Rate Commission transmitting, pursuant to law, notice of a hearing scheduled for December 10, 1981, at the Postal Rate Commission, Washington, D.C.; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2292. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an Act of the Council, D.C. Act 4-115; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2293. A communication from the Chairman of the Council of the District of Columbia transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of an Act of the Council, D.C. Act 4-114; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

EC-2294. A communication from the Associate Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service for Examinations transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on orders exercised under section 212(d)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act in 521 cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MOYNIHAN, from the Select Committee on Intelligence:

Special Report entitled "Report of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence on the Casey Inquiry" (Rept. No. 97-285).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of committee were submitted:

By Mr. THURMOND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Edward R. Becker, of Pennsylvania, to be U.S. Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit; Jackson R. Kiser, of Virginia, to be U.S. District Judge for the Western District of Virginia;

Robert G. Doumar, of Virginia, to be U.S. District Judge for the Eastern District of Virginia;

Brent D. Ward, of Utah, to be U.S. Attorney for the District of Utah for the term of 4 years;

Joseph P. Stadtmueller, of Wisconsin, to be U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of Wisconsin for the term of 4 years;

Donald B. Ayer, of California, to be U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of California for the term of 4 years;

Louis G. DeFalaise, of Kentucky, to be U.S. Attorney for the Eastern District of Kentucky for the term of 4 years;

William S. Vaughn, of Missouri, to be U.S. Marshal for the Eastern District of Missouri for the term of 4 years;

Howard V. Adair, of Alabama, to be U.S. Marshal for the Southern District of Alabama for the term of 4 years;

James L. Meyers, of Louisiana, to be U.S. Marshal for the Middle District of Louisiana for the term of 4 years;

Paul R. Nolan, of Washington, to be U.S. Marshal for the Eastern District of Washington for the term of 4 years; and

Harry Connolly, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. Marshal for the Northern District of Oklahoma for the term of 4 years.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and

second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. PELL (for himself and Mr. BUMPERS):

S. 1896. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the special leasing provisions enacted by the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DURENBERGER:

S. 1897. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional 8 years to amend governing instruments to meet the requirements for gifts of split interests to charity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BOREN:

S. 1898. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt certain vehicles, trailers, bodies, chassis, parts, and accessories used for farming purposes from the excise tax and from the highway use tax imposed on such property; to the Committee on Finance.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. PELL (for himself and Mr. BUMPERS):

S. 1896. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the special leasing provisions enacted by the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981; to the Committee on Finance.

REPEAL OF SPECIAL LEASING PROVISIONS

• Mr. PELL, Mr. President, I am today introducing legislation to repeal the so-called "leasing" provision of the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981.

This is the provision of the act that permits corporations to buy and sell Federal tax credits as though the credits were stocks, bonds or bushels of wheat.

This leasing provision has been in effect for little more than 3 months, but it is already apparent that it is an unjustified and outrageous raid on the U.S. Treasury and on the taxpayers of the Nation. Indeed, this "leasing" provision is really a "leeching" provision because it permits wealthy, profitable corporations to leech billions of dollars from the taxpayers.

The original estimate was that this provision would cost the Treasury \$27 billion in lost revenue during the next 5 years. It is now apparent that corporations are going to take far greater advantage of this bonanza than anticipated and the costs probably will be much higher.

This tax loss has a direct and heavy impact on the Federal budget. Unless this loophole is closed, every tax dollar lost through it must be made up either by further cuts in Government programs, by increasing taxes on others, or by adding to the Federal deficit.

To me the choice is clear. Vital Federal programs already have been severely cut, and the Federal deficit must be reduced, not increased, if we are to bring inflation under control and bring down interest rates. And it would be unthinkable to increase the taxes paid by the average American to pay for what has been aptly described as a food stamp program for wealthy corporations. There is only one reasonable course of action and that is to repeal the "leeching" provision.

Let me explain why this provision is wasteful and economically unjustified.

The provision permits a corporation which has little or no Federal tax bill to transfer excess investment tax credits or depreciation allowances to another corporation which can make better use of the tax credits. The transfer is made through complex transactions involving the sale and leasing of equipment. The transactions however are mere paper shuffling with no purpose other than to obtain hundreds of millions of dollars of extra tax reductions.

Typically, these transactions are between highly profitable companies that are looking for ways to cut their Federal taxes, and other corporations that have tax credits but have done so poorly in the competitive marketplace that they did not earn any profits and thus do not owe any taxes from which they can deduct the credits.

Typically, then the "leeching" provision helps two kinds of corporations: Wealthy firms that do not need any help, and inefficient, noncompetitive firms that do not deserve any help.

There may be fact be occasions when there is economic justification for aiding an industry or a firm that is having temporary economic difficulties. But there are far better, more efficient and direct ways to provide assistance. Under the leaching provision, the unprofitable company in a leasing transaction realizes about 20 percent or less of the value of the tax credits it sells. Eighty percent or more goes to benefit the wealthy firm that needs no additional tax breaks.

If we apply that ratio to the \$27 billion to be spent through this provision during the next few years, it means that \$21 billion will benefit profitable corporations and only \$6 billion will go to corporations facing financial difficulty. It is the equivalent of running a welfare program in which \$4 is paid to wealthy, nonneedy persons for every dollar paid to the truly needy. It is clearly unjustified.

There is one additional class of nonneedy persons who are profiting immensely from this "leeching" provision, and that is the corporate law firms that arrange these tax marriages between corporations. The typical fee for brokering one of these deals is one-quarter of 1 percent of the tax credits involved. At that rate corporate law firms will pick up about \$67 million in fees during the next 5 years. At a time when we are slashing legal aid for the poor, I wonder if we really want to subsidize corporate law firms.

We should consider also the basic question of whether it is good public policy to permit selling and trading of Federal tax credits. If it is good policy then the privilege should not be reserved to corporations, but extended to the average taxpayer.

After all, many individual Americans today have Federal tax deductions which they cannot fully use, or cannot use as well as others. For example, a taxpayer with a \$10,000 annual income may have during 1 year a serious illness involving \$15,000 in medical bills. Obvious-

ly he cannot deduct his full medical expenses from his income. Should we permit him to sell his excess medical deductions to the highest bidder? After all, the medical deductions would be worth \$7,500 to a wealthy, healthy taxpayer in a 50 percent tax bracket.

Or consider the \$1,000 personal exemption allowed each taxpayer. For a person in the 20 percent tax bracket, that exemption provides a tax reduction of \$200, but for a person in the 50 percent tax bracket the same exemption is worth \$500. Should we permit those in the lower income brackets to auction off their exemptions to higher income taxpayers? A wealthy taxpayer might pay, for example, \$350 for the exemption, providing an extra \$150 to the low-income person, and an extra \$150 tax break to the well-off taxpayer.

The fact is that we do not allow this kind of commercial trading of tax breaks among individuals and we should not permit it among corporations.

Finally, Mr. President, to underscore the size of this corporate tax loophole, let us consider what the Federal Government might do with that \$27 billion if we did not give it away to corporations.

That \$27 billion is more than double the projected deficit in the social security trust fund over the next 5 years. That \$27 billion would fully fund, for the next 10 years, the program of basic educational opportunity grants to needy college students at the current budget level.

The leasing provision of the 1981 Tax Act clearly was a mistake. It was adopted without hearings in either the House of Representatives or the Senate. It slipped through without a shred of debate on the floor of the House or the Senate.

David Stockman, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, commenting in his Atlantic magazine interviews on the tax bill said, "The hogs were really feeding. The greed level, the level of opportunism, just got out of control."

Mr. President, the hogs have fed off the taxpayers long enough through the leasing provision. It should be repealed promptly.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill repealing the lease provisions of the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981 be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1896

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. REPEAL OF SPECIAL LEASING RULES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Subsection (f) of section 168 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to accelerated cost recovery system) is amended by striking out paragraph (8) and redesignating paragraphs (9) through (11) as paragraphs (8) through (10), respectively.

(b) **CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**—

(1) Paragraph (5) of section 168(f) of such Code (relating to short taxable years) is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof.

(2) Subsection (a) of section 1245 of such Code (relating to gain from disposition of certain depreciable property) is amended by striking out paragraph (6).

SEC. 2. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this Act shall apply to agreements entered into after January 1, 1982.●

By Mr. DURENBERGER:

S. 1897. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide an additional 3 years to amend governing instruments to meet the requirements for gifts of split interests to charity, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

CHARITABLE REMAINDER TRUST BILL

● Mr. DURENBERGER. Mr. President, today I am introducing a bill to extend for 1 year expiring provisions permitting the reformation of charitable remainder trusts. The current tax laws governing deferred giving to charity are complex and have been strictly construed by the Treasury Department and the Internal Revenue Service in their regulations and rulings.

To alleviate the problems of unqualified, or nondeductible, gifts of partial interests, Congress in 1974 granted temporary relief permitting the reformation of such gifts so as to permit unqualified gifts to be revised and thereby become deductible. The relief was temporarily extended by Congress in 1976, 1978, and 1980. This fourth temporary extension will give charities, the Treasury, and the Congress time to work out a permanent solution that all parties now acknowledge is needed.

My distinguished colleague, BARBER CONABLE, is introducing similar legislation in the House of Representatives. I hope that both bodies will take action on this proposed legislation before existing law expires on December 31, 1981. The revenue loss is small and is really only the loss of tax windfalls—taxes the Treasury would not have received if the gift of the property had conformed to the existing, very technical, law.

Mr. President, as the Federal Government reduces its direct support for many activities in the social service, education, health, and other areas, we in Congress must do what we can to encourage alternative delivery systems such as charitable organizations. This bill is a small but important part of this effort to limit tax obstacles to increased individual support of charitable organizations.●

By Mr. BOREN:

S. 1898. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt certain vehicles, trailers, bodies, chassis, parts, and accessories used for farming purposes from the excise tax and from the highway use tax imposed on such property; to the Committee on Finance.

EXEMPTION OF CERTAIN FARMING EQUIPMENT FROM CERTAIN TAXES

● Mr. BOREN. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to exempt from excise taxes trailers designed to be used with light duty vehicles for farming purposes or for transporting horses or livestock.

Congress acted in 1971 to amend section 4061 of the Internal Revenue Code to exclude from the manufacturer's excise tax certain bodies and chassis of trucks, buses, truck trailers, and semitrailers.

Congress passed this legislation with the intent of exempting from the tax the majority of farm ranch trailers, including all but the three-axle trailers of the so-called gooseneck configuration.

The exclusion of these truck trailers and semitrailer chassis and bodies, applies if the chassis and bodies are suitable for use with a trailer or semitrailer having a gross vehicle weight of 10,000 pounds or less.

However, unrealistically low limits are imposed upon trailers intended to be used for farming or for horse or livestock transport purposes because of very technical regulations, rulings, and procedures which IRS has issued to administer this law. These restrictive administrative practices have severely limited the use of the exclusion in the case of these farm and ranch trailers.

Only a small number of producers—many of whom are currently involved in disputes with the IRS in some States—manufacture the trailer in question. Some 15,000 people are employed by this industry. Because of the small size of the industry and because the industry does not have precise engineering standards or specifications, it is almost impossible for the industry to respond to the strict limitations which IRS is seeking to impose.

A further hardship is imposed because the IRS lacks sufficient personnel to enforce payment of the tax by all producers. Therefore, IRS often fails to assess the tax on some marginal producers, primarily welding shops which may only build two or three trailers a year. This puts "legitimate" trailer producers at a competitive disadvantage.

Under Treasury regulations, the primary determinant of gross vehicle weight is the maximum load-carrying capability of the axles. Often producers of farming trailers used for transporting horses and livestock use the same axles that recreational vehicles and motor homes use because of the availability and reasonable cost of these axles. Due to the purpose for which these axles are designed, they are often rated at more than 10,000 pounds of gross vehicle weight.

Regardless of the use of "RV" axles for horse and livestock trailers, these trailers are truly used for farming purposes. As such, these trailers should be eligible for the light duty truck exemption.

My bill would change current practices to provide an exemption from the 10 percent manufacturers' excise tax in the case of sales of farming vehicles, chassis, trailers, bodies and equipment which are designed for use for farming purposes or transporting horses or livestock.

Enactment of this legislation will greatly benefit both agriculture and the trailer manufacturing industry. Because the tax is passed on to consumers, in the form of higher prices, its removal will be helpful to agriculture. It also resolves a tax inequity which these manufacturers have suffered under IRS interpretations of the law.

This legislation provides for a more equitable and sensible application of the manufacturers' excise tax. The House has previously passed similar legislation

on two different occasions, and I think it is time for the Senate to act on this measure.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 1898

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXCISE TAX EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN VEHICLES, TRAILERS, BODIES, PARTS AND ACCESSORIES USED FOR FARMING PURPOSES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Paragraph (2) of section 4063(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to the exemption from the manufacturer's excise tax for certain farming equipment) is amended to read as follows:

"(2) **FARMING EQUIPMENT.**—The tax imposed under section 4061 shall not apply in the case of any vehicle, trailer, semitrailer, body, chassis, part or accessory designed—

"(A) to process or prepare seed, feed, or fertilizer for use on farms;

"(B) to haul feed, seed, fertilizer, or harvested crops to, from, or on farms;

"(C) to spread feed, seed, or fertilizer on farms;

"(D) to load or unload feed, seed, fertilizer, harvested crops, or livestock on farms;

"(E) to transport livestock to, from, or on farms;

"(F) to feed livestock on farms; or

"(G) for any combination of the purposes described in subparagraphs (A) through (F). For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term 'farm' has the meaning given such term in section 6420(c)(2)."

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by this section shall apply with respect to articles sold after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2. HIGHWAY USE TAX EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN MOTOR VEHICLES, TRAILERS, AND SEMITRAILERS USED FOR FARMING PURPOSES.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 4483 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to exemptions from the highway use tax) is amended by adding the following new subsection (d):

"(d) **CERTAIN FARM VEHICLES.**—The tax imposed by section 4481 on the use of highway motor vehicles shall not apply to any motor vehicle, semitrailer, or trailer which—

"(1) is described in section 4063(a)(2), and

"(2) is to be used for a purpose described in section 4063(a)(2)."

(b) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—The amendment made by subsection (a) of this section shall be effective after the date of the enactment of this Act.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 473

At the request of Mr. DURENBERGER, the Senator from Arizona (Mr. DECONCINI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 473, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide that the amount of the charitable deduction allowable for expenses incurred in the operation of a motor vehicle will be determined in the same manner Government employees determine reimbursement for the use of their vehicles on Government business.

S. 881

At the request of Mr. DANFORTH, his name was withdrawn as a cosponsor of

S. 881, a bill to amend the Small Business Act to strengthen the role of the small, innovative firms in federally funded research and development, and to utilize Federal research and development as a base for technological innovation to meet agency needs and to contribute to the growth and strength of the Nation's economy.

S. 1131

At the request of Mr. DANFORTH, the Senator from Alabama (Mr. DENTON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1131, a bill to require the Federal Government to pay interest on overdue payments and to take early payment discounts only when payment is timely made, and for other purposes.

S. 1215

At the request of Mr. PROXMIRE, the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH) and the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. SCHMITT) were added as cosponsors of S. 1215, a bill to clarify the circumstances under which territorial provisions in licenses to distribute and sell trademarked malt beverage products are lawful under the antitrust laws.

S. 1272

At the request of Mr. CANNON, the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. DURENBERGER), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. HEINZ), the Senator from Montana (Mr. MELCHER), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) were added as cosponsors of S. 1272, a bill to modify certain airport and airway user taxes to provide appropriate funding for the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, and for other purposes.

S. 1450

At the request of Mr. CANNON, the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. WEICKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1450, a bill to provide for the continued deregulation of the Nation's airlines, and for other purposes.

S. 1610

At the request of Mr. DANFORTH, the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. HEINZ) were added as cosponsors of S. 1610, a bill to increase the excise tax on cigarettes and to transfer the revenues from such tax to the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund.

S. 1625

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) and the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1625, a bill to authorize the President of the United States to present on behalf of Congress a specially struck gold medal to the widow of Roy Wilkins.

S. 1651

At the request of Mr. BENTSEN, the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. NICKLES) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1651, a bill to combat international terrorism.

S. 1656

At the request of Mr. DURENBERGER, the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. HEFLIN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1656, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to clarify certain requirements

which apply to mortgage subsidy bonds, and for other purposes.

S. 1675

At the request of Mr. HATFIELD, the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1675, a bill to help eliminate world hunger and malnutrition and promote global security.

S. 1701

At the request of Mrs. HAWKINS, the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. FORD), and the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. HUDDLESTON) were added as cosponsors of S. 1701, a bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to authorize the Attorney General to acquire and exchange information to assist Federal, State, and local officials in the identification of certain deceased individuals and in the location of missing children and other specified individuals.

S. 1780

At the request of Mr. ROTH, the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BUMPERS) were added as cosponsors of S. 1780, a bill to provide civil penalties for false claims and statements made to the United States, to recipients of property, services, or money from the United States, or to parties to contracts with the United States, and for other purposes.

S. 1785

At the request of Mr. NUNN, the Senator from Virginia (Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.), and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EAST) were added as cosponsors of S. 1785, a bill to increase the penalties for violations of the Taft-Hartley Act, to prohibit persons, upon their convictions of certain crimes, from holding offices in or certain positions related to labor organizations and employee benefit plans, and to clarify certain responsibilities of the Department of Labor.

S. 1839

At the request of Mr. DURENBERGER, the Senator from Maine (Mr. COHEN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1839, a bill to amend the effective date provision of section 403(b)(3) of the Windfall Profit Tax Act of 1980 (Public Law 96-223) to further defer the effective date of certain provisions providing for the recognition as income of LIFO inventory amounts.

S. 1840

At the request of Mr. DURENBERGER, the Senator from Utah (Mr. GARN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1840, a bill to amend section 170 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the amounts that may be deducted for maintaining exchange students as members of the taxpayer's household.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 117

At the request of Mr. BOREN, the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. BOSCHWITZ), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON), the Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. EXON), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. FORD), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. HEFLIN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. HUDDLESTON), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE), the Senator

from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSTON), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) the Senator from Georgia (Mr. MATTINGLY), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. MATSUNAGA), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. PRESSLER), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. PRYOR), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. RANDOLPH), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. SCHMITT), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. ANDREWS) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 117, a joint resolution to authorize and request the President to designate the week of January 17, 1982, through January 23, 1982, as "National Jaycee Week."

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 121

At the request of Mr. MITCHELL, the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. GLENN), and the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) were added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 121, a joint resolution to provide for the designation of the year 1982 as the "Bicentennial Year of the American Bald Eagle" and the designation of June 20, 1982, as "National Bald Eagle Day."

SENATE RESOLUTION 238

At the request of Mr. BENTSEN, the Senator from Montana (Mr. MELCHER), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. ZORINSKY), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. MATTINGLY), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. RIEGLE), and the Senator from Nevada (Mr. CANNON) were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 238, a resolution to retain the deductability from personal taxes of interest paid on residential mortgages.

AMENDMENT NO. 638

At the request of Mr. DeCONCINI, his name was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 638 proposed to H.R. 4995, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED FOR PRINTING

NATIONAL DISABLED VETERANS WEEK

AMENDMENT NO. 641

(Ordered to be printed and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.)

MR. CRANSTON (for himself, Mr. RANDOLPH, Mr. MATSUNAGA, Mr. DeCONCINI, and Mr. MITCHELL) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the joint resolution (S.J. Res. 123) authorizing and requesting the President to proclaim "National Disabled Veterans Week."

AMENDMENT NO. 641 TO SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 123: PROPOSED NATIONAL DISABLED VETERANS WEEK

MR. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I am today submitting, on behalf of myself and Senators RANDOLPH, MATSUNAGA, DeCONCINI, and MITCHELL, an amendment to Senate Joint Resolution 123, which was introduced on Tuesday, November

10, by Senator HAYAKAWA to authorize and request the President to proclaim the week of November 7, 1982, as National Disabled Veterans Week.

Mr. President, as ranking minority member of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I strongly support the basic concept, embodied in Senate Joint Resolution 123, of setting aside a week to honor those veterans who incurred disabilities in their service to our Nation as members of the U.S. Armed Forces. The needs of this group of veterans, together with the survivors of those who have died from service-connected causes, are the top-priority concern in my work on the Veterans' Affairs Committee. I believe that it is most appropriate—as we continue our efforts to insure that the programs that the Congress has established to provide these veterans with the compensation, readjustment, health-care, and other benefits that they need and deserve are as effective and efficient as possible—that a week be specially designated to honor these veterans and recognize the invaluable contributions that they have made to our national security and welfare. The proclamation of a special week in their honor would also serve to remind all our citizens of the great debt that we owe this special group of veterans as a result of the service they performed and the sacrifices they made on behalf of all of us.

Therefore, I congratulate Senator HAYAKAWA for having introduced this resolution.

Indeed, I would support the establishment of a permanent week, not just one in 1982, for this purpose.

However, Mr. President, there are a number of changes that I believe should be made in the resolution in order for it to express more appropriately its basic concept. These changes, which are incorporated in our amendment, although suggested, unfortunately could not be made before the resolution was introduced.

Mr. President, I urge that the Judiciary Committee give our amendment its most serious consideration in its deliberations on the resolution and that that committee and the Senate give the resolution, with appropriate amendments, prompt consideration so that adequate time would be available following its enactment for preparations to make National Disabled Veterans Week the well-planned, widely observed occasion that it should be.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a document describing and showing the changes that our amendment would make in the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

SUMMARY AND CORDON RULE OF CHANGES PROPOSED TO BE MADE IN THE PREAMBLE AND BODY OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 123 BY AMENDMENT NO. 641

A. SUMMARY OF AMENDMENTS TO SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 123

The changes that our amendment would make can be summarized as follows:

1. The first clause of the preamble makes reference to "2,500,000 disabled veterans in

the United States"; the amendment reads "[2,300,000 veterans with disabilities resulting from their service in the United States Armed Forces]. This change is proposed because of the importance that the very first part of the resolution make clear that the veterans to be honored are those who suffer from service-connected disabilities and because, according to best information available to the Veterans' Affairs Committee, the correct number, rounded to the nearest one hundred thousand, is 2,300,000. The VA's budget documents for fiscal year 1982 include data showing that there were 2,268,219 recipients of VA service-connected disability compensation in fiscal year 1980 and projections that there were 2,275,707 recipients in FY 1981 and will be 2,281,007 in FY 1982. In addition, there are an unknown number of veterans who have disabilities that they incurred as a result of active-duty service but for which they are not receiving VA compensation. However, there are no reliable estimates that would warrant the use of a number larger than 2.3 million for this purpose.

2. The third clause of the preamble gives certain examples of the types of severe disabilities that these veterans endure and includes only one category of mental disabilities—"delayed-stress syndrome"; the amendment adds a reference to "other mental disorders". In providing examples of the severe disabilities from which some veterans suffer, it seems preferable to cite a broad category that includes the most incapacitating disabilities, psychoses in this case, rather than to name just one specific type of disability that—although it can be very serious and is a tragic consequence of combat experiences for many—is not as debilitating as some other mental conditions.

3. The fourth clause of the preamble declares that "16 to 35 percent of all disabled veterans are jobless as a result of their disabilities"; the amendment states instead that service-connected disabled veterans "consistently experience inordinately high rates of joblessness." Unfortunately, due to the manner in which employment data are collected and analyzed, there are no reliable data to support the use of any specific percentages of joblessness among service-connected disabled veterans. Although it is generally agreed that disabled persons are significantly more likely to be jobless than non-disabled individuals, the Department of Labor's Bureau of Labor Statistics does not compile unemployment statistics on handicapped individuals generally or on disabled veterans specifically. As numerous hearings on the employment of veterans, including service-connected disabled veterans before the Veterans' Affairs Committee and the Labor and Human Resources Committee have demonstrated, it is most appropriate to include a reference to joblessness as a special, very significant problem that many service-connected disabled veterans face. However, in light of the unavailability of reliable data, the more general reference to the extent of this problem is called for.

4. In the fifth clause of the preamble and in the text where references are made to disabled veterans' contributions to "the welfare" of our country, the amendment expands that characterization to include references to their contributions to the "national security," which was the primary objective of these veterans' service. In addition, in the fifth clause of the preamble, the amendment would include mention of the fact that these veterans' contributions helped "our Nation preserve its freedom, strength, and prosperity."

5. The amendment makes certain clarifying changes in the resolution.

E. CORDON RULE

Changes in the preamble and body of the resolution that would be made by the amendment are shown as follows (matter

proposed to be omitted is shown in brackets, new matter (and the "resolved clause", which is not changed) is printed in italic, and other matter in which no change is proposed is printed in roman without brackets):

S.J. RES. 123 AS AMENDED

Whereas there are [2,500,000 disabled veterans in the United States] 2,300,000 veterans with disabilities resulting from their service in the United States Armed Forces;

Whereas these disabled veterans have sacrificed their well-being in the service of their country;

Whereas many of these disabled veterans endure severe disabilities, such as loss of limb, paralysis, blindness, deafness, and delayed-stress syndrome and other mental disorders;

Whereas [16 to 35 percent of all disabled veterans are jobless as a result of their disabilities] these disabled veterans consistently experience inordinately high rates of joblessness; and

Whereas disabled veterans have made [important] vital contributions to the national security and welfare by helping our Nation preserve its freedom, strength, and prosperity:

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation designating the week of November 7, 1982, as "National Disabled Veterans Week", in recognition of the contributions [that disabled veterans have made to the welfare of the United States, and calling upon all Government agencies and the] that veterans with service-connected disabilities have made to the national security and welfare of the United States and calling upon Government agencies at the Federal, State, and local levels and the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION ACT, 1982

AMENDMENT NO. 642

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

Mrs. HAWKINS (for herself, Mr. WILLIAMS, and Mr. CRANSTON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the bill (H.R. 4560) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, and for other purposes.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1982

AMENDMENT NO. 643

(Ordered to be printed.)

Mr. HOLLINGS proposed an amendment to the bill (H.R. 4995) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1982, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENT NO. 644

(Ordered to be printed.)

Mr. HOLLINGS proposed an amendment to the bill, H.R. 4995, supra.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. BAKER. Mr. President, on behalf of Mr. MATHIAS I wish to announce that

the Committee on Rules and Administration will hold a meeting on Tuesday, December 8, 1981, at 10 a.m., in room 301, Russell Senate Office Building. The purpose of the meeting is to receive testimony on two proposals that would authorize construction of a memorial to Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

Senate Joint Resolution 95, introduced by Senator HATFIELD, authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Interior, subject to the supervision and approval of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission, to proceed with the construction of the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial in the District of Columbia. S. 1638, introduced by Senator MOYNIHAN, provides for the establishment of a national memorial to FDR in New York.

Those interested in testifying or submitting a statement for the record should contact the Committee on Rules and Administration, 305 Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510, telephone—224-6352.

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

Mr. ROTH. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that the Committee on Governmental Affairs will hold a hearing on Tuesday, December 8, 1981, at 10 a.m. in room 3302 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building to discuss the nomination of Mr. Frederic V. Malek of Virginia to be a Governor of the U.S. Postal Service for the term expiring December 8, 1989. For further information, please contact Margaret Hecht at 224-4751.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FEDERAL EXPENDITURES, RESEARCH, AND RULES

Mr. DANFORTH. Mr. President, the hearing scheduled for December 3, 1981, by the Subcommittee on Federal Expenditures, Research, and Rules, Committee on Governmental Affairs, to consider the uniform procurement system draft proposal submitted to the Congress by the Office of Federal Procurement Policy, has been postponed at the request of the Department of Defense. It is the intent of the subcommittee to reschedule the hearing in the near future.

AUTHORITY FOR A COMMITTEE TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, December 2, at 1:30 p.m., to hold a confirmation hearing on the nominations of Kenneth Brown to be Ambassador to the Congo and Francis McNamara to be Ambassador to the Gabonese Republic.

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

FNMA CARRYBACK/CARRY-FORWARD AMENDMENT

• Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I am pleased to express my support for S. 1883, introduced by Senator PACKWOOD. As a

cosponsor of this bill, I feel its passage is necessary for a variety of reasons, the most important of which is that hopefully it will help bring a little money to the housing market. This amendment would extend the Federal National Mortgage Association's net operating loss carryback to 10 years and carryforward to 5 years, thus conforming the tax treatment of FNMA to other financial institutions. At present, FNMA, like most businesses, can carry back 3 years and carry forward 15.

FNMA, a corporation chartered by Congress, provides assistance and stability to the home mortgage market. Today FNMA holds \$59 billion in home mortgages—1 out of every 20 in America.

In 1969, Congress created a longer carryback provision for financial institutions which invest heavily in real estate, out of concern for the impact of market swings. FNMA was simply overlooked in 1969 because the law establishing FNMA's present charter was enacted in 1968, and FNMA's transition to private status was not completed until 1970.

S. 1883 simply corrects this anomaly by providing FNMA with the same carryback/carryforward treatment as other financial institutions. This is entirely appropriate in terms of tax equity or parity, since FNMA's business and financial cycles are closely linked to those of the thrifts and other financial institutions.

This amendment will provide FNMA with a needed planning and management tool in 1982, although it will have no budgetary impact until fiscal 1983. In future years, its budgetary impact will be determined by interest rate conditions.

In sum, this amendment's long-range impact is primarily to shift the revenue loss for the Nation's housing and lending institutions to a more propitious time. That should help in these troubled times.●

DISAPPEARANCE OF SISTERS JEAN REIMER AND HELEN LAVALLEY IN GUATEMALA

● Mrs. HAWKINS. Mr. President, I believe that all Americans are affected by the tragic loss of life that casts a dark shadow over the future of Central America. Daily our newspapers are filled with pictures and stories of diplomats, businessmen, and peasants being swiftly and brutally murdered in the revolutionary atmosphere engulfing the region. The strife that is rending Central American society is provoking extreme responses from all sides. When this strife swallows up innocent victims our sadness is especially deep. This seemed to be the case early last week when two Dominican nuns who have been doing missionary work in Guatemala were reported missing. Shortly after their disappearance, I expressed my concern for the safety of Sisters Jean Reimer and Helen Lavalley to Gen. Romeo Lucas, President of Guatemala. In response, I received a letter from Mr. Carlos Toledo Vielmann, the Public Relations Secretary to President Lucas indicating that as soon as the Government learned that the two nuns were missing they "immediately issued orders

for the search, location, and rescue of the missing ones."

Concern for the safety of Sisters Reimer and Lavalley was commendable and fully warranted. Both of the sisters are American citizens, and it is the duty of the U.S. Government to protect its nationals living abroad. However, Mr. President, it was entirely unwarranted to use the concern for the well-being of the two missionaries as a pretext for thinly veiled accusations against the Government of Guatemala.

I have thought that our country prided itself on the tradition of innocent until proven guilty. However, Americans who implied that the Guatemalan Government was responsible for the disappearance of the two Dominican nuns turned American tradition on its ear. They imputed guilt where later events proved no crime was committed. Last week the two missing nuns were located safe and sound, and allegations that they were abducted or murdered were proven false.

Mr. President, it concerns me that prominent Americans would use this sort of an occasion to launch an attack on the Government of Guatemala. I do not condone the human rights violations that have occurred in Guatemala or other countries of the region. However, we must bear in mind that abuses in these countries are due principally to the military involvement of Cuba and the Soviet Union in the affairs of the region. The intervention of Cuba and the Soviet Union have exacerbated the problems in the region, and the constant stream of Soviet and Cuban arms, supplies, and trained personnel into Guatemala, and other Central American countries have increased the level of combat.

We cannot afford to be naive in these matters. War does not conform to neat rules. Innocent victims are sometimes and unfortunately trapped between the combatants. And in the type of terrorist warfare promoted by the Cubans, innocent victims are frequently the targets of the combat. Even in our own Civil War, civilian casualties were high.

These cruel facts should encourage us to redouble our efforts to insure peace throughout the world. But peace cannot be bought at any price, and we must remember that the overthrow of a government does not guarantee that a better government will take its place. Iran, Nicaragua, South Yemen, Ethiopia, the Soviet Union, and Cuba are only a few illustrations of this fact. I believe that we should take these historical lessons to heart and recognize that we can damage our own national interests and the interests of improved human rights throughout the world if we insist on treating human rights of countries at war as our paramount concern.

Mr. President, I am very happy that Sisters Reimer and Lavalley were located safe and sound, and I hope that this happy ending will remind us all not to leap again to conclusions until all the facts are in.

Mr. President, I ask that the letter from Mr. Vielmann mentioned earlier be printed in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

[Translation]

GUATEMALA,
November 27, 1981.

Senator PAULA HAWKINS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HAWKINS: In reply to your kind inquiry addressed to the President of the Republic, General Romeo Lucas, regarding the fate of two Dominican nuns, one priest and one young seminarian, whose disappearance in Guatemala was reported five days ago. I am pleased to advise you that this group of religious people was located safe and sound. I would like to inform you that upon learning of their disappearance through the U.S. Embassy, we immediately issued orders for the search, location and rescue of the missing ones.

I would like to take this opportunity to make Your Honor aware of the fact that the initial news concerning this case, as well as the latest that has been published by the press in that country, project the feeling that these clergy people were kidnapped by security agents from my government. This is not the first time that this happens, since there seems to be certain media in your country which bears a marked intention to present my government as a ferocious dictatorship, capable of executing the most horrendous crimes.

The blame for that adverse and unjust propaganda, fostered and financed by the Soviet Union, lies precisely on the hostile critique which is promoted in your country against the Guatemalan authorities, who are engaged in a bloody fight against the criminal elements that are attempting to destabilize our nation. These groups, armed and trained outside Guatemala, are committed only to the sinister plans of international communism, whose objective is to sink Guatemala in a political and economic chaos, as tactics serving the strategy of hegemonic control in our continent.

It is indeed regrettable that powerful individuals in the United States, completely unaware of what is really happening in Guatemala, are willing to become echo boxes of an evil propaganda against my government. That, in spite of the existing friendship between our countries, we are treated like enemies. And that, while the Soviet Union is supplying the terrorists through Cuba with all the warfare armaments that they request, we are denied the right to purchase the equipment we require to repel their offensive.

My government respects and practices the democratic values which are deeply treasured in your country. General elections for the free choice of a new Guatemalan government are scheduled for March of the coming year. But these pacific, orderly and legal options are rejected by the guerrillas, whose raids, kidnappings and bombings, as well as other terroristic tactics, are a direct attack against the Guatemalan freedoms. It is deplorable that some of your prominent people have joined the agents of international communism in their endeavor to eradicate from our hemisphere all vestiges of peace, order and justice.

I hope that authorized voices, like your own, speak up to straighten matters into their proper place.

Respectfully yours,
CARLOS TOLEDO VIELMANN,
Public Relations Secretary
of the Presidency.●

BICENTENNIAL YEAR OF THE AMERICAN BALD EAGLE

● Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I am pleased to join in sponsoring Senate

Joint Resolution 121, to provide for the designation of the year 1982 as the "Bicentennial Year of the American Bald Eagle" and the designation of June 20, 1982, as "National Bald Eagle Day."

In the 200 years since its designation as our national symbol, the American bald eagle has been sadly reduced in numbers. Destruction of its natural habitat by expanding development and environmental pollution is largely responsible for the decline of this majestic bird.

Recent studies, however, indicate that the bald eagle population has begun to recover. This comeback is attributable to the substantial efforts of various governmental agencies, private groups, corporations, and individuals. The success of their efforts with the American bald eagle should inspire us to conserve all of our precious national wildlife resources and the habitat which is essential to them.●

S. 1692: THE NEED FOR EXPEDITED PORT DEVELOPMENT

• Mr. ABDNOR. Mr. President, David A. Howard, publisher of American Shipper magazine, earlier this year wrote a most interesting article that has only come to my attention since our Subcommittee on Water Resources reported S. 1692. Mr. Howard argues that the shipping industry is best served if the industry is willing to pay the cost of new port development, in return for expedited permitting and development. I believe that this is a sound position, and I believe it is one that my colleagues should examine with care.

I ask that the article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

HOW TO GET A 55-Ft. COAL PORT GOING IN A HURRY

(By David A. Howard)

An article commencing on page 32 of this issue reports on the bill introduced by Senators Warner and Johnston to provide Federal financing and a fast-track approach to dredging three American harbors to depths of 55 feet to meet the needs of the export coal trade. Associate Editor Larry Dennis handled the story—including the thorny problem of reaction from areas which may be denied 55-foot harbor depths at Federal expense. While there is little question about the need for 55-foot projects, the extra depth will be beneficial to other types of trade—oil, petrochemicals, heavy industry—giving the chosen ports advantages far beyond the coal trade alone. Politics will come into play. Larry's article is straight-forward, objective reporting.

I addressed the same topic at a meeting of the North Atlantic Ports Association in Washington December 4. Washington Editor Tony Beargie covered the NAPA meeting (January American Shipper page 30) and specifically instructed him to skip over what I said. I am sure he did as he should appear here—not up front.

Here is the gist of what I said:

I recommended that any port seeking a 55-foot channel depth for coal ships should finance the project itself and levy tolls against deep-draft vessels to pay for the project. I acknowledged that the word "toll" is a dirty thought in the maritime industry, but led my audience through a simple exercise in mathematics to prove (I hope) my point.

I asked each member of the audience to take out a pencil, the back side of an envelope or some other piece of paper, and jot down certain figures.

(1) "In the upper right hand corner, jot down the number of years it required to complete your latest harbor deepening project, from the time it was agreed the extra depth was needed until the project was completed and ready for use." (I imagine most everyone wrote a number between 15 and 20 years.)

(2) "Next, jot down your rough estimate—I'm sure you have one—of what it would cost to deepen your harbor from its present depth to 55 feet to handle the coal business."

(3) "Divide that number by 10. It will give you the approximate annual cost of paying off the revenue or general obligation bonds you must issue to finance the 55-foot project." (Actually, it is a high side figure. But never mind. I didn't want anyone accusing me of being low.)

(4) "For your next figure, write down the approximate number of tankers and bulkers which entered your port last year. Don't worry about the size; some will be large; some will be small."

(5) "Now, divide that number in half. I'm assuming here that if you have 55 feet of water and attract larger ships, the actual number of vessels will be smaller."

(6) "Take the number of ships you just wrote down and divide it into the annual cost of paying off those bonds."

"That, good friends, is the average toll which will have to be assessed against each deep draft ship taking advantage of the extra depth you provide in going from your present depth of channel to 55 feet."

"It's a rather frightening figure, I'm sure.

(7) "For your final figure, write down the extra revenue a vessel owner will earn on each voyage by being able to load to 55 feet instead of 42 feet or 38 feet, depending upon the depth of your present channel."

"This last figure will give you some idea of the toll which any bulk ship owner would be very happy to pay—if you only gave him the chance."

(A toll of about \$1,000 per inch of draft over 40 feet is a likely toll figure according to my own calculations, but I forgot to cover this point in my talk at Washington.)

Admittedly, the figures will not add up for some ports. "If your harbor has a granite base at 40 feet, maybe God never intended for you to be a coal shipping port."

I pointed out that rail distance from coal mines should have little to do with a port's decision on whether to go after the coal business. An extra hundred miles of rail is next to nothing compared to the advantage in ocean freights obtained with a vessel loaded to 55 feet.

Lastly, I made a suggestion about what could be the most logical point in the eastern United States to develop a deep draft harbor especially for the coal trade. It's Panama City, Florida, where the Gulf of Mexico runs 100 feet to within a few hundred yards of the Florida shoreline. A few miles to the east, at Port St. Joe, the Gulf shallows up again. To the west, at Pensacola, it shallows up also. The ideal natural phenomenon occurs in the East only at Panama City (unless you consider the South Florida ports of Miami, Port Everglades, and West Palm Beach).●

MIAMI CONFERENCE ON THE CARIBBEAN

• Mrs. HAWKINS. Mr. President, Sunday evening I was privileged to introduce Special Trade Representative William Brock as the main speaker at the session of the Fifth Annual Miami Conference on the Caribbean. The purpose of this and the preceding conferences was to open dialog on economic development of the Caribbean basin nations. Seven heads of State from Caribbean

basin nations were in attendance as well as scores of businessmen and government officials from all over the region.

I have had a long-standing interest in the affairs of the Caribbean basin because my home State of Florida is a Caribbean State. Florida not only engages in extensive trade with the Caribbean basin nations, but shares with the region a common history, linguistic and cultural ties. Though not commonly thought of as such, because of Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana, and Texas, the United States is a Caribbean nation as well, and we share with other Caribbean nations a stake in the future of the region. Conferences such as this that help harness the talents, resources, and good will of private business for the region's economic development hold out bright prospects for the future.

Mr. President, I ask that the statements given by Dr. Robert V. West, Jr., president of the Caribbean/Central American Action which sponsored the conference, and Special Trade Representative William Brock who was the main speaker at the opening session be printed in the RECORD following my remarks. I hope that my colleagues will read these statements and learn further about the administration's ideas on the Caribbean and the role that private enterprise will play in bringing to this important region long-term stability and prosperity.

The statements follow:

REMARKS OF DR. ROBERT V. WEST, JR.

Distinguished Members of the Head Table, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I appreciate this opportunity on behalf of Caribbean/Central American Action to add some brief remarks to those of Governor Graham on the occasion of the opening of this conference. Witnessing what appears from this auspicious beginning to be the most successful and significant to date in this series of Miami Conferences on the Caribbean, cannot help but be struck by the extent to which the concept of this conference and the number and prominence of its participants have grown in these few short years.

Caribbean/Central American Action has followed a parallel course during the same period of time in its early development and in its steadily growing reputation, corporate support and range of activities.

I like to believe that both of these developments—the blossoming of the Miami Conference and of C/CAA—reflect the fact that an idea many of us have had for a long time is now an idea whose time has come.

In the context of U.S. policy, for those of us in this country, the crux of the idea is recognizing that both the U.S. private sector and the United States as a nation have a major stake in the healthy future of Caribbean countries, and both our business community and our government need to intensify their efforts to deal with the problems threatening that future.

In a broader context transcending our respective national concerns, the idea is a conviction that private-sector oriented development approach in the final analysis has the most to offer the developing world, and that the Caribbean is a singularly appropriate region in which to demonstrate that fact to skeptics in our midst and around the globe.

Tonight we have an opportunity to hear a representative of President Reagan's Administration set forth the U.S. Government's

concept and approach at the highest policy level to the challenges it perceives in the region. Ambassador Brock is a particularly appropriate individual to deliver this message since as U.S. Trade Representative he has been designated as inter-agency coordinator of the Administration's Caribbean Basin Initiative. Tomorrow morning and at the subsequent luncheons and dinners on the program, leaders of Caribbean and Central American nations will present a similarly high-level policy overview of their perceptions and approaches to the challenges facing the region.

I would be very surprised if any of these public-sector presentations fail to touch in some way upon the question of the role of the private sector in development—the extent to which such a role of reliance upon it is useful, adequate, appropriate, feasible and/or important.

Complementing this governmental policy perspective, the intensive working sessions of the conference focus on factors that make a private-sector development strategy feasible from the point of view of the private sector itself.

President Reagan at Cancun and elsewhere has announced that U.S. development policy will emphasize trade and investment and those aid programs that support them.

Numerous governments across the Caribbean have come to power in the last two years on a platform emphasizing development, through enterprise as well as better relations with the United States.

The fact that many of those governments, and others throughout the region, are represented at this conference by their chief executive or high-level cabinet members itself, indicates the importance they place on the issues and the implementation of private-sector based development strategies.

All this not only means we can act now as we never have before, but that we must act now or run the risk of forfeiting the opportunity for the indefinite future. The same optimism that has accompanied the resurgence of private-sector organizations, and the return to political leadership of governments eager to stimulate appropriate enterprise, will turn quickly to greater cynicism and hostility than in the past if the promises don't materialize. We're looking at a short window in time, probably no longer than the terms of office of the governments elected on the enterprise platform. Until our own talk of private enterprise starts translating into actual jobs, actual export markets, actual joint ventures, it is just a theory to its Caribbean audience, and its popularity will vanish if we can't make it work.

All eyes are on the U.S. Government right now to see if we are going to make it through that brief opening of opportunity or not. The announcement of the Caribbean Basin Initiative, the appointment of the Rockefeller Committee on Jamaica, the visits and consultations by U.S. officials with public and private sector leaders in the region to develop ideas for the Initiative—all these are signs that have created a tremendous amount of hope and expectation in the region, laced with a degree of skepticism in some quarters as a result of past disappointments. I believe that the Administration's participation in this conference itself gives substantial cause for renewed optimism. The telephone words of greeting from the President, the presence here of Ambassador Brock, and the participation of numerous other U.S. Government officials both as panel speakers and as conference registrants, indicate a true desire not just to deliver a message, but to listen and learn, and to build more insights into policies now under development.

In this context, I think it is appropriate to point out that there are three separate messages which the Caribbean and the U.S. business communities are waiting to hear from the Reagan Administration. The details of

the policy package—new trade or investment incentives or the like—are only the first. There is also a desire for a basic sense that the U.S. Government truly understands that economic needs are at the heart of the political challenges in the region. And there is a need for reassurance that when the Government says private sector activity will play the lead role, it means to go out and mobilize it—not that it believes the whole scenario will just happen automatically.

Trusting that we will have a better grasp of all these matters after this evening's presentation, I will proceed to a final point. And that is that if the U.S. Government and the governments in the region are feeling the pressure to perform, the U.S. business community should be feeling it even more. For the ball is truly in our court now.

We are the ones who for years have said that developing countries have relied too much on governmental action instead of private enterprise.

We are the ones who have criticized traditional U.S. development aid programs and urged greater involvement for business.

We are the ones who have complained that the United States Government hasn't done enough to show support for foreign governments friendly to private enterprise.

Now is our chance to perform or forever hold our peace. I am optimistic. The people in this room tonight have come here with high hopes. A conference like this should produce some actual results.

I believe we will have failed if the participants here from governments in the region leave without a stronger sense that the U.S. private sector is able and willing to address their needs.

I believe we will have failed if the representatives of U.S. corporations in this gathering leave without a new commitment to actively seek opportunities in the Caribbean.

We do not intend to fail.

We intend to demonstrate that a private-sector based development strategy will work in the Caribbean because we know it can, we know it must, and we intend to see that it does.

ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR WILLIAM E. BROCK

I don't have to tell you that this Conference finds our nations standing at a crossroads. I don't have to tell you that for too many years we have struggled, albeit with good intentions, but as yet unsuccessfully with a recurring economic malaise in the Caribbean Basin.

There is no easy solution, and it's about time that we all realized that.

At the recent summit in Cancun, President Reagan addressed the real issues of development and urged that overly ambitious and unrealistic solutions not be allowed to continue to divert us from the practical steps that can be taken now to promote progress, particularly at the bilateral and regional level. The true benefits of development are to be found in concrete and often complicated activities, not in abstract formulas or grand designs.

The problems of the Caribbean are serious, and are having a spillover effect outside the Basin. President Reagan has been clear that he places a high priority on helping to solve those problems. The kind of approach he wants to take, and that I believe we all want, is one which will focus on the long-term economic well-being of the nations of the Caribbean: Approaches which aren't dependent solely or largely on government assistance or which raise expectations that can't be realized.

We have been the subject of some criticism from those who ask: "Why is this Caribbean Basin Initiative taking so long to develop?" "When will the promised 'unveiling' take place?"

There is a pretty simple answer. It wouldn't have taken very long to come forward with a

'quick-fix' solution . . . or to have announced a unilateral program that was developed without the benefit of the views of the people it was designed to help.

And the unveiling? Well, we're not engaged in this effort for its public relations aspects.

Over the last six months, we have been engaged in the task of melding trade, investment, and financial assistance measures into a workable approach to regional development. We have been seeking a coherent and integrated package that would give us the best chance of unleashing the kind of energy; the kind of serious interest among entrepreneurs that could turn the prevailing economic outlook on its head. We have not reached for panaceas because we know they don't exist. Instead, we have considered how we might join with other interested countries to energize the spirit of self-help which already exists in the area.

It was quickly apparent that, in some cases, the measures being considered might be viewed as a departure from traditional U.S. practice in the program areas affected. You may take it as an indication of our seriousness and of our deep-felt concern for the problems of the Caribbean Basin that at no time during our internal discussions have we precluded adoption of a measure solely because it might depart from traditional policy. This flexibility was communicated during our consultations with potential beneficiaries, and it had the welcome effect of opening dialogues that were frank and absent of any divisive rhetoric.

If the Initiative is to break new ground, we must make our Congress a partner in the process. Therefore, the Administration has begun consultations with our legislators. We have also been working closely with representatives of the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands so as to ensure that the Initiative has both the benefit of their perspectives on regional development, and takes into account their development needs.

We also came to realize that an integrated program would be far less effective if we moved ahead without the active participation of a number of major regional lenders, including Venezuela, Mexico, and Canada. The three nations I've mentioned are all major contributors now—proportionately greater than we. We need to mobilize their own special problem-solving approaches to effectively deal with the complex range of issues. We have, therefore, adopted a cooperative approach, which is collegial in planning, will allow contributors individual scope, and is focused on measures tailored to the special problems of each of the beneficiaries. We are deeply grateful that Mexico, Canada, and Venezuela have each shown an intense interest in cooperative efforts designed to achieve mutual objectives in this cause.

Let me return to the subject of our consultations with the Governments and private sectors of the potential beneficiaries. Although time consuming, we have learned a great deal through this process. We are gratified by the sense of common vision that has begun to develop, and we will proceed to the implementation phase only with the concurrence and support of the nations whose development is tied to the measures contemplated.

Our consultations generally began with a review of the current local economic and business climate. Without a predictable and favorable setting for an expansion in investment and production, it would be pointless for us to even consider measures in the trade and financial assistance areas. We found that there had been, and continued to be, a tendency to view investment attraction primarily as an issue of incentives—both direct or through special tax treatment. On the other hand, it was acknowledged that international business still viewed some parts of the Carib-

bean and Central American Basin as high-risk areas.

To change this perception, it was generally concluded that bilateral investment treaties covering such issues as right-of-entry, national treatment, expropriation, and dispute settlement procedures would be helpful, if such treaties meet the self-determined needs of the area's nations. Clear rights and guarantees to investors, and predictable standards of investment treatment would be powerful signals of national commitment to market-oriented solutions to economic problems.

While investment treaties would ameliorate some of the element of risk that reduces the level of private sector activity, there is still a need for political risk insurance that is now in part available from our own Overseas Private Investment Corporation and from similar national entities in developed countries. Interest in this type of risk coverage also exists among the middle and upper-income developing countries.

Therefore, we have been exploring the feasibility of a multilateral political risk insurance institution which would be open to investors from all nations and which would extend the scope of risk coverage to fill gaps which currently exist under the OPIC-type arrangements. Investment in the Basin must come from the broadest group of contributors, and this strongly argues for an expanded insurance program.

In another context, potential host governments were generally satisfied with the effectiveness of the OPIC investment promotion program, particularly the special country missions, and we have plans to expand these operations over the coming months.

One obstacle to restoring business confidence widely cited by Basin nations is the lack of short-term financial resources. Ordinary, short-term commercial credit has almost disappeared in some states of the region—and this is a major factor in an unfolding economic nightmare for these nations. The problem is so acute in some nations that existing enterprises are without access to sufficient working capital to carry on with their production. Small manufacturing concerns are the first to be hit by the credit squeeze since limited resources are being directed in the first instance to public sector programs and then to larger companies.

We are most anxious to be able to respond—to the extent our own resources will permit—to the liquidity crisis. But we seek to do this in a way that reinforces our fundamental long-term objectives by combining additional financial assistance with opportunities for trade and investment. In this way, the beneficiaries will have an improved potential for meeting future credit obligations. We hope to be able to forge a multi-national response soon.

Another means of generating greater entrepreneurial interest—and one which has had support from private enterprise in the Basin and in the United States—will be to implement changes in U.S. tax treatment for investors. We also know that existing tax policy is based on extended experience. Accordingly, we will have to carefully examine the range of proposals for tax code and tax treaty initiatives which were proposed to us, recognizing their potential importance as a means of promoting increased private sector interest in the region.

Our mutual goals for new investment in the region and the maximum utilization of existing productive capacity cannot be realized without a healthy outlook for trade. There can be no question that substantial export markets currently exist which can be developed and secured by the region's private sector. The United States provides extremely favorable access for most manufactured exports from the region. The post-Tokyo Round U.S. duty structure contains

few rates over five percent. Duty-free access for most products is provided the Caribbean Basin nations and other developing countries under the U.S. Generalized System of Preferences.

During our consultations with the potential beneficiary states, we were struck by the fact that exporters and governments continued to find our GSP difficult to understand and use, despite frequent seminars. There is confusion surrounding the petition process and problems in predicting product eligibility under the existing value-added and country-of-origin criteria.

We remain convinced that, over time, exporters of the Basin must be able to reap more fully the benefits of the GSP system. But we recognize the importance of expanded trade as an engine of growth for the region. We have come, therefore, to consider a more tailored and simplified extension of duty-free access for the Basin, within the constraints of our international obligations under the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and other international accords such as the Multifiber Arrangement.

If such a further modification of our tariff policy can be justified on the basis of its impact upon private sector activity in the region, and if we are satisfied that the beneficiaries are taking all feasible steps to create a domestic economic and political climate conducive to private enterprise, then I am personally willing to recommend that we move to something approaching a one-way free trade area in most product sectors—not only to insure stable market access, but equally to create a magnet for world-wide investment interest.

Returning to the question of capital availability, we were struck during our consultations by the breadth and number of truly worthy public sector capital projects that are under consideration and which would be supportive of our mutual efforts to spur commercial expansion. There are also a host of initiatives in the areas of technical assistance, training for public sector managers, techniques of modern marketing, and so forth which are competing for scarce financial resources. In this setting, I think there is a demonstrated need for increased financial assistance, which contributors and international institutions should help fund.

Turning from the potential elements of the Initiative to the environment in which it's being developed, intensive consultations with the Basin countries, the Nassau Four, and others interested in this Initiative, both at home and abroad, has been a hallmark of our policy-making process. This is a time-consuming but vital component to the formulation of sound policy.

This practice of prior consultation with our neighbors must become a common feature of our policy-making process. In the trade area, previous consultations have been conducted mainly when the U.S. was considering the adoption of measures that might negatively affect one or more of our neighbors. But perhaps ignored has been the pressing need to consult on common problems and opportunities, in a spirit of cooperation—not confrontation.

This kind of exchange of views should become routine and not be confined to trade issues. Divisive problems should not be the only catalyst for such exchanges. Opportunities abound not only for consultation but for jointly-sponsored projects within the hemisphere.

For this reason, I believe a meeting of trade ministers from the Latin American and Caribbean countries would be very welcome and provide all of us an opportunity to discuss the Trade Agenda for the next decade in preparation for the 1982 GATT Ministerial meeting.

One specific Agenda item for which we share with the countries of Latin America

and the Caribbean a desire for more effective international discipline is the matter of safeguard actions. The United States soon will suggest a work program on safeguards that will provide a basis for subsequent GATT Ministerial consideration. We hope that the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean will support this work program and its long-term objectives.

The GATT Ministerial should be viewed by the Latin American and Caribbean nations as an opportunity to raise legitimate concerns regarding the operation of the multilateral trading system.

A successful GATT Ministerial will help to reduce present uncertainties associated with making the transition to freer trade policies. It is our hope that the Ministerial will start a new effort that will result in significant benefits for Latin American and Caribbean countries that pursue pragmatic, market-oriented policies of trade expansion and diversification.

I would like to conclude by reiterating the importance we place on a multi-faceted Caribbean Basin Initiative. We need a stable platform for development—resting on three strong supporting pillars—trade, investment, and aid. A fourth leg is cooperation, and cooperation means listening to what others have to say and giving them an opportunity to consider and respond to what you have in mind. The result will be a new sense of our common purpose.

We are being careful not to overstate what can be achieved by our mutual efforts. Some of what we do will have an immediate, positive effect; but by far the greatest benefits may not be felt for many years. Future generations will thank us for our patience and restraint and for our concern for the future as well as for the present. ●

ADDRESS BY JACK W. FLYNT, NATIONAL COMMANDER OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

● Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, on November 14, the National Commander of the American Legion, Jack W. Flynt, addressed the Maine Department of the American Legion at the Napoleon Ouellette Post No. 24 in Rumford, Maine. Mr. Flynt's remarks convey the sense of the frustration and anger that many veterans, especially Vietnam veterans, have experienced since viewing the portrayal of Vietnam veterans in the PBS show, "Frank: A Vietnam Veteran."

There are millions of Vietnam veterans who are well-adjusted, productive members of our society. These men and women deserve our respect and gratitude.

There are, however, many others who continue to suffer from scars, both physical and psychological, inflicted during the Vietnam war. To these men and women, we have an obligation that we must not ignore. We must continue our increasing efforts to resolve the controversies surrounding the provision of health care for these veterans and work to see that our debt to them is paid in full.

The maintenance of an independent and viable VA hospital and health care system is an essential element of our commitment to our Nation's veterans. As Commander Flynt notes, this system must remain committed to the needs of all veterans. As a member of the Senate Veterans' Affairs Committee, I will work to see that we do not lose sight of this vital goal.

Mr. President, I ask that the full

text of Commander Flynt's remarks be printed in the RECORD along with a biographical sketch of Commander Flynt.

The material follows:

REMARKS BY JACK W. FLYNT

Last month . . . I sat at a long low table in a darkened conference room in our Washington headquarters . . . to preview a video tape of a Public Broadcasting Service Veterans Day special. When I walked into that conference room . . . I glanced around the room at those gathered there to view the tape with me. I had no idea the danger I was in . . . the risk I was taking . . . not only by being in a darkened room with ten or fifteen Vietnam veterans . . . but by working closely . . . day in and day out . . . with a professional staff made up of nearly 60 percent Vietnam veterans.

Well, if I believed what I was to see that day . . . If "Frank: A Vietnam Veteran" is typical . . . as the Public Broadcasting Service would have us believe . . . then I take my life in my hands every time I deal with our national staff. For gathered at that table with me—all from the Vietnam war—was a Silver Star winner . . . a combat medic . . . an infantry platoon leader . . . a retired Air Force colonel . . . to name only a few. All of them are . . . I believe . . . the best in the country at what they do . . . all of them are professionals, committed to serving America's veterans through service to God and Country. What I saw in "Frank: A Vietnam Veteran" caused me, not fear . . . not distrust. No. What it caused was sorrow . . . and not a little anger. Sorrow . . . that so many fine Americans were about to be painted black by one broad brush stroke . . . Anger . . . that the sacrifices and suffering of so many fine men and women were to be treated with so little dignity . . . so little respect.

Those of you who have seen the program . . . know what I felt . . . you saw what I saw . . . and your outrage must equal my own. Why? Because of the contrast such a program provides with the proper recognition all veterans so richly deserve.

Three days ago . . . on Veterans Day . . . I stood in the warm Texas sunshine . . . before one of the most revered symbols of liberty in my home state . . . Indeed, in the nation. I stood before the Alamo . . . to join with thousands of other Americans to honor our veterans. I was privileged to lay a wreath before the tomb of one who died for this country . . . and to participate in a grand parade to honor those who fought . . . and lived to fight again, if necessary, for America. It was a special day, full of pageantry and tradition. On that day in Texas . . . America's veterans were honored with dignity . . . and with the respect and gratitude they so richly deserve.

But as I spoke, my heart was heavy . . . knowing that elsewhere, a whole generation of this country's veterans were not so honored. They . . . and much of the nation . . . saw their ability questioned . . . their motives suspected . . . their performance in war called disgraceful . . . by the implication that "Frank" was typical. But worse, a generation of veterans . . . who themselves have fought hard for the respect they deserve . . . had their characters sullied once again. After years of silent suffering . . . and years of fighting for their rights . . . they felt old wounds reopened . . . old prejudices revived . . . and old stereotypes renewed.

That, ladies and gentlemen, is the legacy of "Frank: A Vietnam Veteran." It is a legacy the Veterans of Vietnam do not deserve.

Here in the department of Maine, you know that as well as I do. Your record of success in dealing with the real . . . not imagined . . . problems of Vietnam veterans, have long

been a source of inspiration to the rest of the national organization. The battle in which you . . . even today . . . are embroiled . . . over your right to continue to operate the DVOP program . . . underscores not only your ability to do a tough job well . . . but more, your willingness to fight for the right to do that job. Your unequalled successes in placing veterans in jobs—at a rate three times that achieved by government agencies at less than half the cost—proves two things to me:

It shows that the Legionnaires of Maine can make national programs work, and work right. But more, it shows that the implications of "Frank: A Vietnam Veteran" are wrong. The veterans of Vietnam can work . . . they will work . . . and they can be important contributors to society—if they are given the chance. That is the real damage done by the PBS program. Barriers that have been knocked down—education, employment, social—knocked down by the hard work and commitment of dedicated caring people like yourselves—can go up again, if the stereotype and prejudices included in "Frank" take hold anew. We of the American Legion cannot allow that to happen.

Dedication to America's interests is an attribute common to members of The American Legion. It is strong here . . . it is strong across the National Organization . . . and it is strong among the Vietnam veterans in our ranks.

In Washington, Vietnam veterans . . . under the direction of the National Security/Foreign Relations Commission . . . carry out the mandates of the national organization in matters dealing with our active military . . . our alliances . . . our relationships with all nations. Our Economic Commission relies on the abilities and talents of a Vietnam Veteran . . . to see that the mandates of employment and job security for veterans are carried out. And our legislative interests on Capitol Hill are protected by some of the best representatives any organization can send to the offices of Congress.

I was in Washington on the day of the critical AWACS vote in the United States Senate. Less than two weeks before the vote, the NEC resolved to support the sale . . . and in that short period of time . . . your legislative staff in Washington marshalled the Legion's resources and ensured that our views were known in the Senate. The 52-48 vote in favor of the sale was a victory you can be proud of . . . for The American Legion shares no small portion of the victory. It was a victory not for a party, not for any group . . . but a victory for the nation . . . and for peace.

That, ladies and gentlemen, is the kind of thing the Vietnam Veteran can accomplish. He is not alone. Like his fellow veterans from all wars, he can do so much more. Here in Maine, he toils in your factories . . . educates your children . . . mans your police forces . . . treats your illnesses . . . fights your fires. He builds your houses, edits your newspapers, and yes, he prays with you.

Right now, his prayers may be a little different. He may be praying that he not be denied again . . . the respect that he has earned. He may be asking God that none see fit to bar him from the job he deserves. He may be asking that the insult to him . . . at the hands of misguided broadcasters . . . not cause others to reject service in defense of the nation he suffered to protect. And he may be asking for all of us to help.

We will not forget him.

We will fight alongside him for a resolution to his concerns over Agent Orange. We will fight to maintain the VA hospital system as one committed to the needs of all veterans. We will fight for his right to work. We will continue to fight for a secure, free nation in which he can raise his children. And we will fight to see that he always

enjoys the respect and gratitude he so richly deserves.

Ladies and gentlemen, The American Legion will never be idle when the interests of the nation or its protectors are threatened. We will not go unheard . . . and we will remain a force to be reckoned with. Why?

Because of you . . . Because of your strength . . . as shown by your high levels of accomplishment . . . and your commitment to our ideals of service to God and Country. The voice of The American Legion rings clearer . . . and speaks louder . . . because of the commitment you, as Legion and Auxiliary members, show to truth and honor. You will not be fooled by such false and misleading portrayals as "Frank: A Vietnam Veteran." It is one view . . . a view that holds no deep truth, because . . . as the founder of Boston's Trinity College-Amos Bronson Alcott—said nearly a century-and-a-half ago:

"The deepest truths are best read between the lines, and for the most part refuse to be written."

Ladies and gentlemen, the deep truths about America's veterans are written in blood . . . sacrifice . . . and honor. Those of us who have been there . . . can read between those lines.

Thank you.

[Biographical Sketch]

JACK W. FLYNT, NATIONAL COMMANDER, THE AMERICAN LEGION

Jack W. Flynt, 58, of Dimmitt, Texas, was elected National Commander of The American Legion the nation's largest veterans organization of nearly 2.7 million members, at the closing session of the Legion's 63rd annual National Convention Sept. 3 in Honolulu, Hawaii.

A U.S. Army veteran of World War II, he served in the Persian Gulf area and in the European Theater with Headquarters and Service Company, Allied Forces Headquarters, Caserta, Italy. He has been an active Legionnaire for nearly 30 years and is a member of Greer H. Estes Post 445, Dimmitt, Texas.

He attended Texas A&M for two and a half years before leaving school to enter military service. On return to civilian life, he resumed his formal education at West Texas State University.

He has been engaged in farming, ranching, farm related businesses and the insurance industry throughout his working career. He was designated a Charter Life Underwriter by the American College of Life Underwriters in 1974. He withdrew from active participation in his private business early in 1981 to devote full time to his campaign for the office of National Commander of The American Legion.

Flynt has taken an active role throughout his three decades of membership. He served his home post as service officer, commander and adjutant, an office which he held until his election as National Commander.

He held many district and department (state) offices in The American Legion of Texas, including that of Department Commander in 1966-67. During that same year his wife, Mary, served as Department President for the Texas American Legion Auxiliary.

At the state level, he was a member of the Finance Committee, Department Board of Trustees, Chairman of the Department Convention City Commission, Rehabilitation Commission, a counselor at Texas Boys State and President of The American Legion Convention City Corporation of Texas.

At the National level of Legion activity, Flynt served four years as Texas' American Legion National Executive Committeeman

and nine of his thirteen years as a member of the National Americanism Commission were spent as chairman of the Subcommittee for Youth Activities. In 1974-75, he was National Vice Commander of The American Legion.

Commander Flynt's family is thoroughly American Legion oriented. His wife has been active in the Auxiliary. Their son, U.S. Air Force Capt. Jack W. Flynt II, is a member of George S. Berry American Legion Post 575, Lubbock, Texas, and was a citizen of Texas American Legion Boys State. Their daughters, Karron and Sharron, both are members of the American Legion Auxiliary and former citizens of Texas American Legion Auxiliary Bluebonnet Girls State.

Flynt is active in affairs of his church, having served as Sunday School Superintendent for five years, secretary of his church's official board and secretary of Methodist Men.

He is a member of the Sheriff's Association of Texas, Texas A&M Century Club, Farm Bureau and several Agricultural commodities organizations. He is also a 32nd Degree Mason and a member of all Masonic Orders.

He has served as fund drive chairman for the Salvation Army and for the Red Cross Chapter of his home community.

Through all of his activities in the Legion and civic and social service, Commander Flynt has shown an intense interest in young people and in family life. Among his principal objectives during his term of office will be to emphasize the importance of American youth and the need to restore in American family life the morality, integrity and respect that has made the family the bedrock foundation of American Society. ■

EDUCATION'S THREE MILE ISLAND

• Mr. EAST. Mr. President, as we continue to search for ways to make existing programs more effective and to eliminate waste of our tax dollars we encounter new concepts that challenge our way of thinking. Whereas humanitarian programs were once gauged by the dollar amount appropriated now they are beginning to be judged by the results they produce.

Dr. McCay Vernon, editor of the "American Annals of the Deaf" and professor of psychology at Western Maryland College has written an article appearing in the October 1981 issue of the Peabody Journal of Education, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn., that challenges us to rethink what the best educational programs for disabled children are. The shortcomings of Public Law 94-142 are outlined in this article and some valid points raised that demonstrate more money is not always the solution to every problem that confronts us.

Mr. President, I ask that this article be printed in the RECORD:

The article follows:

EDUCATION'S "THREE MILE ISLAND": PL 94-142

The education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1973 (PL 94-142) is the most important legislative issue affecting handicapped youth in our lifetimes. Its generality far exceeds disabled youth because of the fundamental economic, constitutional, political, and moral-philosophical questions it raises. Unfortunately, the law was enacted without these broader issues being understood or even raised.

THE LAW

PL 94-142, now being implemented nationally, requires local educational agencies

to ensure a free, least restrictive public education for all disabled children, regardless of costs (Price & Goodman, 1980; Ralser & Nagel, 1980). They must either provide education themselves or pay for it if obtained elsewhere. The program must exist in the least restrictive environment irrespective of cost. For example, if satisfactory education is available locally at a reasonable price, this is not sufficient if there is a "less restrictive" program elsewhere, even though the latter may be prohibitively expensive (Vernon, 1979).

Historically, the law grew out of efforts by parents to place their mentally retarded children in schools instead of hospitals or settings where no services were provided (Pennsylvania Association for Retarded Children vs. Commonwealth, 1971). We must realize that the law developed from the needs of retarded youth, not handicapped children generally.

Initially, laws promising education for handicapped children appear as a humane effort on the part of our government to embody in legislation the basic Constitutional guarantee of equal opportunity for all. In reality, PL 94-142 is an ill-conceived law embodying a "Pollyanna-Horatio Alger-like" euphoria contrary to fact perception of reality." It threatens the education of an entire generation of handicapped youth and squanders the limited educational funds available in our country for both disabled and regular children. At a deeper level, it raises Constitutional, economic and moral issues at the heart of this nation, currently and in the future. At a practical level, PL 94-142 jeopardizes realistic efforts at serving disabled children by legislating the impossible and by indiscriminately wasting fiscal resources. Pat Bauer reported in the Washington Post (May 23, 1980) illustrating parts of the problem:

Six-year-old Brooke Bennett was transferred from her Fairfax County public school by her parents last winter after she told them repeated stories about classroom disruptions and violence by a hyperactive classmate.

"We don't want to send our child to that school anymore. The teachers are spending all their time with the kids who are acting out," says Brooke's mother, Jody Bennett of Vienna.

"I believe in the concept of mainstreaming (teaching handicapped students in conventional classroom settings). But if we're going to mainstream, we're going to have to provide some resources to support it."

Dr. Harry Silver, an associate director of the National Institute of Mental Health, says it may well be impossible for school districts to comply with the law, serve all the handicapped students who need help and still stay within their present budgets.

These are strong statements. Without equally strong supporting evidence, they represent nothing more than a polemic. Let us consider the evidence.

POLITICAL-CONSTITUTIONAL

Among the most cherished rights of states and local communities, rights guaranteed by the Constitution, are those related to education. By leaving education primarily to states and local communities, our country rose from 1850 to 1950 to international eminence (first place, to be boastful) in science, technology, medicine, and the general level of education and productivity of our population. While this remarkable achievement did not result solely from local control of education, it would never have occurred if local control had not worked extremely effectively.

The existence of forced racial segregation remains the one undeniable and shameful failure of these years of local jurisdiction. This fact stands as a stinging indictment of an otherwise successful, proven approach to education for the United States. How does all of this relate to the Education of All

Handicapped Children Act? About 1963 the federal government began implementing the education of handicapped children in dominating, controlling ways—a fact best reflected in dollars and cents. According to Lavor (1976) from 1963 until 1976 the United States Office of Education, now the Department of Education, increased funding for disabled children from 2.5 million dollars (a token amount in the federal budget) to more than one billion dollars in 1980. In other words, the federal fiscal investment increased more than 4,000 times between today and 17 years ago.

No one is naive enough to think, as Vernon (1979) pointed out, that local school districts get this money without massive federal control over what they do. Most state programs for the handicapped rely on federal dollars for their support (Lavor, 1978). They were in 1975 when PL 94-142 was passed. This financial dependence of the states on federal government sets the economic stage for the passage of the Bill. Congress enacted PL 94-142 and dictated to local school districts: "You will educate all disabled children." Previously, most districts failed to do so. Furthermore, the Congress stated (in PL 94-142) that local schools would provide this universal education in the best, i.e., the least restrictive, way possible, regardless of costs. As a result, school districts inherited an impossible dilemma. They either surrendered all federal monies they had already used to support their existing programs for handicapped children or else they assumed the overwhelming financial burden of PL 94-142. The latter costs are both astronomical and in many cases wasteful.

An analogy best illustrates the situation created by the Education for All Handicapped Children Act. The states and local school districts were and are in the position of the beautiful young maiden with no money or job skills who has accepted a mink coat, luxury apartment, sports car, and \$2,000 monthly allowance from a lecherous politician. The federal government, like the depraved suitor providing all these luxuries, intends to proceed with the courtship. Instead of demanding sexual indulgence, however, the federal government mandates through the monitoring power of PL 94-142, full control of exactly what states and local school districts do educationally with their handicapped children (PL 94-142, 94th Congress, November 1975). Furthermore, the law, through the same monitoring power, controls exactly how much these districts are going to pay for these educational services with their own state and local money, regardless of how much money it requires. The federal share of the cost is minimal, namely 12% above what it costs to educate a regular student (see Table 1.)

When the depraved lover who has financially indulged the young maiden approaches the moment of truth the crassness of his carnal bargain is inevitably settled by some token statement of affection. Similarly, as the federal government prepared financially and politically to ravage local school districts the inevitable seductive verbiage appeared. Those who passed the law promised that they would help significantly to pay costs of implementation. Needless to say, the amounts authorized by Congress were not appropriated by Congress. In fact the minute sums appropriated have been reduced substantially (see table 1). Thus, like the deflowered maiden still waiting for her marriage proposal but long since replaced by another woman, local school districts have been royally seduced. They now must pay for educational services chosen and determined, via monitoring, by the Department of Education.

What all of this means constitutionally is that by virtue of PL 94-142 the federal government now dictates to local schools exactly what they will do with their own handi-

capped children, deciding how much local money to spend to do it, and determining the circumstances by which the federal government will oversee compliance. This represents an extreme legal position with respect to the Constitution and one into which our country has moved gradually without conscious awareness.

FUNDING HISTORY FOR EDUCATION FOR ALL HANDICAPPED CHILDREN ACT, STATE GRANT PROGRAM

[Dollar amounts in millions, contribution in percent]

| Fiscal year appropriation | For use by schools in— request | Adminis- tration | Congress ap- pro- priated | Contribution | Author- ized | Actual |
|------------------------------|--|---------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|-----------------|--------|
| 1977 | 1977-78 | | \$252.0 | \$5 | \$5 | |
| 1978 | 1978-79 | \$365 | 566.0 | 10 | 10 | |
| 1979 | 1979-80 | 804 | 804.0 | 20 | 12 | |
| 1980 | 1980-81 | (1) | 874.5 | 30 | 12 | |
| 1981 | 1981-82 | 922 | | 40 | 12 | |

¹ OMB request is \$862,000,000; administration can change that.

ECONOMIC AND PHILOSOPHICAL-ETHICAL VALUES

Every society has limits on what it can provide its citizens, including those with handicaps. This unpleasant, but axiomatic, fundamental must underlie realistic programming. Years ago when special schools were established for handicapped children, the basic rationale was twofold. First, authorities recognized it as a human moral obligation. Second, these special schools selected children likely to become self-supporting, contributing members of society once given specialized education. This assumption proved true for most such programs; e.g., Gallaudet College which educates deaf students has returned a huge dividend for every tax dollar invested.

In general, for disabled youth not showing potential to be self-supporting, contributing members of society there were no schools. The needs of most of these individuals for food, shelter, supervision, and recreation was recognized and provided. Sometimes these services were inadequate—e.g., in certain hospitals for the mentally retarded. All of this has changed with the passage of PL 94-142. Now every handicapped child must receive an optimal comprehensive educational program regardless of cost. An actual case exemplifies what this means:

"Judy is a psychotic child three years old whose mental illness is due to an irreversible organic brain syndrome which is incurable. She requires 24 hour a day care due to extreme hyperactivity. Judy is severely mentally retarded and has multiple other physical and psychological problems. She lives in a small county of 40,000 people in New Jersey. Under PL 94-142 she must be educated in the least restrictive environment. In Judy's case this comes to \$60,000 a year. It will continue to cost at least this much until she is 21. This represents an expense of over \$1,500 a year for each citizen of her county. The total cost will be over a million dollars for the period from now until she is 21."

Obviously Judy is an extreme case, but she illustrates an important economic fact. Under PL 94-142, we as a country will be making by far our heaviest per capita educational financial investments in those youths least able to contribute to society. In fact, large sums of education money normally spent on gifted or average children, most all of whom will return a dividend to society, we must invest now in children with little or no probability of ever being other than wards of the state. Many, including myself, who staunchly support education and services for handicapped youth, believe that PL 94-142 ultimately will do more to reduce than increase these services. Public resistance will produce a backlash effect similar to that generated by Prohibition legislation. To focus this discussion,

we must face three major issues raised by PL 94-142:

1. Can we continue to make our biggest per capita educational investment in those least able to return a dividend to society? If we can, is it appropriate? The question makes us all uncomfortable. For this reason, neither Congress nor education has confronted the facts directly and realistically. Attempts to do this cause one to be perceived as against handicapped children, hardly a position with which a politician or teacher wants to be identified.

2. Can the federal government tell local school districts how to spend their own educational dollars and remain consistent with the Constitution?

3. PL 94-142 places tremendous emphasis on a local program for the child. Theoretically this can benefit young children in particular. Is it feasible economically, however, and in terms of other resources? To illustrate, let's take a deaf child living in a small town in Illinois. For this child to acquire a good education requires a specifically trained teacher who understands his communication and language learning problems, a speech pathologist who can work with this aspect of education, an audiologist to measure hearing, sound treated classrooms, a sign language interpreter, special textbooks, a loop induction amplification system in all classrooms, in-service education of all teachers and administrators, ad infinitum. To provide these services locally for only one child is inordinately expensive, costing in the range of \$25,000 to \$50,000 annually.

Even then, I seriously doubt the wisdom of keeping a deaf child isolated from other deaf children. Furthermore, when you start requiring several professionals to work individually in a small locality with a single handicapped child the supply of professionals, as well as the supply of money, soon runs out. In a purely economic sense, PL 94-142 is analogous to the federal government directing Chrysler Motor Company to build each car in the locale where they will sell it. Picture the cost of this kind of decentralization. Remember PL 94-142 states that the optimal program is to be provided and that we cannot raise costs as a relevant issue.

Thus far, we have considered some of the broad constitutional, economic, and moral issues represented by PL 94-142. Let us again consider one type of handicap, early profound deafness, and examine the effect of the law in "the world of reality."

CURRENT PRACTICE

First of all, local school districts say, "Give us federal money, even if only a token of what it takes to do the job demanded by PL 94-142." Then, because they face resistance to increased local taxes, these school districts ask themselves, "How can we make a little profit on this money; i.e., how can we process these deaf children and still have some federal funds left for other purposes?" Of course, according to Pechter (1978), the obvious answer is to just dump the deaf, or other disabled, child in a regular class with 30 hearing children and supply no supportive services. This is exactly what is happening all over the United States today.

More commonly the dumping approach is supplemented by a token tutor or resource teacher. The deaf student (and 15 other handicapped children) may see this teacher briefly once or twice weekly. Regardless of the details of the individual programs, the essence of what is happening today, as Vernon (1979) states, is that while PL 94-142 promises handicapped children and their families Utopia, it actually provides a horrendously poor education, in direct contradiction to most of what we have learned about the teaching of deaf and other handicapped children during the last century.

Another irony of the law is that for a minority of sophisticated, aggressive, litigious parents, it offers thousands of dollars worth of education for their children. If they intimidate local educators, or if they willingly devote years to the struggle, they can use this law to obtain a smorgasbord of special education goodies. Pechter (1978) says, however, that for the average, less sophisticated, less educated parent, those who are most in need, the system does not work.

The Individual Educational Plan, court hearings, etc. involve such overwhelming complexity that these parents are left helpless to obtain anything for their children except what local school officials offer (Pechter, 1978; Vernon, 1979). Usually these officials are from the field of general education and know nothing about deafness. As the end result, children and families most in need of educational services receive the least under PL 94-142. The bright, capable, litigious families already possessing the most to start with, can widen the differences between the "haves" and the "have nots."

SUMMARY

PL 94-142 is not merely going to devastate an entire generation of disabled youth educationally and psychologically—it has a generality far beyond handicapped children. It represents a fundamental departure from long standing interpretations of the Constitution relative to education. Economically, it imposes on the education of the disabled a position which says (a) cost is not to be considered a factor in developing an educational program, and (b) we will invest the most money in children least able to return to society a dividend on this investment.

If the road to hell is paved with good intentions, PL 94-142 certainly represents enough of a brick to cover half the distance. It is to education what Three Mile Island is to the use of nuclear energy. ●

EMERGENCY RESPONSE

● Mr. DECONCINI. Mr. President, the State of Arizona has initiated the development of an emergency self-management training and public education program. The program represents a new approach to insuring the safety of citizens during times of both natural and man-caused disasters. The purpose of the program is to provide Arizona educators and adult groups with comprehensive, instructional materials that can be utilized to teach self-management preparedness and response skills relevant to emergency situations. Arizona's foresight in providing this program will enable its citizens to work cooperatively with emergency services organizations and will give them the opportunity to develop skills that could help each individual to minimize—or avoid—the consequences of a disaster situation.

The program represents a cooperative effort—between Government and the private sector—to address an existing need. Since private sector support of a program of this nature gives the project credibility, the project requires an expanded base of private sector support. Sponsorship by additional private sector organizations would reduce the burden on current sponsors and could help provide the program more directly to concerned citizens. The Government and industry team approach to public education established in this project is necessary in times of significant Federal

funding reductions for educational programs.

Civil preparedness programs have been developed in the past, but they have had serious methodological problems. In order to overcome these problems, and to provide a unique approach in this important area, a competitive request for proposals was issued by the Arizona Division of Emergency Services. Desert-Mountain Associates, an Arizona corporation specializing in skill-based training and instructional product development, was awarded the professional services contract for completion of the project, and development efforts were initiated in January 1981, under the sponsorship of the Arizona Division of Emergency Services (Charles Ott, Jr., director), the Arizona nuclear power project, and the Salt River project.

Desert-Mountain is developing a program that represents a systematic research and development process based on skill-learning, as opposed to merely relating information about potential disasters. After surveying existing materials and interviewing emergency services experts and educators throughout the State, subject matter parameters and instructional specifications were established. These specifications provide a basis for citizens who participate in the program to become skilled in numerous survival techniques that will enable them to prepare for and mitigate a number of disasters likely to occur in Arizona.

Six topics and three levels of audience have been selected. These parameters were established on the basis of input from emergency services personnel, educators, and Arizona citizens. The topics are: Radiation safety, floods, desert-mountain survival, earthquakes, hazardous materials and energy-related emergencies. The audience levels are pre-teenage, teenage, and adult. A model set of materials on radiation safety has been developed and is undergoing a preliminary tryout.

The program sponsors and Desert-Mountain Associates, Inc., are to be commended for addressing an important and difficult task. The net result of the development and implementation efforts will be a citizenry that is better able to survive in both peacetime and attack-related emergencies. At a time when citizens throughout the country are registering their concerns about their vulnerability to disaster situations, especially to nuclear attack, Arizona has taken a step in the right direction.

I heartily encourage Arizona citizens to make use of the program materials when they become available in 1983, following the final field test. I believe that the program will serve as a national model for skill-based emergency preparedness and response training.●

PRESIDENT'S EXPORT COUNCIL CITES IMPORTANCE OF EXPORT TRADING COMPANY LEGISLATION

● Mr. HEINZ. Mr. President, as its first order of business upon being reconstituted by President Reagan, the President's Export Council adopted a resolution calling for prompt enactment of export trading company legislation and

urging the President to make this his top priority in the international trade area.

As the resolution points out, growth of the trading company concept is essential if we are to involve small- and medium-sized businesses more fully in exporting activities. Over the long term this concept promises to change the way this country approaches exporting, in the process making us both more competitive and more aggressive at the very time we are finding the competition ever tougher.

The Senate has already expressed its support for export trading companies, having passed the legislation in question unanimously last April. That bill, S. 734, which Senators DANFORTH, TSONGAS, BENTSEN, and I introduced, is now pending in the House, and it is to the House that the President's Export Council urges the President to direct his attention and persuasive powers. I have recently noted some signs of progress on this measure in the other body, and I hope that this resolution will help convince House Members to continue moving this bill. The Reagan administration, of course, needs no such convincing, having supported the bill from its inception, but I am also pleased to note the increasing level of administration involvement in efforts to get S. 734 enacted.

Mr. President, I ask that the text of the President's Export Council's letter to President Reagan be printed in the RECORD.

The letter follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S EXPORT COUNCIL,
Washington, D.C., October 30, 1981.
The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On behalf of the President's Export Council, I submit here with its resolution calling for prompt enactment of legislation to facilitate the formation and operation of export trading companies:

The President's Export Council, as its first order of business, agreed to advise you that the establishment of the export trading company concept should be your top priority in the international trade area.

Export trading companies are necessary in order to realize economies of scale and to provide small firms with access to the expertise so often critical to successful international competition. Formation of such companies should provide a major step in the economic recovery of the nation. They would contribute to the reduction of the nation's trade deficit by fostering the growth of exports, which already contribute approximately 20,000 jobs for every one billion dollars in sales.

We recognize that the Administration has already endorsed the export trading company concept, but call your attention to the fact that immediate action in the House of Representatives is necessary if legislation is to pass this year. We urge the Administration to intensify discussions with appropriate committees in the House, particularly the Judiciary Committee, in order to work toward speedy passage of export trading company legislation.

We hope you will give our views close attention, as this is one of the most practical ways in which the United States can increase exports.

Sincerely,

J. PAUL LYET,
Chairman.●

THE WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

● Mr. PELL. Mr. President, senior citizens from all over the country have come to Washington this week to participate in the third White House Conference on Aging.

This event, first held in 1961 and again in 1971, has played a significant role in the development of the aging agenda for each of the two preceding decades. The Older Americans Act of 1965 and the medicare and medicaid programs grew out of resolutions that were developed by delegates to the first White House Conference on Aging. The second White House conference was no less eventful and paved the way for the passage of the supplementary security income (SSI) program and the extension of the mandatory retirement age.

The program recommendations that emerged from both of these conferences were the products of many hours of discussion and free exchange of ideas among the delegates.

This year's conference on aging is unique in many ways. Because of the need to restrain Federal spending, much of the discussion will focus on ways to improve the quality of existing Federal aging programs and to more effectively target senior citizens who are most in need.

During the budget process, which began last spring, Congress has voted repeatedly to trim the tree of Federal programs. In my view, however, far too many branches of the tree have been cut off and the so-called "social safety net" has become smaller and smaller. The White House Conference on Aging offers a forum for those who are directly affected by these cutbacks to speak and share their thoughts on how our Federal financial resources can be more efficiently utilized.

I have been concerned, therefore, Mr. President, about rumors that the administration has tried to dictate the rules of procedure for this conference and limit debate on individual committee reports.

Without a free exchange of ideas or sufficient opportunity for the delegates to play a meaningful role in the deliberations of the White House Conference on Aging, it is useless to hope that any significant recommendations will emerge from this year's conference.

Many of the delegates have strong feelings about the direction of the administration's economic program because they have experienced the effects firsthand.

They have come a long way and have spent many hours preparing for this conference and ought to be allowed to share their views without interference with the American people.

I hope that these issues will soon be resolved so that the Congress and the administration will have the full benefit of the experience and expertise of the participants in the White House Conference on Aging.●

SENATOR ABDNOR WRITES ON HARBOR DEVELOPMENT AND S. 1692

• **MR. MOYNIHAN.** Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Water Resources Subcommittee, the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. ABDNOR), has written an article for the Baltimore Sun on the subject of harbor development. I commend his words to all who have an interest in seeing this country capitalize on one of our greatest economic opportunities in the coming decade—the export of American steam coal. The boon will not occur unless we build deep-water ports to accommodate the super-colliers now being built by our foreign buyers.

Senator ABDNOR and I are cosponsors of a bill, the National Harbors Improvement Act (S. 1692), that would encourage ports to proceed immediately with harbor development plans. Financing of port improvements would be undertaken entirely by the local port, thus freeing the ports from the burden of the congressional authorization and appropriations process. Our bill retains a strong commitment to the continued Federal maintenance of all our harbors by requiring the ports to pay only 25 percent of their maintenance dredging costs. Our bill would confine the regulatory process for dredging permits to 2 years.

Under Senator ABDNOR's leadership, the Water Resources Subcommittee reported S. 1692 to the full Environment and Public Works Committee on November 18, 1981. The committee will mark up the legislation on December 2, 1981.

The arguments for rapid Senate action are made quite strongly in the chairman's article. Its timeliness cannot be understated. Mr. President, I ask that Senator ABDNOR's article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the Baltimore Sun, Nov. 21, 1981]

HARBOR DEVELOPMENT

(By JAMES ABDNOR)

America's port capabilities lag behind much of the world. We lack deep ports. Thus, we have no ability to use the superships that haul coal, and other commodities at far lower costs per ton.

Yet our present system, where Congress authorizes projects and appropriates federal dollars to dredge channels, one by one, seems unlikely to produce any rapid improvements.

Let's look at the record:

It now takes a generation—about 26 years—to begin construction on a typical Army Corps of Engineers water project. Congress hasn't passed a new water resources bill since 1976. We have a backlog of \$50 billion in authorized, but unbuilt, federal water-resources projects. It will take 25 years to work through that backlog. Spending on Corps of Engineers work, in uninflated dollars, is now half what it was 15 years ago.

On the other side is the demand. America has an opportunity to augment exports dramatically with the sudden surge in demand for U.S. coal. But deepened coal ports won't come cheaply. The 50-foot-deep Baltimore project would cost the federal government about \$340 million. When you tote them all up, you arrive at a cost of \$3 billion. Compare that with the \$180 million the federal government has been spending yearly on harbor deepening.

There simply are not enough federal dollars around to deepen all the harbors we would like to deepen. Also, we face an increasing backlog of unfulfilled maintenance dredging.

President Reagan may have provided guidance with the challenge he set in his September economic message. "When the federal government provides a service directly to a particular industry or to a group of citizens, I believe that those who receive the benefits should bear the costs." He has called for full port-by-port cost recovery for harbor work.

For the first time in U.S. history, reality forces us to look beyond Washington for harbor improvements. We must let investors and shippers, not the Congress, determine where the dollars are spent.

Senator Moynihan of New York and I are sponsoring a bill that shifts all the costs for new harbor-project work to the local port authorities, while continuing a major federal subsidy for subsequent yearly maintenance dredging. This is how the Dutch do it, and they have one of the world's best harbors—Rotterdam. A beneficiary-pays concept will move port development out of politics into decisions based on economic sense.

It certainly would be easy to say that the already authorized Baltimore Harbor project should be built right away, with federal dollars. I'm not sure that it would sound so logical in other port cities. And, frankly, it is probably not possible in Congress.

It would certainly prove unfair if we forced local government to swallow these harbor costs. But my proposal specifically allows local government to collect user fees from the ships that are the direct beneficiaries.

This means that the foreign coal buyers will have to pay some of the cost. If substantial benefits truly exist, shouldn't the ports be able to obtain necessary funding in the marketplace, then repay it through fees collected as a result of the additional, more efficient shipping?

The average added user charge on shipping a ton of coal, to amortize a deepened port, would run to \$2 a ton or less. The savings to the shipper from economies of scale would be about \$6 a ton. And don't forget, shippers are paying port charges now that are far higher than would be imposed under a user-charge scheme. It costs nearly \$50 a ton to handle some types of cargoes at Baltimore now.

Finally, the bill includes language that will greatly expedite local project approval and development. I am confident we can build projects in a few years, rather than decades.

It is vital that Congress move quickly on the Abdnor-Moynihan legislation. Last week, our Subcommittee on Water Resources approved my bill and sent it to the full committee for action December 2. We need to provide certainty to the ports and to their customers, we need to assist President Reagan in meeting the goal of economic recovery that he has set for our nation. •

ORDER OF PROCEDURE ON TOMORROW

MR. STEVENS. Mr. President, it is my understanding that there are already entered orders for rollcall votes tomorrow. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There has been no ordering of yeas and nays on anything that has yet been taken up for tomorrow.

ORDER FOR THE RECOGNITION OF SENATOR BUMPERS ON TOMORROW

MR. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. BUMPERS) be en-

titled to a special order following the two leaders on tomorrow.

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

THE PROGRAM ON TOMORROW

MR. STEVENS. Mr. President, will the Chair state what then is the program for the morning following the special order of Senator BUMPERS?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. At 9:40 a.m. there will be 20 minutes of debate on two amendments of the Senator from South Carolina Senator HOLLINGS. That will be followed by two back-to-back votes on those two amendments on which the yeas and nays have not been ordered.

MR. STEVENS. I understand.

There is the unanimous-consent agreement that was entered last evening at my request that sets four treaties for a vote, one vote to count for four, at 4:20 p.m. tomorrow afternoon. Is that still correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

The Chair stands corrected. The yeas and nays have been ordered on those four treaties, one vote to count as four.

MINERAL LEASING LAWS AMENDMENT

MR. STEVENS. Mr. President, if my good friend from West Virginia is in agreement, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate Calendar Order No. 373, H.R. 4591.

MR. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, there is no objection on this side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 4591) to amend the mineral leasing laws of the United States to provide for uniform treatment of certain receipts under such laws, and for other purposes.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H.R. 4591) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

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

MR. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

PIRACY AND COUNTERFEITING AMENDMENTS ACT OF 1981

MR. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate Calendar Order No. 383, S. 691.

MR. ROBERT C. BYRD. No objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 691) to amend titles 18 and 17 of the United States Code to strengthen the laws against record, tape, and film piracy and counterfeiting, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, as follows:

On page 2, line 6, strike "and", and insert "or other":

On page 2, line 11, strike "an", and insert "other":

On page 2, strike line 18, through and including line 21, and insert the following:

"(2) the term 'traffic' means to transport, transfer or otherwise dispose of, to another, as consideration for anything of value or to make or obtain control of with intent to so transport, transfer or dispose of; and

On page 3, line 13, after "used", insert "or intended to be used":

On page 3, line 17, strike "audiovisual work or motion picture", and insert "motion picture or other audiovisual work";

On page 3, after line 19, insert the following:

"(d) When any person is convicted of any violation of subsection (a), the court in its judgment of conviction shall in addition to the penalty therein prescribed, order the forfeiture and destruction or other disposition of all counterfeit labels and all articles to which counterfeit labels have been affixed or which were intended to have had such labels affixed.

"(e) Except to the extent they are inconsistent with the provisions of this title, all provisions of section 509, title 17, United States Code, are applicable to violations of subsection (a)."

On page 4, line 10, after "section", insert the following: "and such penalties shall be in addition to any other provision of law";

On page 5, strike line 3, through and including line 5, and insert the following:

"(C) is a second or subsequent offense under either of subsections (b)(1) or (b)(2) of this section, where a prior offense involved a sound recording, or a motion picture or other audiovisual work";

On page 5, line 23, after "or", insert "other":

On page 6, strike line 9, through and including line 11, and insert the following:

"(2) the terms 'reproduction' and 'distribution' refer to the exclusive rights of a copyright owner under clauses (1) and (3) respectively of section 106 (relating to exclusive rights in copyrighted works), as limited by sections 107 through 118, of title 17."

On page 6, in the material between line 20 and line 21, strike "and", and insert "or other".

So as to make the bill read:

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 "Piracy and Counterfeiting Amendments Act of 1981".

Sec. 2. Section 2318 of title 18, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"§ 2318. Trafficking in counterfeit labels for phonorecords, and copies of motion pictures or other audiovisual works

"(a) Whoever, in any of the circumstances described in subsection (c) of this section, knowingly traffics in a counterfeit label affixed or designed to be affixed to a phonorecord, or a copy of a motion picture or other audiovisual work, shall be fined not more than \$250,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both.

"(b) As used in this section—

"(1) the term 'counterfeit label' means an identifying label or container that appears to be genuine, but is not;

"(2) the term 'traffic' means to transport, transfer or otherwise dispose of, to another, as consideration for anything of value or to make or obtain control of with intent to so transport, transfer or dispose of; and

"(3) the terms 'copy', 'phonorecord', 'motion picture', and 'audiovisual work' have, respectively, the meanings given those terms in section 101 (relating to definitions) of title 17.

"(c) The circumstances referred to in subsection (a) of this section are—

"(1) the offense is committed within the special maritime and territorial jurisdiction of the United States; or within the special aircraft jurisdiction of the United States (as defined in section 101 of the Federal Aviation Act of 1958);

"(2) the mail or a facility of interstate or foreign commerce is used or intended to be used in the commission of the offense; or

"(3) the counterfeit label is affixed to or encloses, or is designed to be affixed to or enclose, a copyrighted motion picture or other audiovisual work, or a phonorecord of a copyrighted sound recording.

"(d) When any person is convicted of any violation of subsection (a), the court in its judgment of conviction shall in addition to the penalty therein prescribed, order the forfeiture and destruction or other disposition of all counterfeit labels and all articles to which counterfeit labels have been affixed or which were intended to have had such labels affixed.

"(e) Except to the extent they are inconsistent with the provisions of this title, all provisions of section 509, title 17, United States Code, are applicable to violations of subsection (a)."

Sec. 3. Title 18, United States Code, is amended by inserting after section 2318 the following new section:

"§ 2319. Criminal infringement of a copyright

"(a) Whoever violates section 506(a) (relating to criminal offenses) of title 17 shall be punished as provided in subsection (b) of this section and such penalties shall be in addition to any other provisions of title 17 or any other law.

"(b) Any person who commits an offense under subsection (a) of this section—

"(1) shall be fined not more than \$250,000 or imprisoned for not more than five years, or both, if the offense—

"(A) involves the reproduction or distribution, during any one-hundred-and-eighty-day period, of at least one thousand phonorecords or copies infringing the copyright in one or more sound recordings;

"(B) involves the reproduction or distribution, during any one-hundred-and-eighty-day period, of at least sixty-five copies infringing the copyright in one or more motion pictures or other audiovisual works; or

"(C) is a second or subsequent offense under either of subsections (b)(1) or (b)(2) of this section, where a prior offense involved a sound recording, or a motion picture or other audiovisual work;

"(2) shall be fined not more than \$250,000 or imprisoned for not more than two years, or both, if the offense—

"(A) involves the reproduction or distribution, during any one-hundred-and-eighty-day period, of more than one hundred but less than one thousand phonorecords or copies infringing the copyright in one or more sound recordings; or

"(B) involves the reproduction or distribution, during any one-hundred-and-eighty-day period, of more than seven but less than sixty-five copies infringing the copyright in one or more motion pictures or other audiovisual works; and

"(3) shall be fined not more than \$25,000 or imprisoned for not more than one year, or both, in any other case.

"(c) As used in this section—

"(1) the terms 'sound recording', 'motion picture', 'audiovisual work', 'phonorecord' and 'copies' have, respectively, the meanings set forth in section 101 (relating to definitions) of title 17; and

"(2) the terms 'reproduction' and 'distribution' refer to the exclusive rights of a copyright owner under clauses (1) and (3) respectively of section 106 (relating to exclusive rights in copyrighted works), as limited by sections 107 through 118, of title 17".

Sec. 4. The table of sections for chapter 113 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by striking out the item relating to section 2318 and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"2318. Trafficking in counterfeit labels for phonorecords and copies of motion pictures or other audiovisual works.

"2319. Criminal infringement of a copyright".

Sec. 5. Section 506(a) of title 17, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

"(a) CRIMINAL INFRINGEMENT.—Any person who infringes a copyright willfully and for purposes of commercial advantage or private financial gain shall be punished as provided in section 2319 of title 18."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

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

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

So the bill (S. 691), as amended, was passed.

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

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

INDEFINITE POSTPONEMENT OF SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 48

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate Calendar Order No. 388, Senate Concurrent Resolution 48, a concurrent resolution disapproving the proposed sale to Pakistan of F-16 aircraft, and I ask unanimous consent that that calendar item be indefinitely postponed.

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

EXECUTIVE SESSION

RETURN OF TAX CONVENTIONS WITH THE ARAB REPUBLIC OF EGYPT, ISRAEL, AND THAILAND

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session for the purpose of considering calendar item No. 2, Senate Executive Resolution No. 2, the Return of Tax Conventions with the Arab Republic of Egypt, Israel, and Thailand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to executive session. The executive resolution will be stated.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Ex. Res. 2) Return of Tax Conventions with the Arab Republic of Egypt, Israel, and Thailand.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the executive resolution.

The executive resolution (S. Ex. Res. 2) was agreed to.

MR. STEVENS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

MR. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

MR. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of the action taken in executive session.

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

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MR. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to the consideration of legislative business.

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

MR. STEVENS. Mr. President, is there an order for convening yet tomorrow morning?

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. There is not yet an order.

RECESS UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

MR. STEVENS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess until 9 a.m. tomorrow morning.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 7:36 p.m., recessed until 9 a.m., Wednesday, December 2, 1981.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 1, 1981:

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

Eugene V. Lipp, of California, to be a Member of the National Transportation Safety Board for a term expiring December 31, 1986, vice James B. King, term expiring.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Gerald E. Thomas, of California, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Cooperative Republic of Guyana.

William Robert Casey, Jr., of Colorado, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Niger.

Mark Evans Austad, of Arizona, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Norway.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

Clarence Eugene Hodges, of Maryland, to be Chief of the Children's Bureau, Department of Health and Human Services, vice John A. Calhoun III.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The following-named career Member of the Senior Foreign Service of the Department of Commerce for promotion in the Senior Foreign Service to the class indicated:

Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service of the United States of America, Class of Minister-Counselor:

Joseph F. Christiano, of New York.

The following-named career Members of the Foreign Service of the Department of

Commerce for promotion into the Senior Foreign Service as indicated:

Career Members of the Senior Foreign Service of the United States of America, class of Counselor:

Walter Clair Lenahan, of Washington.
Daniel Taher, of New Jersey.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE

The following-named persons for appointment as career Members of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Counselor, Consular Officers, and Secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Wayne Hoshal, of Virginia.

Robert Carl Liimatainen, of Michigan.

For reappointment in the Foreign Service as a Foreign Service officer of class 3, a Consular officer, and a Secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Duane Edwin Sams, of Connecticut.

Susie Jacqueline Tucker, of California.

For appointment as a Foreign Service Information officer of class 3, a Consular officer, and a Secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Alfred F. Head, of Virginia.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 4, Consular Officers, and Secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Donald J. Amis, of California.

Lawrence Rea Baer, of California.

Perry Edwin Ball, of Georgia.

Bruce Edward Carter, of Pennsylvania.

Miguel de la Pena, of Massachusetts.

David B. Dunn, of California.

Alfred Gonzales, of California.

Andrew Lewis Allen Goodman, of Illinois.

Daniel Kiang, of New York.

Gerald J. Loftus, of Florida.

Carl S. Matthews, of Virginia.

Albert G. Nahas, of Pennsylvania.

Lauren Peters, of Hawaii.

Francis Joseph Ricciardone, Jr., of New Hampshire.

John Richard Schmidt, of Wisconsin.

Richard Henry Smyth, of California.

James R. Van Lanningham, of Arizona.

Edward H. Vázquez, of New Jersey.

Thomas J. White, of New York.

Howard C. Wiener III, of Virginia.

For appointment as Foreign Service Information officers of class 4, Consular Officers, and Secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

My-Chau Bui-Griffin, of New Hampshire.

Leslie W. McBee, of California.

Members of the Foreign Service to be Consular officers and Secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:

Glenn R. Adams, of Maryland.

Ollie Palmer Anderson, Jr., of Maryland.

Alex Andrews, of Virginia.

Dona Dailey Arnold, of New York.

Gust Avrakotos, of Maryland.

John Richard Baca, of Texas.

Robert Northrup Bentley, of New Hampshire.

Clyde Bishop, of Pennsylvania.

Marcia Stephens Bloom, of New Jersey.

William Boyd, of Virginia.

David E. Brantley, of Maryland.

John Breckenridge, of Washington.

Brenda C. Brisbon, of New York.

Barbara A. Broe, of Virginia.

Kevin Brown, of the District of Columbia.

Stuart Vaughan Brown, of the District of Columbia.

Robert D. Burkette, of Tennessee.

Prudence Bushnell, of Texas.

Paul Byerly, of Texas.

Phillip Carter III, of the Virgin Islands.

Joel P. Cassman, of California.

Arnold A. Chacón, of Colorado.

Frank Collins III, of Virginia.

Raymond Louis Colon, of New York.

Ann Vaughn Covington, of Nevada.

James J. Coyle, of Virginia.

Robert Davis, of Virginia.

Scott H. DeLisi, of Minnesota.

Guido Del Prado, of California.

Anne Elizabeth Darse, of Michigan.

Patrick C. Diehl, of Virginia.

Peter Dorey, of Minnesota.

Ellie Duckett, of Alabama.

Keith Alan Edains, of Mississippi.

Cynthia Erskine, of Colorado.

Jerome Thomas Farrell, of California.

Rafael Fermoselle, of Virginia.

Charles E. Fisk, Jr., of Virginia.

Dennis A. Foster, of North Carolina.

James John Foster, of the District of Columbia.

Peter S. Gadzinski, of Wisconsin.

William R. Gaines, Jr., of New Mexico.

Jeffrey F. Gilman, of Alaska.

Barbara J. Good, of California.

David N. Greig, of Virginia.

Linda L. Gresham, of Tennessee.

Michael E. Guest, of South Carolina.

Charles L. Hafner, of Virginia.

Norman C. Hall, of Virginia.

Marilyn Harrington, of Massachusetts.

Maura Harty, of New York.

Leonard Allen Hill, of Washington.

Darcy Elizabeth Fillebrown Hofmann, of California.

Clyde I. Howard, Jr., of Arizona.

Stanley R. Hunter, of Washington.

Jane Ingle, of Maryland.

Dennis Jamison, of Virginia.

Darrel Allan Jenks, of Pennsylvania.

Lois L. Johnson, of California.

John Melvin Jones, of Virginia.

Patricia W. Jonsson, of Virginia.

Frederick J. Kaplan, of Washington.

Alexander Karagiannis, of Missouri.

Beverly Killpack, of Virginia.

Hans G. Klemm, of Michigan.

Anthony M. Kolankiewicz, of Pennsylvania.

Stanley E. Koller, of Virginia.

David A. Kornbluth, of California.

Dale Krumviede, of Virginia.

Mara Lang, of New York.

Joseph LaPiana, of Virginia.

Beverly Ann LaVigne, of California.

Richard Lecuona, of Virginia.

Dan Leibig, of Virginia.

Henry A. Levine, of New York.

Rose Marie Likins, of Virginia.

Edward Lindsey, of Virginia.

Brian Lofquist, of Virginia.

Kevin K. Maher, of Georgia.

Janean L. Mann, of the District of Columbia.

Ralph L. Mason, of the District of Columbia.

Edward L. Mattson, of Virginia.

Stephanie M. Mattson, of Virginia.

James David McGee, of Indiana.

Andrew P. McGrath, of Virginia.

Edward Raymond McMahon, of New Jersey.

W. Michael Meserve, of Maine.

Wendela Moore, of New York.

Dan W. Mozena, of Maryland.

Donald Franklin Mulligan, Jr., of Arizona.

Arnold Noe Muñoz, of California.

Wayne Edward Neill II, of Nevada.

Bruce Richard Nelson, of Minnesota.

Wanda Letitia Nesbitt, of Pennsylvania.

Marc Emanuel Northern, of Kansas.

Michael D. Olson, of Virginia.

Andrés D. Ofiate, of Arizona.

Brian G. Page, of Virginia.

Steven E. Perlman, of New York.

William M. Phillips III, of Virginia.

Newman Bruce Pickering, of California.

Stephen Pipkin, of Virginia.

Roman Popadiuk, of New York.

Mary Lynn Porto, of Texas.

Barbara Anne Presgrove, of Florida.

Thomas Gwyn Reich, Jr., of North Carolina.

Thomas Steven Reichelderfer, of California.

J. Paul Reid, of California.

Janet E. Robson, of Michigan
 Richard Patrick Rodgers, of Virginia
 Theodore A. Rosen, of the District of Columbia
 Michael E. Ruhn, of New Hampshire
 Edward J. Saizar, of California
 Jeanne Lee Samuel, of Virginia
 Barbara M. Sand, of California
 Edward G. Simonsen, Jr., of New York
 Storm Simenson, of Virginia
 William Sinclair, of Maryland
 Pamela Jo Howell Slutz, of Virginia
 Greenleaf H. Smith, of Virginia
 Jay Thomas Smith, of Indiana
 Russell Y. Smith, of Virginia
 Penelope M. Snare, of Maryland
 Mark S. Sparkman, of Virginia
 Mignonne Spellmeyer, of Virginia
 George M. Staples, of California
 David Carter Stewart, of Texas
 Jean Rene Surena, of New York
 Richard Stephen Taylor, of Georgia
 Renée Louise Toirac, of California
 Alan David Troxel, of California
 Soching Tsai, of California
 Robert J. Vandaveer, of California
 Rupert D. Vaughan, of South Carolina
 Donald J. Ventue, of New Jersey
 Ricardo Villalobos, of Virginia
 Jeffrey L. Vreeland, of Virginia
 Susan Marie Wagner, of Florida
 Thomas F. Wallace III, of Virginia
 Jacob Wallis, of Delaware
 Howard Weiss, of California
 Joyce E. Wells, of Virginia
 Robert Dale Wilson, of Missouri
 Seth D. Winnick, of New Jersey
 James M. Young, of Minnesota
 Members of the Foreign Service to be Consular officers of the United States of America:
 Dianne H. Graham, of Virginia
 George F. Sherman, Jr., of Maryland
 Nativa Simoes, of California

Members of the Foreign Service to be Secretaries in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:
 Karl S. Beck, of Florida
 George S. Dragnich, of Virginia
 Gerard F. Helfrich, of Virginia
 William A. Levis, of California
 Gerald S. Rose, of California
 Arthur W. Rovine, of Maryland
 Otto O. Schnepp, of California
 David Grant Smith, of Virginia

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Reserve of the Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3366, 3367, 3370, and 3383:

ARMY PROMOTION LIST

To be colonel

Askew, Donald C., **XX**
 Azar, James T., **XXX-XX-XX**
 Beard, James L., **XXX-XX**
 Jones, Jack B., **XX**
 Juneau, Jeraid, **XXX-XX-XX**
 Lynch, Frank L., **XXX-XX**
 Mannberger, Marx, **XXX-X**
 Marholz, Duane, **XX**
 McAteer, Kenneth, **XXX-XX**
 McCluer, Raymond, **XXX-XX-X**
 Moriarity, John, **XXX-XX-X**
 Orelli, Patrick, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Phillips, Donald, **XXX-XX-X**
 Pinkerton, R. L., **X**
 Pore, Stanley C., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Porter, Richard, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Quick, Richard, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Ragland, Ronald, **XXX-XX-X**
 Rolls, John Jr., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Ross, Martin S., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Willoughby, J., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Willyerd, Robert, **XXX-XX-XX**
 Wilson, Nicholas, **XXX-XX**
 Zinni, Gabriel, **XXX-X**

CHAPLAIN
 To be colonel
 Desaegher, John, **XXXX-XXXX**

ARMY NURSE CORPS
 To be colonel
 Charney, Robert, **XXXX-XXXX**

MEDICAL CORPS
 To be colonel
 Burmeister, Ray, **XXXX-XXXX**
 Galvin, John R., **XXXX-XXXX**

ARMY PROMOTION LIST
 To be lieutenant colonel

Albright, B., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Andrae, Michael, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Barbaro, Anthony, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Beebe, John, **XXX-XX-XX**
 Bergquist, W. R., **XXX-XX**
 Bogle, Charles, **XXX-XX**
 Brunner, Daniel, **XXX-XX**
 Chaffin, Richard, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Chandler, James, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Cobb, Stephen H., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Collins, William, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Colvin, Kenneth, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Contreras, V. J., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Deloatch, V., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Duffy, Daniel J., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Ebinger, Roger, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Edwards, Richard, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Engelage, Marcia, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Evans, Thomas N., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Fields, Richard, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Flemate, Henry, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Fogli, Philip, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Forster, L. P., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Fowkes, Gordon, **XXX-XX**
 Franklin, Donald, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Freedham, Donald, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Freeland, Jon N., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Frego, James P., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Gardner, Dan N., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Graham, William, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Greenhut, J., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Griffiths, K. A., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Groves, Delmer, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Grupper, Albert, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Hackett, Donald, **XXX-XX**
 Harrison, E., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Harryman, John, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Havekost, John, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Humphries, Jack, **XXX-XX**
 Hyter, Charles, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Jacobek, James, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Jendras, Jerome, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Joseph, Taft M., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Kalar, David L., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Katahara, Gerald, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Kato, Hiroshi, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Kee, Norman R., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Kleinmaier, Lee, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Kofsky, Leonard, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Kotter, Jack H., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Kubicek, Charles, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Livingston, S., **XXX-XX-XX**
 Madel, Francis, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Magee, Donald C., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Maudlin, Ray M., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 McBride, Charles, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 McFarlin, Larry, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 McIntyre, Peter, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 McLaughlin, G., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Morgan, Glen A., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Morris, Rodney, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Muller, Michael, **XXX-X**
 Mullis, William, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Pagenkopf, D., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Pendleton, W. N., **XXX-XX**
 Poarch, Warren, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Porter, Benjamin, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Rigby, Carlos K., **XXX-XX**
 Ringler, Walter, **XXX**
 Robertson, R. H., **XXX-XX-X**
 Robinson, Jackie, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Schlegel, Robert, **XXX-XX**
 Schmeizer, J. H., **XXX-X**
 Slack, Ronald E., **XXX-XX**

Smith, Jack B., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Staub, William, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Stricklen, W. A., **XXX-XX**
 Stump, Norman, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Swanson, Robert, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Sweet, Dana R., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Taylor, John N., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Vogel, Hal, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Waddie, Harry L., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Wallen, Francis, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Wayne, Don, **XXX-XX**
 Webber, James Q., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 White, Robert D., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Wood, John F., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Youngman, George, **XXX-XX-XXXX**

CHAPLAIN
 To be lieutenant colonel

Bradley, William, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Burns, William, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Gott, Harold P., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Stanton, Robert, **XXX-XX-XXXX**

MEDICAL CORPS
 To be lieutenant colonel

Cantey, Joseph, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Fischl, Edwin C., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Lebedovych, V., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Tidwell, Thomas, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Turbeville, D., **XXX-XX-XXXX**

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS
 To be Lieutenant colonel

Payton, Howard, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Rolle, Joseph H., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Sealfon, Michael, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Woodyard, T. C., **XXX-XX-XXXX**

The following-named officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections, 591, 593, and 594:

ARMY PROMOTION LIST
 To be colonel

Chupka, Bernard, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Roth, Richard R., **XXX-XX**

MEDICAL CORPS
 To be colonel

Campbell, C. G., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Eller, Jimmie L., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Forster, Wolfram, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Gibbons, Harry, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Hammarsten, J., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Hardee, Erasmus, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Libert, Samuel, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Lowney, John F., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Major, Francis, **XXX-XX**
 McDevitt, Thomas, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Paxton, Harold, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Sadler, Theodore, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Saladin, Thomas, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Schaefer, John, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Sproch, Richard, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Stein, Robert B., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Strickland, Alva, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Swengel, Richard, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Weaver, Marlin, **XXX-XX-XXXX**

ARMY NURSE CORPS
 To be Lieutenant colonel

McClure, M. L., **XXX-XX-XXXX**

DENTAL CORPS
 To be Lieutenant colonel

Ashcraft, Ray A., **XXX-XX**
 Ballew, Dewey G., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Barahl, Leonard, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Burnett, Donald, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Coebern, Robert, **XXX-X**
 Cohen, Merlin L., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Coughlin, Phillip, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Fox, Carl L., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Glick, George, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Hedberg, Francis G., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Johnson, Bernard, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Korfman, Martin, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 LeBourdais, M. W., **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Simmons, William, **XXX-XX-XXXX**
 Spencer, Gerrard, **XXX-XX-XXXX**

Tom, Harry K., XXX-XX-XXXX
Wallace, John R., XXX-XX-XXXX

MEDICAL CORPS

To be Lieutenant colonel

Abrigo, Anatolio, XXX-XX-XXXX
Adeison, Harvey, XXX-XX-XXXX
Ahsamuddin, K., XXX-XX-XXXX
Ainsworth, Jerry, XXX-XX-XXXX
Allsago, Andres, XXX-XX-XXXX
Anderson, T. B., XXX-XX-XXXX
Arnett, Norman, XXX-XX-XXXX
Aslaf, Joseph R., XXX-XX-XXXX
Azarean, Albert, XXX-XX-XXXX
Barcos, Maurice P., XXX-XX-XXXX
Berger, Bernard, XXX-XX-XXXX
Bintilif, Sharon J., XXX-XX-XXXX
Blanco, Jose E., XXX-XX-XXXX
Boncina, Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
Boone, Alexander, XXX-XX-XXXX
Borsuk, Gregory, XXX-XX-XXXX
Bradford, Ray, XXX-XX-XXXX
Bratkowski, H., XXX-XX-XXXX
Brown, Harold A., XXX-XX-XXXX
Budd, Frank W., XXX-XX-XXXX
Burden, Arthur, XXX-XX-XXXX
Burke, Robert C., XXX-XX-XXXX
Butler, Harvey, XXX-XX-XXXX
Cahue, Aldo E., XXX-XX-XXXX
Canup, Clarence, XXX-XX-XXXX
Cashman, Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
Cava, Eugenio F., XXX-XX-XXXX
Ceriani, Phillip, XXX-XX-XXXX
Chahin, Ramon, XXX-XX-XXXX
Chew, Wilbur, XXX-XX-XXXX
Ciccia, Samuel, XXX-XX-XXXX
Coan, James E., XXX-XX-XXXX
Coburn, Bry H., XXX-XX-XXXX
Congdon, James, XXX-XX-XXXX
Constantinow, E., XXX-XX-XXXX
Conze, Pierre F., XXX-XX-XXXX
Cooper, George, XXX-XX-XXXX
Cooper, Maxwell, XXX-XX-XXXX
Crast, Frank W., XXX-XX-XXXX
Craver, William, XXX-XX-XXXX
Criares, N. J., XXX-XX-XXXX
De la Cruz, T., XXX-XX-XXXX
Didams, Albert, XXX-XX-XXXX
DiLallo, C. A., XXX-XX-XXXX
Ditmare, Harry, XXX-XX-XXXX
Drake, Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX
Drez, David J., XXX-XX-XXXX
DuBoff, Eugene, XXX-XX-XXXX
Dunklin, Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
Dunn, Jack N., XXX-XX-XXXX
Egelman, Arthur, XXX-XX-XXXX
Emmick, Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
Fasoglio, Aldo, XXX-XX-XXXX
Finer, Jerome A., XXX-XX-XXXX
Fleischner, J., XXX-XX-XXXX
Fontana, Nathel, XXX-XX-XXXX
Garcia, Arturo, XXX-XX-XXXX
Gardner, John C., XXX-XX-XXXX
Godwin, Winston, XXX-XX-XXXX
Goodwin, Daniel, XXX-XX-XXXX
Gordon, Walter, XXX-XX-XXXX
Gotlin, Ronald, XXX-XX-XXXX
Gray, John H., XXX-XX-XXXX
Haines, Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
Hakim, Simon Z., XXX-XX-XXXX
Hall, William, XXX-XX-XXXX
Halvorson, Harold, XXX-XX-XXXX
Haskell, Amparo, XXX-XX-XXXX
Haugland, David, XXX-XX-XXXX
Haws, Hale L., XXX-XX-XXXX
Hays, Marvin B., XXX-XX-XXXX
Hentz, Edwin C., XXX-XX-XXXX
Howard, Edith M., XXX-XX-XXXX
Howe, Patrick A., XXX-XX-XXXX
Hoxie, Lloyd B., XXX-XX-XXXX
Hutchinson, H., XXX-XX-XXXX
Johnston, Renner, XXX-XX-XXXX
Keller, H. B., XXX-XX-XXXX
Kilhenney, C. F., XXX-XX-XXXX
Kinsey, Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
Knight, Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
Knudson, Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
Koller, Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX
LaBarre, William, XXX-XX-XXXX
Lazarus, Stephen, XXX-XX-XXXX

Lebedooych, M. W., XXX-XX-XXXX
Le Famine, Arman, XXX-XX-XXXX
Leja, Ivars, XXX-XX-XXXX
Levin, Jerry C., XXX-XX-XXXX
Lidner, Victor, XXX-XX-XXXX
Lofstrom, Dennis, XXX-XX-XXXX
Lopez-Correa, R., XXX-XX-XXXX
Lowe, Ernest W., XXX-XX-XXXX
Lugo-Faria, M. D., XXX-XX-XXXX
Lydiatt, James, XXX-XX-XXXX
MacCormack, John, XXX-XX-XXXX
Magno, Jose N., XXX-XX-XXXX
Marshall, John, XXX-XX-XXXX
Martin, Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
Maxwell, George, XXX-XX-XXXX
McDermott, G. M., XXX-XX-XXXX
McElreath, Ricky, XXX-XX-XXXX
Megalli, Maguid, XXX-XX-XXXX
Metcalf, D. E., XXX-XX-XXXX
Meyer, Hobart, XXX-XX-XXXX
Milburn, William, XXX-XX-XXXX
Miller, Harold, XXX-XX-XXXX
Montgomery, N., XXX-XX-XXXX
Moya, Jaime, XXX-XX-XXXX
Nowakowski, P. A., XXX-XX-XXXX
Ochoa, Gonzalo, XXX-XX-XXXX
Padden, Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
Palombi, Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
Pearsall, G. F., XXX-XX-XXXX
Peeples, R. E., XXX-XX-XXXX
Petty, Clayton, XXX-XX-XXXX
Pieroni, Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
Porrell, William, XXX-XX-XXXX
Posnikoff, Jack, XXX-XX-XXXX
Prats, Arturo R., XXX-XX-XXXX
Quigley, Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
Raciotti, T. R., XXX-XX-XXXX
Ramos, Evelyn, XXX-XX-XXXX
Reed, Robert L., XXX-XX-XXXX
Rente, Frederick, XXX-XX-XXXX
Reskallah, T. T., XXX-XX-XXXX
Reinecke, Frank, XXX-XX-XXXX
Riley, George R., XXX-XX-XXXX
Roh, Joseph F., XXX-XX-XXXX
Saitberg, G. H., XXX-XX-XXXX
Schaupp, Ronald, XXX-XX-XXXX
Schettler, W. H., XXX-XX-XXXX
Seltzer, S. J., XXX-XX-XXXX
Seng, S. Barry, XXX-XX-XXXX
Singson, Calixto, XXX-XX-XXXX
Slavin, James D., XXX-XX-XXXX
Smith, Warren D., XXX-XX-XXXX
Sobel, Harold J., XXX-XX-XXXX
Soll, Robert W., XXX-XX-XXXX
Springer, Harry, XXX-XX-XXXX
Svare, Gerhart, XXX-XX-XXXX
Tahmoush, Albert, XXX-XX-XXXX
Torkelson, Leif, XXX-XX-XXXX
Turner, William, XXX-XX-XXXX
Van Ravenswaay, T., XXX-XX-XXXX
Van Way, Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX
Vergara, Gerardo, XXX-XX-XXXX
Vernon, Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
Wagner, John R., XXX-XX-XXXX
Warren, David, XXX-XX-XXXX
Weber, Max, XXX-XX-XXXX
Wexler, Jerome, XXX-XX-XXXX
Wilkins, George, XXX-XX-XXXX
Winston, Steuart, XXX-XX-XXXX
Wong, Normund, XXX-XX-XXXX
Wong, Sidney H., XXX-XX-XXXX
Woo, Daniel, XXX-XX-XXXX
Woods, Joseph C., XXX-XX-XXXX
Yamamoto, Sam M., XXX-XX-XXXX

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

To be Lieutenant colonel

Barber, Paul G., XXX-XX-XXXX
Dunham, Kenneth, XXX-XX-XXXX
Zeltzer, Harry, XXX-XX-XXXX

ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

To be Lieutenant colonel

Baehm Donald W., XXX-XX-XXXX

VETERINARY CORPS

To be Lieutenant colonel

Grossman, A., XXX-XX-XXXX

Staley, Leo G., XXX-XX-XXXX

The following-named officers, for appointment in the Reserve of the Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3494:

MEDICAL CORPS

To be Lieutenant colonel

Lesar, May S. L., XXX-XX-XXXX
Sauer, Curtis M., XXX-XX-XXXX
Spitz, Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
Zavidil, Anthony, XXX-XX-XXXX

The following-named Army National Guard officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3385:

ARMY PROMOTION LIST

To be colonel

Baker, John W., XXX-XX-XXXX
Ballard, T. R., XXX-XX-XXXX
Beatty, Burrell, XXX-XX-XXXX
Blanc, Gerard G., XXX-XX-XXXX
Bonafede, Samuel, XXX-XX-XXXX
Brinkley, Billie, XXX-XX-XXXX
Caldarone, R. E., XXX-XX-XXXX
Carpenter, D. B., XXX-XX-XXXX
Chapin, Glen R., XXX-XX-XXXX
Chase, David D., XXX-XX-XXXX
Clark, William, XXX-XX-XXXX
Coffey, Clarence, XXX-XX-XXXX
Cox, John H., XXX-XX-XXXX
D'Arajo, John, XXX-XX-XXXX
Dehne, Douglas, XXX-XX-XXXX
Del Sesto, J. R., XXX-XX-XXXX
Devine, Donn D., XXX-XX-XXXX
Erdahl, Ervin D., XXX-XX-XXXX
Exstrand, Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX
Fantauzzi-Ruiz, R., XXX-XX-XXXX
Foresman, E. G., XXX-XX-XXXX
Freeman, William, XXX-XX-XXXX
Friess, Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX
Gentry, James H., XXX-XX-XXXX
Gottlieb, W. J., XXX-XX-XXXX
Guerin, Donald, XXX-XX-XXXX
Gunderson, R. D., XXX-XX-XXXX
Guthrie, Lamont, XXX-XX-XXXX
Hagin, James D., XXX-XX-XXXX
Hinman, Donald, XXX-XX-XXXX
Hollis, Johnie, XXX-XX-XXXX
Honaker, Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
Householder, R., XXX-XX-XXXX
Hlenich, Henry, XXX-XX-XXXX
Johnson, Rodger, XXX-XX-XXXX
Legge, William, XXX-XX-XXXX
Little, John H., XXX-XX-XXXX
Lynch, George W., XXX-XX-XXXX
Mallan, Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX
Manley, James D., XXX-XX-XXXX
Marholz, Duane, XXX-XX-XXXX
Martin, Roby G., XXX-XX-XXXX
May, Lavern, XXX-XX-XXXX
Miller, Howard, XXX-XX-XXXX
Minchin, Gerald, XXX-XX-XXXX
Mohr, Charles G., XXX-XX-XXXX
Nakatsu, Myles, XXX-XX-XXXX
Osborne, Allan, XXX-XX-XXXX
Patrick, William, XXX-XX-XXXX
Saulter, Rudy J., XXX-XX-XXXX
Scheid, Gordon, XXX-XX-XXXX
Sentmen, Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
Smithhart, W. L., XXX-XX-XXXX
Stephens, Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
Sundin, Gene L., XXX-XX-XXXX
Sweeney, John D., XXX-XX-XXXX
Tauriello, D. B., XXX-XX-XXXX
Willingham, Max, XXX-XX-XXXX
Zurbuch, Peter, XXX-XX-XXXX

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonel

Cashman, Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX
Diefenbach, E., XXX-XX-XXXX
Padilla-Ramirez, H., XXX-XX-XXXX
Palesse, John A., XXX-XX-XXXX
Pieroni, George, XXX-XX-XXXX
Simpson, Marion, XXX-XX-XXXX

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

To be colonel

Richardson, E., XXX-XX-XXXX

ARMY PROMOTION LIST

To be Lieutenant colonel

Bailey, Paul W., XXXX-XXXX
 Bauserman, S. L., XXXX-XXXX
 Bennette, Jerry, XXXX-XXXX
 Beth, Ewald E., XXXX-XXXX
 Bigler, Robert, XXXX-XXXX
 Boardman, W. E., XXXX-XXXX
 Bourrie, Richard, XXXX-XXXX
 Byrdsong, Vallie, XXXX-XXXX
 Campbell, F. M., XXXX-XXXX
 Carragher, John, XXXX-XXXX
 Charles, Craig, XXXX-XXXX
 Clark, Arthur C., XXXX-XXXX
 Cumick, John C., XXXX-XXXX
 Dampier, William, XXXX-XXXX
 Darling, James, XXXX-XXXX
 Dennis, Larry, XXXX-XXXX
 Ehrmantraut, E. J., XXXX-XXXX
 Enzor, Burney H., XXXX-XXXX
 Erdley, Larry L., XXXX-XXXX
 Ferguson, Jack, XXXX-XXXX
 Fontaine, B. A., XXXX-XXXX
 Freeman, Warren, XXXX-XXXX
 Fuller, Duane E., XXXX-XXXX
 Gee, Bobby J., XXXX-XXXX
 Gillaspie, R. E., XXXX-XXXX
 Guthrie, Ronnie, XXXX-XXXX
 Guynes, Ervin A., XXXX-XXXX
 Haley, Larry E., XXXX-X...
 Hayes, Edison O., XXXX-XXXX
 Heywood, F. W., XXXX-XXXX
 Hoffman, William, XXXX-XXXX
 Hogan, Roderick, XXXX-XXXX
 Howell, William, XXXX-XXXX
 Hunter, Dennis, XXXX-XXXX
 Ice, Thomas R., XXXX-XXXX
 Injasoulian, P., XXXX-XXXX
 Jackson, James, XXXX-X...
 Jensen, Dennis, XXXX-XXXX
 Johnson, Robert, XXXX-XXXX
 Kissam, John B., XXXX-XXXX
 Kloss, Richard, XXXX-XXXX
 Lampe, Larry E., XXXX-XXXX
 Langley, Joseph, XXXX-XXXX
 Lord, Samuel D., XXXX-XXXX
 Love, James F., XXXX-XXXX
 Lovett, Carlton, XXXX-XXXX
 Mabey, Robert D., XXXX-XXXX
 MacRitchie, S., XXXX-XXXX
 Maher, Joseph J., XXXX-XXXX
 Markley, William, XXXX-XXXX
 Marks, Thomas A., XXXX-XXXX
 Marier, Arnold, XXXX-XXXX
 Marshall, Kim E., XXXX-XXXX
 McBride, James, XXXX-XXXX
 McDowell, L. E., XXXX-XXXX
 McElwain, Emmett, XXXX-XXXX
 McNinch, David, XXXX-XXXX
 Michael, Robert, XXXX-XXXX
 Miller, Gerald, XXXX-XXXX
 Mix, Terry P., XXXX-XXXX
 Morgan, Robert, XXXX-X...
 Murray, Michael, XXXX-XXXX
 Narel, Richard, XXXX-XXXX
 Nelson, James H., XXXX-XXXX
 Newell, Dale E., XXXX-XXXX
 Norris, Robert, XXXX-XXXX
 Pacholik, Frank, XXXX-XXXX
 Papier, John L., XXXX-XXXX
 Pattwell, Robert, XXXX-X...
 Pemberton, Roy, XXXX-X...
 Pennington, J. R., XXXX-XXXX
 Peterson, R. G., XXXX-XXXX
 Petrik, Stanley, XXXX-X...
 Portante, Guido, XXXX-XXXX
 Pruter, Roger A., XXXX-X...
 Purpera, I. P., XXXX-X...
 Reitz, Robert A., XXXX-XXXX
 Richar, William, XXXX-X...
 Richie, Richard, XXXX-XXXX
 Ruff, Bobby K., XXXX-XXXX
 Rupie, Walter L., XXX...
 Schulte, Thomas, XXXX-X...
 Shaffer, Rohl, XXXX-X...
 Shank, David M., XXXX-XXXX
 Sherman, John R., XXXX-X...
 Sims, Herbert, XXXX-X...
 Sordi, James J., XXXX-XXXX
 Spraga, John B., XXXX-XXXX

Sproul, Hugh B., XXXX-XXXX
 Steele, William, XXXX-XXXX
 Sundeen, Oluf J., XXXX-XXXX
 Taranto, Joseph, XXXX-XXXX
 Teague, Kenneth, XXXX-XXXX
 Turley, Donald, XXXX-XXXX
 Vontrott, John, XXXX-X...
 Walker, Lynn O., XXXX-XXXX
 Wellen, Donald, XXXX-XXXX
 Whitfield, W. J., XXXX-XXXX
 Williams, James, XXXX-XXXX
 Wohlers, Roger, XXXX-XXXX
 Worthington, H., XXXX-XXXX
 Wyatt, Jerry R., XXXX-XXXX
 Zoglio, Anthony, XXXX-XXXX

ARMY NURSE CORPS

To be Lieutenant colonel

Hetzer, Suzanne, XXXX-XXXX
 Schulte, Susan, XXXX-XXXX

DENTAL CORPS

To be Lieutenant colonel

Brannon, Dabney, XXXX-XXXX
 Burgess, James, XXXX-XXXX
 Caballero, F. R., XXXX-X...
 Crabb, Frank W., XXXX-XXXX
 Fournier, Donald, XXXX-XXXX
 Guthrie, William, XXXX-XXXX
 Johnson, Dean F., XXXX-XXXX
 Lewallen, Dick, XXXX-XXXX
 Meldrum, David, XXXX-XXXX
 Ratton, Ralph R., XXXX-XXXX
 Rios, Manuel D., XXXX-XXXX
 Ritola, Carl A., XXXX-XXXX
 Ward, William A., XXXX-XXXX
 Woodiel, Shelby, XXXX-XXXX

MEDICAL CORPS

To be Lieutenant colonel

Birne, Gilbert, XXXX-XXXX
 Black, Grover, XXXX-XXXX
 Braud, Joseph P., XXXX-XXXX
 Cole, Gary B., XXXX-XXXX
 Connolly, C. C., XXXX-XXXX
 Deckard, Cecil, XXXX-XXXX
 Desanto, Eduardo, XXXX-XXXX
 Hahn, Won B., XXXX-XXXX
 Johnston, Robert, XXXX-XXXX
 Mauries, Christy, XXXX-X...
 Rieger, Frank G., XXXX-XXXX
 Rodgers, Donald, XXXX-XXXX
 Rutter, Paul H., XXXX-XXXX
 Schumacher, G., XXXX-XXXX
 Severson, Donald, XXXX-XXXX
 Snow, Rodney M., XXXX-XXXX
 Sy, Janet C., XXXX-XXXX
 Thomas, Mack A., XXXX-XXXX
 Tornyos, Karoly, XXXX-XXXX

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

To be Lieutenant colonel

Bertz, Thomas, XXXX-XXXX
 Bird, Gary H., XXXX-XXXX
 Desmone, John L., XXXX-XXXX
 Egbert, Michael, XXXX-XXXX
 Fraris, Alton B., XXXX-XXXX
 Johnson, Ross A., XXXX-XXXX
 Walton, Bruce, XXXX-XXXX

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States, in their active duty grades, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 531, 532, 533:

Colonels

Allen, Eugene Womack, XXXX-XXXX
 Brooks, Colleen Louise, XXXX-XXXX
 Edmiston, Howard William J., XXXX-XXXX
 Foote, Evelyn Patricia, XXXX-XXXX
 Glaze, James E., XXXX-XXXX
 Hawkins, Eugene Duff, XXXX-XXXX
 Henrionnet, James Franklin, XXXX-XXXX
 Holcomb, Rowland Riddell, XXXX-XXXX
 Luckey, Robert Michael, XXXX-XXXX
 Moutos, Gus, XXXX-X...
 Phillips, Walton Anderson, XXXX-XXXX
 Salimbene, Frank George, XXXX-XXXX
 Schultz, Edward E., XXXX-XXXX

Voke, Edward Nelson, XXXX-XXXX
 Weber, Thomas Edward, XXXX-XXXX

AIR DEFENSE ARTILLERY

Lieutenant colonels

Alverson, Frank Lavet, Jr., XXXX-XXXX
 Bauer, Joseph Leonard, XXXX-XXXX
 Bradley, David Bernard, XXXX-XXXX
 Bailey, Joseph Wilmar, XXXX-XXXX
 Briggs, Michael Robert, XXXX-XXXX
 Brostrom, Theodore Mercer, XXXX-XXXX
 Burch, Walter Marion, XXXX-XXXX
 Carisen, Donald David, XXXX-XXXX
 Deleo, John Blase, Jr., XXXX-XXXX
 Draper, Floyd Lawrence, XXXX-XXXX
 Ferreira, Marvin Eaton, XXXX-XXXX
 Fragner, Ronald Dean, XXXX-XXXX
 Garcia, Alfonso E., XXXX-XXXX
 Garcia, Augustine, XXXX-XXXX
 Gonzales, Antonio Gondara, XXXX-XXXX
 Headen, Clifton, Jr., XXXX-XXXX
 Holloway, Harold Eugene, XXXX-XXXX
 Holt, William Harrison, XXXX-XXXX
 Holthaus, John Francis, Jr., XXXX-X...
 Jackson, Andrew Leon, Jr., XXXX-XXXX
 Johnston, Cecil Edward, XXXX-XXXX
 Jolly, Morris Franklin, XXXX-X...
 King, Tommy Bert, XXXX-XXXX
 Linder, Wesley Roy, XXXX-X...
 Mapes, Clarence Bowman, II, XXXX-XXXX
 McKinney, John Baylor, XXXX-XXXX
 Pruitt, Kenneth Kealus, XXXX-XXXX
 Roberts, William Sidney, XXX...
 Schmidt, Donald Alex, XXXX-XXXX
 Schroeder, Jerrold Howard, XXX...
 Shillady, Joseph Hart, Jr., XXX...
 Slate, James Sanford, XXXX-XXXX
 Smith, Bruce Everett, XXXX-XXXX
 Starkey, James Clark III, XXXX-XXXX
 Storz, William Anthony, XXXX-XXXX
 Sugimoto, Paul Yoshinobu, XXXX-XXXX
 Takayama, Thomas Toshio, XXXX-XXXX
 Thomas, Erie Whitehead, Jr., XXXX-X...
 Thomas, Richard Asbury, XXXX-XXXX
 Trott, John Donald, XXXX-XXXX
 Verduin, Robert William, XXXX-XXXX
 Whitcomb, Allen James, XXXX-XXXX
 Wilken, Wayne Malind, XXXX-XXXX
 Wilkie, Robert Bruce, XXXX-XXXX
 Wright, William George, XXXX-XXXX

Majors

Abadie, Jacques, III, XXXX-XXXX
 Ahern, David Lidden, Jr., XXXX-XXXX
 Anderson, Theodore John, XXXX-XXXX
 Antu, Emilio Genaro, XXXX-XXXX
 Baker, Aubrey Lee, XXXX-XXXX
 Baldwin, Larry Gene, XXXX-XXXX
 Beahon, James Lewis, XXXX-XXXX
 Beaton, Albert Whitfield I, XXXX-XXXX
 Blanca, Manuel Arthur, XXXX-XXXX
 Booth, Mark Michael, XXXX-XXXX
 Boucher, Harry Nathan, XXXX-XXXX
 Bradberry, Donald Glen, XXXX-XXXX
 Bramblett, Miles Grant, Jr., XXXX-XXXX
 Brantley, James Ellis, XXXX-XXXX
 Burton, Danny Bold, XXXX-XXXX
 Call, John Richard, XXXX-XXXX
 Campbell, Jerry Robert, XXXX-XXXX
 Christensen, Michael Ralph, XXXX-X...
 Christiansen, Paul Alfred, XXXX-XXXX
 Clay, Dennis Eugene, XXXX-XXXX
 Collins, Roger Scott, XXXX-XXXX
 Condrey, Sam Junior, XXXX-XXXX
 Cook, Daniel Paul, XXXX-XXXX
 Cooper, Terence Lee, XXXX-XXXX
 Corathers, Michael Glenn, XXXX-XXXX
 Cornett, Wesley Augustus, XXXX-XXXX
 Custer, Terry Alan, XXXX-XXXX
 Davito, John Aldo, XXXX-XXXX
 Deavers, William Franklin, XXXX-XXXX
 Dibease, John Paul, Jr., XXXX-XXXX
 Dillard, Robert William, XXXX-XXXX
 Disney, Owen Dwayne, XXXX-XXXX
 Dotson, Connor William, Jr., XXXX-XXXX
 Eble, Gerald Leon, XXXX-XXXX
 Evan, Donald W., XXXX-XXXX
 Farkas, Frank, XXXX-XXXX
 Farrel, Michael, XXXX-XXXX
 Fielding, Robert Joseph, XXXX-XXXX
 Flick, Claude Henry, XXXX-XXXX

Flowers, Edward Alexander, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Gallardo, Alfred, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Geishert, Philip Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Gesner, Jimmie Leroy, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Good, Bobby James, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Gortney, Roy Clyde, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Gray, Donald Chatburn, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Hall, Ronald Anthony, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Haripar, Kurt Claus, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Harvey, Vivian Jim II, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Hayhurst, Bruce Alan, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Henrickson, Arnold Frederi, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Herrera, Rudy, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Hester, Lawrence Dewey, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Hester, Marvin Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Hicks, Ralph Douglas, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Hood, Albert Melvin, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Hordych, Joseph James, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Huffy, Michael Jon, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Hughes, Samuel Reed, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Inge, Danny Aubrey, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Intlehouse, Jackson, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Jacobsen, Jerald Ray, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Janssen, Klaus, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Jarvie, Alan Wyatt, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Johnson, Franklin Carroll, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Johnston, David Shaw, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Jung, Heldon, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Keller, Ronald Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Kelley, Philip Raymond, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Koning, Frederick L., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Krumins, Juris, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Kyle, Robert Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Lafrance, Leo Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Liebig, Fritz William, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Limones, Jesus Raymundo, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Lohmann, Russell Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Long, Herbert Barbour, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Maden, Omar, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Mamika, Anatoly, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Mania, John Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Maynard, Jacques Guy Gasto, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 McCormick, Charles Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 McDaniel, James Ilsey, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 McGuire, George Timothy, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Nagel, Orin Arthur, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Navarrete Eutimio S., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Noe, David Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Norris, David Bruce, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Parker, Patrick Donald, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Pekarek, Arthur Edward, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Perry, Robert James, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Plumley, Joseph Pinkney, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Pizak, Raymond Alan, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Presley, Vernon William, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Priebe, Rodney Martin, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Riddle, Bruce Carleton, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Robbins, George Ben, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Sanders, Earlyn Lynell, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Schooley, Carl Thomas, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Scibelli, Richard Anthony, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Shy, Clyde Wesley, XX...
 Sitzes, Paul Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Smith, Stephen Theron, XX...
 Snow, Richard Melvin, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Spradlin, Evender Grewl, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Stagg, Charles Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Stephens, Wayne Howard, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Stuart, Alan Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Taber, John Lowell, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Tallman, Michael Vincent, X...
 Taylor, Robert Worth, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Terwilliger, George W., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Tinkham, James Morris, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Vandrey, Hans Friedrich, XX...
 Wagner, Henry Max, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Waters, Bruce Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Wayland, Jack Roy, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Woods, Robert William, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Wright, Roger Alan, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Young, Robert William, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Zepp, Werner, XXX-XX-XXXX.

Captains

Ables, John Emerson, XX...
 Allen, John Clayburn VII, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Artis, Walter Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Richey, Richard Gray, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Spears, Jarrell Rodney, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Wilkes, Gerald Jay, XX...

ARMOR
Lieutenant colonels

Ball, Eldon Keith, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Becker, Oliver Reuben, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Bosserman, Richard M., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Cogan, Larry Carlisle, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Earwood, Harold Jackson, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Flynn, Joseph Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Frazier, Errol Roy, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Frost, Dean Horton, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Halcomb, Dallas Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Hamon, Clarke Alfred, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Harris, John Morgan III, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Healy, Harold William, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Hicok, William Tyler, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Hodges, Joseph Kenneth, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Hughes, Michael David, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Jaeger, John Neil, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Jurvelin, Richard Arthur, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Knapp, William Anthony, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Kofoet, Rudolph Lambert, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Lorsung, Norman Ewald, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Maloney, James Russell, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 McCloud, Harry Earl, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Medbery, Wade Eugene, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Meyer, Merel Dean, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Moore, John F., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Moreland, James Douglas, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Muller, Walter Otto, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 O'Kelle, George Willey, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Prestipino, Samuel Anthony, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Schmidt, John III, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Simmons, Carlos Nathaniel, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Stevens, Sherrill Halsey, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Thielen, Edward Joseph, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Thielis, Jerry Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Vossler, Heret Leroy, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Wells, Thomas Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 White, Fay Thomas, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Young, Bernie Lewis, XXX-XX-XXXX.

Majors

Adame, Alberto Arturo, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Akers, Larry Boaders, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Anderson, Frank Raymond, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Angus, Charles Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Ardisson, Richard Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Ash, Sherwood E., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Avent, Julian Glover, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Baker, James Samuel, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Barolet, Francis Alfred, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Barthelness, Robert F., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Beam, Harry Berkley, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Beckman, Randall Mark, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Becker, Frederick Walter, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Benjamin, Ulysee Anthony, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Bennett, Marion Dennis, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Benton, James Alfred, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Black, John Daniel, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Blasche, Theodore Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Bludworth, Robert Stephen, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Boren, James Robert, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Bourque, Michael Bertrand, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Bowers, Anthony James, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Bowers, Leland Craig, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Boys, Paul, Sr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Branstetter, Mason Jay, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Briggs, Duane Archer, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Brimage, Donald R., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Brink, Thomas Logan, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Bryant, Albert Eugene, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Buckley, John Lyons, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Budd, Allen Dean, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Burkett, Maynard Lester, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Byrd, Joe Mack, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Caesar, James Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Campbell, John W., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Capers, Alexander J., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Cardin, Robert Lucien, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Carmichael, Ronald L., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Carroll, Richard Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Cashon, Richard Cole, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Chaney, Jimmie Dale, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Chase, Donald Theron, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Cherry, Jack Marion, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Christine, Steven Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Clary, James Edward III, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Clausen, Dennis James, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Coon, Robert Claude, XXX-XX-XXXX.

Cowell, Richard Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Craven, Grover Oliver, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Creech, Johnny Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Cushman, Stephen Lew, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Dalton, Glenn Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Danby, Arthur Westgarth, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Davis, Donald, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Davis, Regis Walter, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Dawson, William Henry, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Deaver, Ronald E., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Devlin, Michael Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Dickinson, Paul Edwin, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Dinaro, Robert Gino, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Dolan, Dennis Liam, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Dur., George Wilson II, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Edge, Davis Odell, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Eldridge, Gary William, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Elliott, Alfred Henry III, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Embry, James Hastings, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Enyart, Robert Nels, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Erby, Tommy Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Erike, Norman Ray, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Erwin, George M., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Estrada, Arthur Trinidad, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Evans, John Delmar, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Fair, Lawrence Ray, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Fanning, Leo Norman, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Farrow, Phillip Blake, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Flanagan, John Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Foster, Charles Marshall, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Foster, Michael Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Fowled, Ruford Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Frank, Ronald Joe, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Frederic, William John, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Gallaher, Richard Franklin, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Garza, David Arnold, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Gerischer, Barry Phillip, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Gill, Charles Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Ginther, Gene Scott, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Glass, Len Eldon, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Glass, Wayne Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Glessner, Jerry Gene, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Goins, Glenn Scott, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Gordan, David Weldon III, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Gorley, Richard Louis John, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Gray, Randall, Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Grice, Johnny James, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Guynn, Ralph Roger, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Hagemeister, Charles Chris, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Halles, Sherman Ward, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Hampton, James Courtney, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Hanes, Stephen Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Hansch, Peter Karl Hermann, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Harmon, Lee Arthur, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Harper, Stephen D., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Hartwig, Robert Louis, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Harwood, Jerry Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Headley, Jerry Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Healey, Michael Gorton, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Hendleman, James Aaron, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Henry, John Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Henry, Joseph Carl, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Herndon, Carlton Edwin, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Herrick, Emery Louis, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Hethcoat, George Ladd, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Hibl, Kenneth Albert, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Hite, Alfred Javan, XX...
 Hix, Alan Dean, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Holland, Albert Lewis, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Holland, Russell Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Horton, Paul Glen, XX...
 Howe, Gene Carl, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Hurd, Frank Kenneth, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Iler, George Arthur, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Jackson, Michael Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Janus, Jan Dennis, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Jarrett, James R., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Jenkins, Glenn Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Jenkins, Gregory Ross, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Jennings, Lew, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Jersey, William Joseph, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Johnson, Wayne Eugene, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Johnston, Robert Rex, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Jones, Charles Thomas, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Jones, Douglas Ray, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Jones, Robert Ray, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Jordan, William Harold, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Jorgensen, Robert Emil, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Justus, William Stephen, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Kandler, Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX.

Keller, Donald Eugene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kimmer, Henry Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 King, Carl Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kirk, David Clayton, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kirkpatrick, Wayne Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Klopotek, Michael Albert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Knight, Clifford Lynn, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kramer, Robert Stanley, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Krawczyk, Joseph Louis, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kyle, David Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lafever, George Bernard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Laine, Leroy Charles, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Legere, Robert Alan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Leigh, Stuart Layne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lent, Paul Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Leopold, Mark Earle, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lepenske, James Anthony, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lodwig, Steven Harold, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Loper, John Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lossing, Raymond Alvin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lott, Dennis J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lumho, Bobby Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Magers, David Henry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mallett, Bernard, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mandell, Eugene Laurence, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Markham, Frank Bell, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Marlowe, David Herman, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Marshall, Carl Beason, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Martin, Roger Grant, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mason, Manuel William, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Matthews, Marvin Verner, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 McCommon, Lloyd Duane, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McClary, Donald Lindsay, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McClendon, Robert Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McCue, John William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McCullough, Michael Dale, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McDonald, Jerome Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McDowell, David Alexander, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McGowan, Billy James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McMillen, Philip Earl, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McRoberts, Philip Leslie, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Menczer, Stephen Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Merrifield, David Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Millard, Steven L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Miller, John Harold, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Miller, Michael Kent, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mitchell, Robert Vernon, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Monhollen, Edward Lee, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Moody, Steven Joe, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Moore, John Ray, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Morgan, Harold Sherwood, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Morgan, Joseph Bramwell, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Morris, Jack Ray, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Motola, Daniel Albert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mowdy, Thomas Clifton, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mulcahy, Raymond Patrick, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mullins, William Inmon, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Munson, Wayne Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Murtha, Paul Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Muse, James Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Musgrave, Vernie William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nall, Ronnie Will, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nelson, Wayne Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nenninger, Alan Henry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nichols, Daniel Raymond, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nichols, Keith Raymond, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nickle, Robert Ernest O., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Noel, Richard Lane, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Noyes, Phares Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Orr, Robert, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Osterman, Charles Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Page Edward Curtis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Parrington, Richard F., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Parrott, Paul William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pastor, David Anthony, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pearson, Alphonso Howard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pearson, Thomas Richard, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pekema, Andrew Mervin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pittman, Phillip Don, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Plummer, Jerry A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Poston, Daniel Alan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Radford, Charles Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ramsaur, John Barnum, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ratzlaff, Roger Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rausch, Brian George, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rawl, Joseph Heyward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Reid, Eric Pierre, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Reid, Robert Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Richards, James Gomer, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Riley, Michael Owen, XXX-XX-XXXX

Robertson, Francis Blair, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Romaine, Peter John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rorie, Eugene, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ryan, Peter Mark, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Satterfield, Kenneth Troy, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Satterlee, Peter Hamilton, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Scarborough, John Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schattauer, Frederick C., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schmidt, Dennis Ralph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schumacher, Edward Louis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sergeson, James Henry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Shalongo, Daniel William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sheehan, William Henry, III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sheehy, James John, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sheetz, Jerry Lawrence, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Shrude, Jack Warren, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sickler, James Weldon, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Skinner, Herbert Lorenza J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Slawson, John William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Slusser, Sam Marvin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Cecili, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Clarence Alvin, III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Gary Lloyd, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, James Vernon, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, John Merrill, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Richard St. Clair, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, William Lewis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, William Ralph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smyth, Peter Hyde, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Snell, Wilmer Dan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sprayberry, James Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Springer, Barrie Hyde, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stark, Cortland B., XXX-XX-XXXX
 St. John, John Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Straw, Marvin Leroy, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Strickland, Robert Madison, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Strom, Raymond Lester, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sweitzer, Jerry Ray, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Switzer, Warren Homer, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tamm, James Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Taylor, David William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Terry, Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Terrell, Richard Dee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Teters, Richard Lawrence J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Thomson, James Williams, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Thompson, Steven Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tompkins, Charles Edgar, II, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Topping, George Allan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Toy, Wald Douglas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Trent, Donald Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Trussell, Ronald Keith, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tubbs, Thomas Windoes, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tunnell, Rodger Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Turpin, Elmer Harvey, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Urick, Dennis Otto, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Uzelac, Michael John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Vanorden, Fred Joe, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Vanriper, George Glenn, III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Voce, Patrick Francis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wade, Jarrel Blake, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Walding, James Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wallace, John Dudley, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Waller, Luther Omer, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Walters, Glenn Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ward, James Armour, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Warnock, Vernal Gene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wasson, Peter Andrew, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Watkins, Charles G., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Watson, Rodney Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Weaver, Michael Doyle, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Whittaker, Frederick George, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Whitten, Michael Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wicker, Jerome Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wiegand, Kenneth Frank, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wilcox, John Palmer, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Winkler, Campbell Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Witwicki, William Peter, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wolfe, James Ross, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wood, John Pittman, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wood, Scott Gibbon, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Woode, Lawrence Alvin, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Woolwine, Charles Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Yacovou, Gregory Loucas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Young, William Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX

Captains

Campbell, Charles Christop, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Degrasse, Robert Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hagan, Ronald Eugene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 King, Frank Lynn, III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lowman, Charles John, XXX-XX-XXXX

Moore, David Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Shirey, Robert Hobson, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Suozzo, Michael Anthony, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Vongonten, Jimmie Leon, XXX-XX-XXXX

FIELD ARTILLERY
Lieutenant colonels

Baker, John Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Banks, Hayes Bernard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bertish, George David, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Boisseau, Jerry Philip, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Brunick, James Lewis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Casey, William Francis, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Castillo, Victor Ernesto, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Chamberlain, Wayne Justin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cox, James Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Daleo, Francis Bernard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Davis, Harry Lawrence, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dehnel, Curtis Otto, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fiely, Robert Julius, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fitzgerald, Thomas Lloyd I., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fitzsimmons, Ronald Dean, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Floresvillido, Angel Luis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Flynn, Vernon M., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fulmer, Robert Winston, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Glynn, Michael Steven, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Greenwell, Edmund Stephen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Harper, Sanford Eugene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Henderson, Douglas Raymond, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Henderson, James Anthony, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hitzfeld, Larry Otto, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Howard, Billy Joe, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jackson, Avery James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Joyner, James L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kelley, Robert Donald, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Klevith, Willem, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kiser, Joshua Lincoln, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Laferte, Albert Edmond, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lockwood, Charles Jansen J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lopez, Luis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Luente, Raphael, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lunsetter, Wayne Byron, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Manilla, Anthony Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX
 March, James Henry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Martin, Richard Benson, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McClellan, Donald Howard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McConkey, Leroy Russell, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nikotich, George Savo, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nobis, Edwin Nielsen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Novak, John Donald, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pellerano, George, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Peterlin, Frank Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Piram, Joseph Albert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Prokba, Walter Joseph, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pufpaff, Max Eugene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Reeves, Kenneth Earl, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rhoadamer, Frelen Jay, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rivera, Angel Luis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Runnels, David Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schray, Conrad Eugene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sebert, William Keith, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Seibert, Donald David, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Solomon, Alvin Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Taylor, Morris Joe, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Treutel, Frederick Henry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Turk, Thomas Nicholas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Urquhart, John Cheney, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Villarreal, Vivian Jaime, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Weber, Howard Frederick, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wilkie, Robert Leon, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Williams, Rodney Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Youngblood, George L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Yurkas, Gary Elmer, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Zebell, Robert Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX

Majors

Abel, William Arthur, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Abendroth, Terrell Douglas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Adam, Charles Fredric, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Adams, Barry Henry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Adams, Burton Roy, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Adams, Reid Eveson, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Alessi, Robert Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Alexander, George, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Allen, William Ward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Aluag, Steven Roy, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ammendolla, Anthony James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Anderson, David Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Anderson, John David, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Armstrong, William, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Arvin, Charles Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Atwood, Dale Millen, XXX-XX-XXXX

Baddeley, Clayton Eugene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bain, Michael Harvey, XXX-XXXXXX
 Balzer, Frederick Thomas, XXX-XXXXXX
 Barnes, Howard Rodney, XXX-XXXXXX
 Barnes, Paul Lawrence Bott, XXX-XXXXXX
 Bauman, Steven Ray, XXX-XXXXXX
 Baxter, Jackie Lynn, XXX-XXXXXX
 Beauregard, Raymond Levi, XXX-XXXXXX
 Becker, Stephen Charles, XXX-XXXXXX
 Belinge, Clarence Leslie, XXX-XXXXXX
 Benglen, Allan Pierre, XXX-XXXXXX
 Benoit, Michael Leo, XXX-XXXXXX
 Berg, James Andrew, XXX-XXXXXX
 Bertsch, Alfred Otto, XXX-XXXXXX
 Biehl, Gary Milo, XXX-XXXXXX
 Bishop, Gary Lynn, XXX-XXXXXX
 Blacker, Michael Faye, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Black, Charles Michael, XXX-XXXXXX
 Blamey, John Albert, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Blevins, Larry Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bodine, Timothy Ralph, XXX-XXXXXX
 Bollen, Lawrence Allen, Jr., XXX-XXXXXX
 Boring, Charlie Thomas, XXX-XXXXXX
 Bowman, Daniel Louis, XXX-XXXXXX
 Boyd, Jimmy Vance, XXX-XXXXXX
 Bradley, John Peter, XXX-XXXXXX
 Branam, James Dale, XXX-XXXXXX
 Brockway, Charles Richard, XXX-XXXXXX
 Brock, Dennis Leroy, XXX-XXXXXX
 Broughton, Charles Arthur, XXX-XXXXXX
 Browers, Richard Lynn, XXX-XXXXXX
 Brown, Charles, XXX-XXXXXX
 Brown, Douglas Blaine, XXX-XXXXXX
 Brown, Karl Jones, Jr., XXX-XXXXXX
 Brown, Louis Charles, Jr., XXX-XXXXXX
 Brown, Walter Bond, II, XXX-XXXXXX
 Brusstar, James Henry, XXX-XXXXXX
 Bryant, David James, XXX-XXXXXX
 Burch, Gary Lee, XXX-XXXXXX
 Burnette, Ronald James, XXX-XXXXXX
 Burns, Lancy Orr, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Calhoun, David Noel, XXX-XXXXXX
 Campbell, Bryan David, XXX-XXXXXX
 Cannon, Samuel Lee, XXX-XXXXXX
 Carey, Patrick Thomas, XXX-XXXXXX
 Carpenter, Joseph Henry, XXX-XXXXXX
 Carson, John Lee, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Carter, James Melvin, Jr., XXX-XXXXXX
 Carter, William Tran, XXX-XXXXXX
 Cassel, David F., XXX-XXXXXX
 Catlin, Lance Brian, XXX-XXXXXX
 Causey, Windle Ray, XXX-XXXXXX
 Chambers, Jerry Wayne, XXX-XXXXXX
 Cheek, Dwight Clifton, XXX-XXXXXX
 Cherry Norman Reddick, XXX-XXXXXX
 Childress, Phillip Wayne, XXX-XXXXXX
 Christensen, Kjeld Fris, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Christner, James Howard, XXX-XXXXXX
 Christopher, Paul Edward, XXX-XXXXXX
 Cintron, George Ivan, XXX-XXXXXX
 Clark, Dennis Alan, XXX-XXXXXX
 Clements, Francis Anthony, XXX-XXXXXX
 Closkey, Samuel Jay, XXX-XXXXXX
 Coletto, Frank G., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Congrove, Jack Raymond, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Connolly, Raymond John, XXX-XXXXXX
 Cooper, Billy Roy, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Corn, Larry Bert, XXX-XXXXXX
 Coyner, Joe Dunn, Jr., XXX-XXXXXX
 Craven, Douglas Duane, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Croft, Daniel Anderson, XXX-XXXXXX
 Crutchley, Robert Edward J., XXX-XXXXXX
 Culling, Thomas Edwin, XXX-XXXXXX
 Cumbow, Daniel Jackson, XXX-XXXXXX
 Curran, Guy Kirkwold, XXX-XXXXXX
 Davis, Michael Ralph, XXX-XXXXXX
 Dennis, Stephen Smith, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dixon, John Millard, XXX-XXXXXX
 Dowdy, John William, XXX-XXXXXX
 Dubberley, Chester F., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Duitsman, Leighton Lee, XXX-XXXXXX
 Dunn, William Ronald, XXX-XXXXXX
 Dunnam, Gerald Glenn, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Durham, George Allen, Jr., XXX-XXXXXX
 Ehlers, Robert Otto, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Elliott, James Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Elliott, Larry Gilbert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Elton, Gordon Claire, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Eno, John Peter, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Evanitsky, Alex, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Evans, Kenneth Earl, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Faulkenberry, Oscar Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ferrara, Seth Joseph, IV, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Filak, Ronald Walter, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Flanagan, James Patrick, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fluharty, Richard Denver J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Foley, Michael Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Franks, Joe H., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Franzoni, Fred Royce, III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Frecht, John Wallace, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 French, Walter Dwayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Frey, Kurt Matthew, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Friedl, Raymond Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fritz, Charles Walter, III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gaddis, Evan Ray, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Galen, Vincent Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gamber, Robert R., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Garanzuay, Antonio, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gardner, Martin Luther, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Garmon, Patrick Earl, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gibson, Robert Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gilliss, James Melville, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Golly, Leroy Elmo, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gore, Landon Wellington, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Graham, James Edgar, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gray, William Connor, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Greenleaf, Gary George, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Green, Michael Alan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Green, Robert Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Grether, Howard Frank, II, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Griner, William James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Grunseth, Gary Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gunter, Cecil Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hagemann, Ralph Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Halberstadt, Gary Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hall, Richard Malone, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hamilton, Don Breckenridge, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hamlett, Charles Herbert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hannum, Charles Robert, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hanson, James David, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hardy, William Jones, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Harris, Charles Arthur, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Harris, Roger Leland, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Harris, Wayne Frank, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hartley, David Clough, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hawkins, George Arthur, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Helmberg, Arthur Max, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Heit, Richard Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Heillier, Charles Lawrence, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Henson, Jimmie Harding, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hermann, Norbert George, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Herring, Curry Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Herring, John Owen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hester, Robert Vayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Heuschel, Eugene Richard, I, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hicks, Hobert Cornelius, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Higbe, Wayne Jerome, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hiller, James Sidney, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hinman, Walter Leroy, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hinton, Charles Cleveland, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hipp, Robert George, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hollingsworth, Stephen Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Holmes, Harold Herbert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hood, Loren Eugene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hooker, Steven Raymond, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Horton, Robert McLaurin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hovious, Jeffrey Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hudgins, Grover William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hudson, Olin, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hutchinson, John Toland, II, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ingram, Karl Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Iott, Peter Lindy, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jablonski, Edward Stanley, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jackan, Robert George, XXX-XX-XXXX
 James, Gerard Glyn, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jefferson, Kenny Jewell, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Johnson, James Everett, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Johnson, Terry Gian, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Joiner, Thomas Gerard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jones, David Vincent, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jones, James Randall, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kastanek, Larry Joe, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kelley, Gordon Frederick, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kendall, Terry Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kendall, Richard Ira, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kilpatrick, Jimmy Dale, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kimball, Robert Harry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 King Herbert Lee, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kloba, Harold Ronald, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kluender, James Luverne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kollars, Dana J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kregar, David Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lange, Paul Hans, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lazor, John Dale, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Leach, William Powell, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Leeper, Richard Adam, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lehman, Miles Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Linville, James Martin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Little, Charlie, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lively, Garland Ray, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Locke, Joe Henry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Longhi, Frederick Ambrose, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Longobardi, Frank Ralph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lorenz, Ted Martin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Luellig, Paul Joseph, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lutz, Joseph J., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lyman, Richard Howard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 MacDonald, John Stuart, XXX-XX-XXXX
 MacIver, Stuart John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Madayag, Robert Anthony, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Maggard, Sanders Eugene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Magner, Steven William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Malcolm, John William Imhof, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Manning, Tyrus Jerald, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Margueret, Charles Phillip, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Markowski, Michael Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Martin, Daniel Willis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Martin, Larry Dean, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Matejka, Paul Henry, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mauck, Buford William, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mayou, Duane William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McAdoo, Dennis Author, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McAlpine, Robert Watson, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McCarthy, Robert James, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 McCain, Ronald Everett, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McCarty, James Austin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McCord, Harry John Emmins, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McGahee, Harvey William, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 McGaugh, Michael Floyd, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McGraw, Joe Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McKee, Gerald Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McLemore, William Watt, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McNeill, John Joseph, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 McPhaul, Archer Reginald J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 McPherson, Frank Hilton, II, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Meaney, Richard Andrew, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Medrow, Donald Howard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mellen, Paul Clark, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mennig, John Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Meredith, Dennis Manson, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Meull, Gus Martin, II, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Meyer, Alan Roger, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mihailevits, Stephen Otto, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Miller, Calvin Wilson, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Miller, Henry Clinton, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Miller, Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Miller, William Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mills, Stephen Alan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Minihan, Daniel Richard, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mitchell, Bryan David, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mitchell, James Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mitchell, Jon Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mitchell, Otis Dean, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Moench, Frederick Julius, I, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Monk, Joseph P., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Moore, Jerry Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Moore, Otis Dale, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Moore, Paul Russell, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Morris, James Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Morton, Walter Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Moseley, James Wesley, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Moseley, Michael Stephen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Moss, Walter Ralph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Muller, Robert E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Murphy, Michael James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Myers, Ronald Edwin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nabstdt, Robert Emmet, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nakasone, Edwin Minoru, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Neidig, James Barry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nelson, Neil Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nesbitt, Woodrow Malcolm, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Neumann, Glenn Bruce, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Norman, Marshall Ray, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nulle, Theodore Louis, Sr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ober, George Curry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ogle, Glenn Alton, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Osborn, Jonathan Merwin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Palmquist, Robert James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Parker, Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Parmelee, Michael Stephen, XXX-XX-XXXX

Parrish, William H., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Paterson, Michael Louis, XXXX-XXXX
 Patrick, Victor Kenneth, XXXX-XXXX
 Patton, Jackie W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pavlak, Robert Terry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Payne, Max Deon, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pederson, Richard Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pereira, John Anthony, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Perry, Howard Samuel, III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Peterson, David Roland, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pettus, Terry Tyrone, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pfaltzgraff, Dennis Gerald, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Plimble, Charles Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pino, Antonio Louis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Popham, Dan Russell, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Prentice, David John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Prichard, Joe Douglas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pruzkowski, Robert Frank, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pullum, Hallday Mason, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Radnoti, Dennis Lyn, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Radvanyi, Nicholas Alan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Raper, Douglas Lane, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Redding, Terrence Russel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Reid, Ronald T., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Reimer, George Matthew, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Retta, Lawrence Roland, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Reynolds, William Marshall, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rhoades, George Howard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rich, David Francis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Richartz, John Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rinehart, Brian A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ring, James Elsworth, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rodgers, John Wade, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rogers, Morris Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Roth, Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Routon, John Everett, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sangermano, Albert Vincent, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sasin, Billy Ray, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schierenbeck, Everett E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schneider, Ronald Darrell, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schooley, Ronald Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schreiber, Donald A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schwartz, David Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schwartz, Gregory Phillip, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schwepp, Herbert Ernest, J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Scott, Donald Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Scott, Donald Ray, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Seeger, Lawrence Clinton, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Shannahan, Norman Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Shaw, Alan Hume, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Shaw Ralph William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Shelton, Jerry Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Shpkowsky, Thomas Adam, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sinclair, Thomas James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Singleton, Peter, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sloot, William Wynand, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Slucher, Albert Eugene, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smalls, Freddie, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smeltzer, Stanley St. Clair, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Don Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Gary Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Jude Klenert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Lawrence Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Snider, Bill G., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Soule, Peter Ernest, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Southard, Lee Drummond, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Spangler, Paul David, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Spiczak, George Roman, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Staats, James Richard, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Standley, John Millard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stapleton, Robert Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Starnes, James Lamarr, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stecco, Johnny Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stefanovic, Dragan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stillwell, Robert Clay, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stout, Charles Russell, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sudman, Kent William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tanks, David Ralph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tavares, Richard John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Taylor, Larry Lewis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Taylor, Richard Pentreath, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Teague, Charles Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tennant, Clifton Oliver, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Thompson, William Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Thomas, Guy Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Thomas, Michael Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Thomas, Stephen George, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Thorpe, Donald Alan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tice, Vernon Leroy, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tichauer, Francis Anthony, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tillman, William Lane, XXX-XX-XXXX

Tilley, Richard Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Timberlake, Ronald Nell, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tranfaglia, Louis Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Trinca, Gino Jay, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Troyan, Nicholas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tubbs, William George, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Turlington, Richard C., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Turner, Gerald Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Turner, Otis Haley, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tyree, Richard Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Uzzle, Donnie Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Veltin, Michael Edmond, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wade, Gary Howard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wagner, Robert Floyd, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Waldron, Michael Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Walker, Cyrus Dexter, III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Walker, Samuel Pryor, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Walker, Thomas Gorham, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wallace, Tommy Rodger, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Walsh, Sean George, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wassamire, Warren William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Waters, Harry Everett, III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Weatherford, John Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Webb, Phillip Harvey, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wedge, Charles Hurley, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wehr, John Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 West, Herbert, III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Whisenant, Billy Foster, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Whiteley, William Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Whitson, John Anthony, XXX-XX-XXXX
 White, William Joseph, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Widman, Ronald Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wigelsworth, Jesse Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wilbert, William Edmund, II, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wilgen, Michael Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wilkerson, Ronnie Eugene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wilkes, Randell Lester, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Willey, Charles William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Williams, Edgar DeWitt, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Williams, James Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Williams, Jerry Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Williams, Robert Gerald, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wilson, Loran Carl, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Woolard, Claude Eugene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Worley, Ralph Steven, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Worthington, Dale Harley, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wozencraft, Thomas Dean, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wynne, Frank Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Yacovitch, Paul Nicholas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Yaksic, Paul Miller, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Yenchesky, Roy Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Yowell, Robert Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Zacchetti, David Alan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Zahorsky, Michael, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Zavec, Leslie William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Zawilski, Robert Walter, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Zebehazy, Julius Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Zeller, Joseph Louis, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX

Captains

Barlow, Kenneth Arlen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cantrell, Alvin Douglas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Carter, James Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Grabowski, Michael Keith, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Green, Frank Grayson, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Harshman, Max Murray, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Holland, George Chalmers, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Janssens, James P., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jowers, Gus Eric, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Keenan, Robert Arthur, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Knighten, Larry Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Korzeniewski, Joseph G., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lundman, Donald Grant, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Merchen, Lee A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nell, Paul Ernest, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pylett, Ray Gene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Robideaux, Richard Lloyd, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schucker, Michael Brannon, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Shannon, Walter Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Theodore John, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Taylor, Fred Canady, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Unterseher, James Ervin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Warne, Douglas Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Williams, Gary Loring, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wilson, John William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wong, Sanford, XXX-XX-XXXX

INFANTRY

Lieutenant colonels

Adkinson, Michael Harold, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Aiken, George Franklin, XXX-XX-XXXX

Ashton, Guthrie Henry, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bailey, Edward Elmore, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bellfi, Donnie Dale, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bergin, Donald Staunton, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Betha, Edwin Arthur, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Blankenship, John Daniel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Boles, Bennie Carroll, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bonthuis, Robert Earl, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Boykin, John Timothy, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Brown, Bruce Livingstone, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Burke, Robert John, X...
 Burrier, William Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Campbell, Gerald Ray, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Carey, Richard Arthur, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Carrier, William S., III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Clark, Fredrick Marshall, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Colegrove, Leslie H., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cooper, Russell Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cox, Laddie Manson, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Craig, James Ball, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Crescioni, Charles Raymond, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dahlquist, Gordon William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Davis, Melvin Lindon, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Doble, John George, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dunagan, Kern Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Durham, Hugh Clinton, III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Erwin, Hamilton, III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fajardo, Wallace Antonio, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ferguson, William Carlton, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fernandez, Walter Eugene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gardner, Richard Antone, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gibson, William Edgar, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Harper, Philip Ryan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hayman, Jack Harold, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hoffner, T. Davison, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Holmond, Joe Louis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Holston, William Wesley, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Howell, Marquis Dwight, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hutson, Tommy Mack, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jacobs, Irard Eugene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 James, Lonnlie, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 James, Tommie Preston, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Johnson, Edward Ossian, III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Johnson, Larry Earl, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jones, Thomas Joe, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Keshel, Donald Jon, XX...
 Kinkead, Alfred William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Knight, Linwood Polk, Jr., XX...
 Kramel, Glenn Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Krause, Dieter Wilhelm, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Latos, Christos, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lawson, Lott, III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lindbom, Daniel Ralph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mark, Michael Ellison, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Martinez, Luis Enrique, XX...
 Matthews, Carlos Milton, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McAnaw, John Patrick, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McCarthy, Brian Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McHugh, Bernard John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McInnis, Charles Wayne, XX...
 Mitchell, Walter Glenn, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Moore, John Terrell, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Moore, Michael Andre, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Morse, Edward Douglas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Munsey, Jackson Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Murphy, John Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Murphy, Johnnie, Levi, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Myers, William Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nixon, Paul Edward, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ott, Ray Myron, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Patterson, John Stone, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Perez, Felix Eloy, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Peterson, Larry Dean, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Phelps, Randal Keith, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pierce, Niles, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pounder, Dennis Joseph, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Powell, Luther Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rodriguez, Luis Orlando, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Roof, William Ray, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Royal, Gerald Clifford, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sabatini, John Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sabitsch, Albert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Saylor, James Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schultz, Edward E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Shankles, Harold Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Shibao, Lincoln Hiroshi, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sinor, Donald Ray, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, James A., III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stepanovitch, Sava M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sullivan, William Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sutcliffe, Bruce Edwin, XX...

Thomas, Gerald Erskine, [REDACTED]
 Torres, Victor Manuel, [REDACTED]
 Tyler, Fielding Lewis, [REDACTED]
 Ussery, Freddie Joe, [REDACTED]
 Vanveck, James Edgar, [REDACTED]
 Walterhouse, Richard Allen, [REDACTED]
 Ware, Lesly Franklin, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Wartick, Dean P., [REDACTED]
 Watson, Jacob Turner Alvin, [REDACTED]
 Weaver, John Cornelious, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Welch, Terry John, [REDACTED]
 White, Robert Curtis, [REDACTED]
 Whitney, Charles William, [REDACTED]
 Williams, Robert Thomas, [REDACTED]
 Williams, William David, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Worthington, Gerald Ray, [REDACTED]
 Young, James Albert, [REDACTED]

Majors

Abdalla, Steven Joseph, [REDACTED]
 Abell, James Michael, [REDACTED]
 Abraham, Robert Eugene, [REDACTED]
 Acevedo, Ramon, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Adams, Robert Harold, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Allen, Claude Wayne, [REDACTED]
 Allen, Donald Ray, [REDACTED]
 Allen, Ernest Richard, [REDACTED]
 Allen, Norman R., [REDACTED]
 Anderson, James R., [REDACTED]
 Anderson, Terry L., [REDACTED]
 Andrews, Robert Edward, [REDACTED]
 Arndt, Victor Everett, [REDACTED]
 Artis, James Alex, [REDACTED]
 Asselin, William Stewart, [REDACTED]
 Babb, Joe P., [REDACTED]
 Baber, Steve A., [REDACTED]
 Babiazz, Francis E., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Bailey, Linwood P., [REDACTED]
 Baker, Breman Wayne, [REDACTED]
 Baker, Clifford Darrell, [REDACTED]
 Barker, William Russell, [REDACTED]
 Barnes, McArthur, [REDACTED]
 Barnes, Thomas Russell, [REDACTED]
 Barrows, Robert Lawrence, [REDACTED]
 Barth, David Frederick, [REDACTED]
 Baskett, Kenneth Gerald, [REDACTED]
 Bass, Garry Michael, [REDACTED]
 Basso, George, [REDACTED]
 Batts, William Craig, [REDACTED]
 Baum, Bradford Earl, [REDACTED]
 Bays, Eddie Lamar, [REDACTED]
 Beck, Albert Terry, [REDACTED]
 Bedard, Paul David, [REDACTED]
 Bedsole, Jimmy Owens, [REDACTED]
 Behrens, William Allen, [REDACTED]
 Benezra, Marc Theodore, [REDACTED]
 Berns, David Gregory, [REDACTED]
 Berndt, Irwin Richard, [REDACTED]
 Bernhardt, Eugene David, [REDACTED]
 Besaw, John Henry, [REDACTED]
 Betts, Charles Harold, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Biddle, Michael Bruce, [REDACTED]
 Birchett, Esca Carrendun, I., [REDACTED]
 Birdsell, John Edmond, III, [REDACTED]
 Blanks, Herbert Elliot, [REDACTED]
 Blevins, Russell Ray, [REDACTED]
 Bloxom, John Lynn, [REDACTED]
 Bodine, Phillip Eugene, [REDACTED]
 Boger, Gene Shelby, [REDACTED]
 Bonti, Gerald Matthew, [REDACTED]
 Bowens, Charley Wesley, [REDACTED]
 Brabston, Douglas Kent, [REDACTED]
 Bradshaw, James Harlan, [REDACTED]
 Brakel, Garvin Forrest, [REDACTED]
 Braymiller, Charles John, [REDACTED]
 Brayton, Jack Leonard, [REDACTED]
 Brickley, Richard Dean, [REDACTED]
 Brisson, Robert Francis, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Britt, John Oscar, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Broccoll, Chester Edward, [REDACTED]
 Brooks, James Hoyt, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Brosnan, John Denis, [REDACTED]
 Brown, Clarence Richard, [REDACTED]
 Brown, Wallace Patrick, [REDACTED]
 Browne, Harvey Seymour, IV, [REDACTED]
 Burckard, Albert Palmer, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Burke, George Ernest, [REDACTED]
 Burruss, Lewis H., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Butler, Allen Dawson, [REDACTED]
 Butler, Ronald Gene, [REDACTED]

Byers, Larry William, [REDACTED]
 Caballero, Gabino Joseph J., [REDACTED]
 Cabler, Jimmy Lewes, [REDACTED]
 Calloway, Cecil Barnett, [REDACTED]
 Calvert, Ronald Martin, [REDACTED]
 Campbell, Charles Ray, [REDACTED]
 Carbonetti, Stephen Alan, [REDACTED]
 Carlson, Carsten Dean, [REDACTED]
 Carpenter, James Calvin, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Carrell, Daniel Lloyd, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Carroll, Timothy D., [REDACTED]
 Carswell, Harril Dwight, [REDACTED]
 Carter, Donald Anthony, [REDACTED]
 Carter, Herbert Ray, [REDACTED]
 Casler, Paul Melvin, [REDACTED]
 Cathey, David Neal, [REDACTED]
 Cavanaugh, Michael B., [REDACTED]
 Chapman, Charles Ralph, [REDACTED]
 Chapman, William Massey, [REDACTED]
 Charity, George Oliver, III, [REDACTED]
 Chef, Kenneth Wayne, [REDACTED]
 Childress, Craig, Mason, [REDACTED]
 Clark, John N., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Clark, Thomas E., [REDACTED]
 Christiansen, Henry Robert, [REDACTED]
 Clements, Dale Clifford, [REDACTED]
 Cole, Gene West, [REDACTED]
 Collier, William Huett, [REDACTED]
 Colvin, William Larry, [REDACTED]
 Conner, David Leroy, [REDACTED]
 Connors, Harry Lloyd, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Cook, Gregory Lee, [REDACTED]
 Cooper, Michael Clark, [REDACTED]
 Cordrey, Ted David, [REDACTED]
 Cowles, Robert Lowell, [REDACTED]
 Craven, Randall Eugene, [REDACTED]
 Creekmur, David Allan, [REDACTED]
 Crockett, James, [REDACTED]
 Cumba, Raymond, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Cummins, Thomas Mathew, [REDACTED]
 Dadek, William Joseph, [REDACTED]
 Dalton, Dennis Matthew, [REDACTED]
 Dangerfield, Harvey Douglas, [REDACTED]
 Danio, Roger Gary, [REDACTED]
 Davison, William James, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Davis, Clalborne Watkins, [REDACTED]
 Davis, Ronald M., [REDACTED]
 Davis, Terry William, [REDACTED]
 Deegan, James Lester, [REDACTED]
 Degelo, Gary Joseph, [REDACTED]
 Degrange, David Clark, [REDACTED]
 Demaria, Matthew Anthony, [REDACTED]
 Derobertis, Rocco, [REDACTED]
 Detunco, Edward Robert, [REDACTED]
 Detwiler, James Edward, [REDACTED]
 Devault, Steven Edward, [REDACTED]
 Dickens, Frederick Wayne, [REDACTED]
 Dimercurio, Peter Nansen, [REDACTED]
 Dinning, Robert Ira, [REDACTED]
 Doane, John Busby, [REDACTED]
 Dobson, Edgar Lamar, [REDACTED]
 Dodd, Clarence Edward, [REDACTED]
 Dodd, Denis Ray, [REDACTED]
 Doherty, Donald Lee, [REDACTED]
 Donahue, John Christopher, [REDACTED]
 Dorer, John Richard, [REDACTED]
 Dorney, Michael Joseph, [REDACTED]
 Douthitt, Thomas L., [REDACTED]
 Dowling, Charles Robert, [REDACTED]
 Duckett, John Thomas, III, [REDACTED]
 Dulina, Andrew Stanley, III, [REDACTED]
 Duncan, Billy Alfred, [REDACTED]
 Durre, Jerry Herman, [REDACTED]
 Dyer, James Everett, [REDACTED]
 Easterling, William Sidney, [REDACTED]
 Edelman, Richard Edward, [REDACTED]
 Edwards, Marion Eugene, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Eggleston, Robert Allan, [REDACTED]
 Eisaman, Harry William, [REDACTED]
 Elmeer, Phillip Sixten, [REDACTED]
 Elms, Randle David, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Engle, John Jehu, [REDACTED]
 Etheridge, Ted Dudley, [REDACTED]
 Evans, Douglas Dale, [REDACTED]
 Evans, Elbert Franklin, [REDACTED]
 Evans, Richard Smith, [REDACTED]
 Everett, Richard Addison, [REDACTED]
 Favorite, Ralph Sidney, [REDACTED]
 Fedde, Carl Bernhard, [REDACTED]
 Fesler, William Ralph, [REDACTED]

Fetig, James Lee, [REDACTED]
 Filippini, William John, [REDACTED]
 Finch, Joseph Richard, [REDACTED]
 Finley, Harley V., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Flagg, Ernest Bruce, [REDACTED]
 Flaherty, James Francis, [REDACTED]
 Fletcher, Charles Isaac, [REDACTED]
 Flynn, James, [REDACTED]
 Foley, David Leroy, [REDACTED]
 Ford, Barry Clayton, [REDACTED]
 Ford, Charles Jared, [REDACTED]
 Foster, Benjamin Franklin, [REDACTED]
 Foster, Howard Lee, [REDACTED]
 Foster, Hugh Franklin, III, [REDACTED]
 Fox, Terry Alan, [REDACTED]
 Franco, Alexander John, [REDACTED]
 Frazier, Douglas Pemberton, [REDACTED]
 Frazier, J. C., [REDACTED]
 Frederick, Donald Pomeroy, [REDACTED]
 Fredericks, Steven Craig, [REDACTED]
 Friday, William Paul, [REDACTED]
 Friend, Allen James, [REDACTED]
 Fritsche, Charlie Michael, [REDACTED]
 Fulcher, John Timothy, [REDACTED]
 Fulks, Terry Wesley, [REDACTED]
 Gammill, William Owen, [REDACTED]
 Garcia, Francisco Juan, [REDACTED]
 Gary, Lloyd Dain, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Gaudie, Lyman Ernest, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Gauthier, Gary Lee, [REDACTED]
 Gay, Rickey J., [REDACTED]
 Geishauser, Anthony John, [REDACTED]
 Georgeff, Robert Joseph, [REDACTED]
 Gilbertson, Stephen Howard, [REDACTED]
 Gilley, Arthur Troy, [REDACTED]
 Giantz, Robert Bruce, [REDACTED]
 Giannon, William Augustine, [REDACTED]
 Giosup, Harold Lynn, [REDACTED]
 Golden, Edgar Abram, [REDACTED]
 Gonzalez, Juan Francisco, [REDACTED]
 Goodman, Gil Monroe, [REDACTED]
 Goodnight, John Franklin, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Goodson, Charles Willis, [REDACTED]
 Goode, Ross Carl, [REDACTED]
 Goodwin, Lewis Paul, III, [REDACTED]
 Grabham, Robert Wayne, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Graef, Calvin Robert, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Graham, James Joseph, [REDACTED]
 Granberry, Glenn Earl, [REDACTED]
 Gray, Phillip, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Greene, Burton Albert, [REDACTED]
 Greenwood, Dean Arden, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Grey, James Preston, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Griffin, James Xavier, [REDACTED]
 Groppel, Thomas Lee, [REDACTED]
 Grose, Franklin Leroy, [REDACTED]
 Grove, Edwin William, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Gunter, Clifton, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Gurany, Ernie Haashim, [REDACTED]
 Gwynn, Eugene Timothy, [REDACTED]
 Hampton, Robert Dan, [REDACTED]
 Hansen, Norman Arden, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Hanson, Robert John, [REDACTED]
 Harbison, James William, [REDACTED]
 Harmes, Michael Henry, [REDACTED]
 Harmon, Fern Walker, [REDACTED]
 Harris, Donald Lee, [REDACTED]
 Hart, John Joseph, [REDACTED]
 Harte, Carl Robert, [REDACTED]
 Harvey, Charles Eugene, [REDACTED]
 Hase, Robert Paul, [REDACTED]
 Hatton, Fredrick Donald, [REDACTED]
 Haugen, Warren Peter, [REDACTED]
 Hawthorne, Arthur Earl, [REDACTED]
 Hazzard, Billy Eugene, [REDACTED]
 Heacox, Milton Leroy, [REDACTED]
 Heath, Frederick Warner, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Helmiling, Richard Thomas, [REDACTED]
 Henderson, Darrell Thomas, [REDACTED]
 Henderson, Sammy Dwight, [REDACTED]
 Hendricks, James Curtis, [REDACTED]
 Hendricks, John Thomas, [REDACTED]
 Henrickson, Jon Oscar, [REDACTED]
 Henry, Robert John, [REDACTED]
 Herrman, Nelson Randolph, [REDACTED]
 Hersant, Charles John, [REDACTED]
 Hesselgesser, Gary Ross, [REDACTED]
 Hetler, Douglas Willard, [REDACTED]
 Hicks, Kenneth David, [REDACTED]
 Higgins, Larry Bronson, [REDACTED]
 Highfill, Jerry Roy, [REDACTED]

Hildebrandt, Siegfried, II, [REDACTED]
 Hill, Dorsey O'Neal, [REDACTED]
 Hill, Mark William, [REDACTED]
 Hill, Stephen Metcalf, [REDACTED]
 Hinojosa, Israel, [REDACTED]
 Hinton, Jesse Junious, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Hirsch, Dennis Mac, [REDACTED]
 Hissong, Curtis James, [REDACTED]
 Hite, John Theodore, [REDACTED]
 Hodge, Thomas Wayne, [REDACTED]
 Hodson, Michael Edward, [REDACTED]
 Holland, William Lawrence, [REDACTED]
 Hollins, John Earl, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Holt, Richard Lamar, [REDACTED]
 Honrath, Joseph Edward, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Howard, Haskell Linden, [REDACTED]
 Howard, Joseph Chester, [REDACTED]
 Howard, Robert Lewis, [REDACTED]
 Hubbard, Gary Lowell, [REDACTED]
 Huffman, Johnny Wayne, [REDACTED]
 Hughes, Edmund Earl, III, [REDACTED]
 Hughes, Thomas John, [REDACTED]
 Hummel, Terrance James, [REDACTED]
 Hunt, James Ronald, [REDACTED]
 Hunt, Joseph Forrest, [REDACTED]
 Hunter, James Leonard, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Huntington, Clayton Earl, [REDACTED]
 Hyder, William Richard, [REDACTED]
 Hyland, John David, [REDACTED]
 Hyslop, Leland Eugene, [REDACTED]
 Iacovoni, Roger Anthony, [REDACTED]
 Ingraham, Charles Lewis, [REDACTED]
 Jachmann, Bruno Heinz, [REDACTED]
 Jackson, Carleton Warner, [REDACTED]
 Jackson, John Francis, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Jackson, Larry Keith, [REDACTED]
 Jacobi, Michael Matthew, [REDACTED]
 Jaeger, Thomas Wayne, [REDACTED]
 Jakubowski, Joseph Michael, [REDACTED]
 Janous, William James, [REDACTED]
 Japak, Brian Anthony, [REDACTED]
 Jarry, Jacques, [REDACTED]
 Jasper, Franklin Delano R., [REDACTED]
 Jean, Maynard Ray, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Jellen, Lawrence Richard, [REDACTED]
 Jenkins, James Russell, [REDACTED]
 Jennings, Michael Rex, [REDACTED]
 Jeppeson, Martin Peter, [REDACTED]
 Jobe, Dwight Leon, [REDACTED]
 Johnson, Clarence Edward, [REDACTED]
 Johnson, Jesse Lee, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Johnson, Robert Lee, [REDACTED]
 Johnston, Joseph Wayne, [REDACTED]
 Jones, James Samuel, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Jones, Thomas Lex, [REDACTED]
 Jones, Waverly Phillip, [REDACTED]
 Jordan, Adolphus Waverly, [REDACTED]
 Jordan, Larry Dale, [REDACTED]
 Joslyn, Richard Joseph, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Judd, Dastel Neil, [REDACTED]
 Jurgensen, Charles Edward, [REDACTED]
 Just, Edward Arthur, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Justice, James Cleon, [REDACTED]
 Kaczynski, Drest, [REDACTED]
 Kaminski, Roger Lewis, [REDACTED]
 Keck, Michael Barry, [REDACTED]
 Keller, Jackie, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Keiller, Ronald A., [REDACTED]
 Kelley, Claude Peter, [REDACTED]
 Kendall, Clifford Peter, [REDACTED]
 Killam, David Wendell, [REDACTED]
 Kimball, Donald Collier, [REDACTED]
 King, Larry Cecil, [REDACTED]
 King, Michael Leonard, [REDACTED]
 Kiyohara, Ikuro, [REDACTED]
 Klarnet, Frank John, [REDACTED]
 Klesen, Joseph Lansing, [REDACTED]
 Kilin, James Martin, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Kolb, Karl Gunnar, [REDACTED]
 Korfnage, William, [REDACTED]
 Kresho, Mark, [REDACTED]
 Kropf, Dennis Kay, [REDACTED]
 Kuehl, Steven Duane, [REDACTED]
 Kurtzman, Jackson Robert, [REDACTED]
 Lacount, Victor Frederick, [REDACTED]
 Lafleur, Ronald Richard, [REDACTED]
 Lake, Francis Xavier, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Lamb, Kenneth Robert, [REDACTED]
 Lanning, David Earl, [REDACTED]
 Lastrapes, Charles Louis, [REDACTED]
 Latham, Joe Banks, [REDACTED]

Latta, Kenneth Carlton, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Lawton, Johann Richard, [REDACTED]
 Lazor, Joseph Anthony, [REDACTED]
 Leahy, Paul Patrick, [REDACTED]
 Ledors, Frederick Dale, [REDACTED]
 Lee, Michael Kenneth, [REDACTED]
 Lee, Robert Dennis, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Lee, Robert Merrill, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Lee, Thomas J., [REDACTED]
 Legrice, Kenneth F., Jr., [REDACTED]
 Lehmann, Carl Friedrich, [REDACTED]
 Lents, Miklos Attila, [REDACTED]
 Leslie, David Edward, [REDACTED]
 Lester, James Edward, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Lettre, Marcel John, [REDACTED]
 Levasseur, Richard Albert, [REDACTED]
 Lichtneger, Robert William, [REDACTED]
 Linnane, Michael Don, [REDACTED]
 Little, Donald Ray, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Litton, Joseph Paul, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Litton, Roger Louis, [REDACTED]
 Lockard, Robert Alvin, [REDACTED]
 Lockhart, Henry Dillard, II, [REDACTED]
 Lovelace, Douglas Clayton, [REDACTED]
 Lowe, John Walter, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Lowman, Raymond Paul, II, [REDACTED]
 Lucas, Thomas Walton, [REDACTED]
 Lugo, Roberto Olivera, [REDACTED]
 Lunsford, Daniel Charles, [REDACTED]
 Lyle, Richard Timothy, [REDACTED]
 Lyons, Stanley Mark, [REDACTED]
 Mabe, Thomas Lee, [REDACTED]
 Macey, Richard Lloyd, [REDACTED]
 Macey, Thomas Allen, [REDACTED]
 Machnicki, Walter Roger, [REDACTED]
 Magno, Michael Oren, [REDACTED]
 Mague, Michael, [REDACTED]
 Maldonado, Eugene Jerome, [REDACTED]
 Maltais, Richard Thomas, [REDACTED]
 Markiewicz, Ronald Edward, [REDACTED]
 Marr, James Dennis, [REDACTED]
 Martin, Herman Eugene, [REDACTED]
 Martin, Ronald Stanley, [REDACTED]
 Martin, Terry Edward, [REDACTED]
 Martiny, Richard John, [REDACTED]
 Massmann, Peter W., [REDACTED]
 Maxwell, Donald Ray, [REDACTED]
 May, John William, [REDACTED]
 May, Joseph Allian, [REDACTED]
 Mays, John Remy, [REDACTED]
 Mazikowski, Arthur Wayne, [REDACTED]
 McCabe, Lawrence Samuel, Jr., [REDACTED]
 McCabe, Douglas Jolly, [REDACTED]
 McClelland, Harold Edward, [REDACTED]
 McCord, James Henry, [REDACTED]
 McCutchan, John Robert, [REDACTED]
 McDaniel, John Sidney, [REDACTED]
 McDonald, David Francis, [REDACTED]
 McDonnell, Donald Francis, [REDACTED]
 McDowell, Richard James, [REDACTED]
 McGrew, Danny Glen, [REDACTED]
 McKeegan, Thomas John, Jr., [REDACTED]
 McKenna, George Ward, [REDACTED]
 McKinney, Dan Howard, [REDACTED]
 McLean, Floyd William, Jr., [REDACTED]
 McMahon, Timothy Leland, [REDACTED]
 McNab, Michael Craig, [REDACTED]
 McSpadden, Jimmy Glen, [REDACTED]
 Meade, Randolph, [REDACTED]
 Meeks, Thomas Vertis, [REDACTED]
 Menendez, Angel Severino, [REDACTED]
 Mercadante, John Frank, [REDACTED]
 Metzger, Harold Vernon, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Meyer, Gary George, [REDACTED]
 Meyer, Walter Woodrow, [REDACTED]
 Milburn, Stephen George, [REDACTED]
 Mildenstein, Arlo Junior, [REDACTED]
 Mills, Terry Alan, [REDACTED]
 Milner, Robert Allen, [REDACTED]
 Mishler, Harold Elmer, [REDACTED]
 Mitchell, Melvin Curtiss, [REDACTED]
 Mitchener, James Earl, [REDACTED]
 Monahan, Edward Michael, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Money, Isaac Leon, [REDACTED]
 Monson, Lyle Donald, Sr., [REDACTED]
 Montgomery, Dennis Jay, [REDACTED]
 Moore, Jerry Lambert, [REDACTED]
 Moore, Joel Roger, [REDACTED]
 Moore, Kenneth Dewayne, [REDACTED]
 Morehouse, James Allyn, [REDACTED]
 Morey, Gerald Lee, [REDACTED]
 Morretta, Salvatore Robert, [REDACTED]
 Morris, Terry Roger, [REDACTED]
 Morrison, Charles Michael, [REDACTED]
 Morrow, William John, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Mucha, Martin Gail, [REDACTED]
 Muendel, Edmund Frank, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Muhler, Edward Gordon, [REDACTED]
 Mulholland, Russell J., [REDACTED]
 Murdock, David Emmitt, [REDACTED]
 Murphy, Daniel John, [REDACTED]
 Murphy, John Paul, [REDACTED]
 Murray, Oliver Eddie, [REDACTED]
 Murrow, Samuel Corpening, [REDACTED]
 Musgrave, Thomas Edmund, [REDACTED]
 Myers, Brooke William, [REDACTED]
 Myers, John Columba, [REDACTED]
 Myers, Robert Clyde, [REDACTED]
 Mylett, Clifford Daniel, [REDACTED]
 Nakashima, Miles Eric, [REDACTED]
 Necessary, Douglas Harding, [REDACTED]
 Neil, Richard George, [REDACTED]
 Nelson, Eric James, [REDACTED]
 Nelson, Richard Norman, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Noll, William Nelson, [REDACTED]
 Norberg, Michael Keith, [REDACTED]
 Obriant, Francis Hogan II, [REDACTED]
 Odom, Robert Nell, [REDACTED]
 O'Donnell, David Earl, [REDACTED]
 O'Keefe, Robert Raymond, [REDACTED]
 Olson, James Allen, [REDACTED]
 Olson, Merlin Harvey, [REDACTED]
 Oman, Jon Richens, [REDACTED]
 Ooley, John Everett, [REDACTED]
 Oosterhuis, John Richard, [REDACTED]
 Osborn, James Estel, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Osimo, Ronald Edward, [REDACTED]
 O'Sullivan, John Ignatius, [REDACTED]
 Overurf, Kenneth Leroy, [REDACTED]
 Owen, Evan Leslie, [REDACTED]
 Palmer, Bernard Paul, Sr., [REDACTED]
 Palmer, Dennis Dean, [REDACTED]
 Parker, Hayes Duncan, [REDACTED]
 Parker, Ronald Peter, [REDACTED]
 Parpart, Juergen Helmut, [REDACTED]
 Parr, Jack Dean, [REDACTED]
 Parson, William Donald, [REDACTED]
 Parthemore, Richard R., [REDACTED]
 Pasquarelli, Timothy L., [REDACTED]
 Patalano, Francis Frederic, [REDACTED]
 Patterson, Harry Owen, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Patton, Melvin Henry, [REDACTED]
 Penny, James Warren, [REDACTED]
 Peterson, Henry Bruce, [REDACTED]
 Peterson, Robert Dale, [REDACTED]
 Picasso, Bartholomew D., [REDACTED]
 Picco, David Joseph, [REDACTED]
 Pierce, William F., [REDACTED]
 Piet, Stanley David, [REDACTED]
 Pifer, Richard Gail, [REDACTED]
 Pike, Randall Ross, [REDACTED]
 Pillows, Elbert Lee, [REDACTED]
 Pittman, Paul McKinley, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Pizzano, Brian Vincent, [REDACTED]
 Plummer, Douglas Edward, [REDACTED]
 Pogue, Larry Hale, [REDACTED]
 Pollard, William Everett, [REDACTED]
 Polster, Wayne Michael, [REDACTED]
 Porter, Bruce Edward, [REDACTED]
 Porter, John Phillip, [REDACTED]
 Potter, Billy Hershel, [REDACTED]
 Pouncey, John Edward, [REDACTED]
 Presley, Bruce Wayne, [REDACTED]
 Price, Ulyess Douglas, [REDACTED]
 Pride, Lawson Raymond, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Pritchett, Jerry Don, [REDACTED]
 Pruette, Ronnie Ray, [REDACTED]
 Pryor, Jack H., [REDACTED]
 Pursche, Allen Carl, [REDACTED]
 Rachal, Daniel William, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Rallo, Joseph John, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Rankin, Ronald William, [REDACTED]
 Raymer, Doyle Lynn, [REDACTED]
 Reavis, Lomie Carl, [REDACTED]
 Reese, Wesley Dale, [REDACTED]
 Reimold, David Lawrence, [REDACTED]
 Rice, Harry Kirby, Jr., [REDACTED]
 Richards, Donald George, [REDACTED]
 Riley, Joseph Ralph, [REDACTED]
 Riney, Dan Curtis, [REDACTED]

Risovi, Gerald Vincent, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Riverasanchez, Miguel A., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Roach, James Stevens, Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Roberts, Richard Wayne, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Roberts, Robert Carleton J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Robison, Berry, II, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rodgers, Donald Thornton, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rooney, James Walter, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Ross, John Bond, III, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Roth, Ray Lynn, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rounsville, Peter Jay, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Roux, Ronald Lionel, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Roy, Thomas Michael, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Salmon, Lawrence Regis, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sander, Royal William, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sanders, Richard Anderson, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sanger, Jasper J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sapp, Robert Edgar, Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sariego, Alan Juan, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sather, Thomas David, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sathre, Victor MacDonald, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Schliep, Raymond Walter, Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Schlegel, John Edward, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Schneickert, George David, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Scott, Mitchell Dewitt, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sebright, David Clare, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sellers, Jesse Clarence, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Seybold, Calvin, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Shadoan, Robert P., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Shanks, Charles William, Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Shannon, Jackie Howard, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Shannon, John Christie, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Shaulis, Albert Anthony, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Shea, John Michael, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Shelton, Dorwin Lynn, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Shellabarger, Dennis Myers, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sheppard, David Alan, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Shirk, William Larry, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Showalter, Kent Amos, Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Shuman, Wallace Byrd, Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sigle, Rodney Lincoln, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Silkett, Wayne Arnold, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Silva, John Leonard, Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Simmons, Thomas Robert, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Simms, James Major, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Simpson, James Elbert, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sinclair, Gordon Earl, III, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sipe, Donald Dale, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Slaughter, Rodger D., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sloan, Larry Richard, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, Barry Edward, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, Earl Charles, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, George Edward, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, Harry Allen, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, James Archer, III, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, James Myron, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, Joseph Edward, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, Larry David, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, Larry E., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, Mark Allyn, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, Ronald Lee, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Smith, Peter F., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Snow, William Benham, III, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sorrell, Richard Hubert, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Soucy, Philip Edmund, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sparrow, Jack Lewis, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Speicher, Martin Lovell, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Spiker, Gerald John, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Spurgeon, Leland, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Stack, Robert J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Stallings, Roger Jean, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Stanberry, Robert Keith, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Stanton, Thomas Willard, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Stapleton, Arlis Gerald, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Starke, William Stewart, II, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Stedman, Charles David, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Steele, Donald Webster, Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Steiner, Carl Frederic, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Steinmetz, Samuel, III, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Stephens, Hugh Emerson, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Stitt, Harold William, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Stone, William Ollie, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Stout, Duane Clarence, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Stratton, Gerald Joseph, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Stringer, Marion Delson, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sturdivant, Ronald Edward, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sutton, Charles Kenneth, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Swank, David Wallace, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Swinehart, Jack Kenneth, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Szymanski, William Raymond, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.

Tahir, Alic, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Taylor, Ben Frank, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Taylor, Charles Cleveland, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Taylor, Ronald Grant, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Tenhet, Paul Quinn, II, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Teufert, William Robert, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Theriault, Hilbert Dale, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Thomas, Donald William, Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Thomas, Farris Carter, III, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Thompson, Anthony, III, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Thompson, Tommy Joe, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Tiberi, Paul, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Todd, Joseph William, III, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Tominay, Patrick Kevin, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Tonelli, Robert Michael, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Townsend, Thomas William, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Townsend, Tommy Dale, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Trach, Brian Lee, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Tracy, Daniel Anthony, III, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Travis, Frederick Stephen, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Treat, Harlie Russell, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Trigg, Dennis Wayne, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Trumble, Roy Robert, III, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Turner, Charles R., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Ulakovic, James John, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Unterweger, Peter Michael, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Urbanik, Roger Edward, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Vanallen, Jack Warren, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Vance, David B., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Vangorp, Philip Eugene, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Vanpeer, Fred Henry, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Vargasinka, Stephen T., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Vasile, Robert Concetto, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Verga, Peter Frank, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Vincent, Wayne Richard, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Voth, William Friedrich, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wade, Daniel Eugene, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wade, Larry Joe, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wait, Neill Wesley, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Walden, Jerry Troy, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Waldrum, Theodore Owens, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Walker, James Ross, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wall, Daniel William, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wallace, Don Winfield, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wargo, Phillip John, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Watson, Don Robert, Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Watson, Jon Alan, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Weatherington, Kerry Dale, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Webb, Russell Ervin, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Webber, Gavin George, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wertz, John Lawrence III, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wesley, Benjamin Harrison, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wheeler, Clermont Edward J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 White, Billy Max, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 White, Charles Edward II, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 White, Clyde Ronald, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 White, Gary Russell, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 White, Jeffery Hugh, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 White, Richard Herschel, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 White, Sherrill J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 White, Wayne Leslie, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Whiteside, Richard Ivan, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wiggin, James Warren, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wiggins, Richard Alan, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wilcox, Larry Wayne, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wilds, Edward Eugene, Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wilk, Roger Walter, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wilkins, Albert Gene, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Williamson, Bobby Wayne, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Williams, Arthur Carlyle J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Williams, Edward Leslie, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Williams, Harry Lee, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Williams, James C., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Williams, Joe Anders, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wilson, Morris P., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wilson, David Paul, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wilson, John Edward, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wilson, Scott Edward, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wingo, Kenneth Jefferson J., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Winters, Harold Bell, Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wirth, Donald Edward, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wise, Robert William, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wood, Stephen Richard, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Woodward, Billy Ray, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Woodington, Ryon Leon, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Woodring, Gary Edward, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Woodward, George Baird, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Worthington, Leonard H., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wright, Charles Edwin, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wright, Richard Joseph, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.

Wright, William Angel, Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Yap, Rudolph Heong Gee, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Yarborough, David Laraine, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Yates, Atlas Reginald, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Yost, Burrwood, Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Young, James Sidney, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Young, Joe Lee, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Young, Paul Nathaniel, Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Young, Wade Lee, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Zamora, Jerome C., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Zieske, Arthur Neal, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Zitnick, Steven Mark, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.

Captains

Bailey, Charlton Greer, Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Benway, Kenneth James, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Bonn, John Henry, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Boone, William Franklin, II, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Buntion, Joe Ed, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Castle, Richard Grimes, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Clapp, Edwin Lomie, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Clark, Robert Lee, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Connor, Lee Osborne, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Cummings, Noel Melton, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Dieffenbach, James Allen, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Dorsey, Edward, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Dunn, James Carroll, Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Edwards, Jerry Doyle, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Frayne, William Leroy, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Gandy, Gregory Kirk, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Gilatta, Leonard, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Grable, Bruce Wayne, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Grant, Thomas Richard, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Grugin, James Calvert, Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Hansen, Randolph Maynard, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Harris, Robert Lee, Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Hayne, John Albert Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Hinton, Joe Kinney, II, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Hoffman, Samuel Garland, Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Hoke, Terry Linn, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Hoss, Anthony Joseph, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Houghtaling, Terry Jay, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Iten, Thomas Joel, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Knox, Tommy Joe, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Lobdell, Bryan Charles, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Maca, Bronislaw, Romuald, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Mahoney, James Charles, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Mason, Robert Anthony, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 McCormick, Michael Elliott, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 McKean, Thomas Franklin, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Miller, Walter Russell, Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Mondragon, Alex Leroy, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Moss, Thomas Carlyle, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Nichols, Stephen Randall, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Pike, Geoffrey Edward, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Reno, Mark Thomas, II, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Rhoads, Ronnie Dewayne, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Royle, Heinz Jürgen, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Schatz, Kurt Frederic, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Schroeder, Kenneth Gage, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Schulz, Donald Wayne, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Schwab, John Samuel, III, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Sharpe, Kenneth William, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Specht, William Henry, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Tidwell, Allen Clark, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Tomisch, Michael Frederick, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Trammell, Louis Byrd, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Virgin, Michael Eric, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Waal, Carl Ralph, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Washburn, Thomas Dell, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Watts, Ronald Edward, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Weck, Lonnie Elwin, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Whittaker, James Forrester, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Wise, Roger Eugene, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Zuber, Terence Valentin, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.

*CHEMICAL CORPS**Lieutenant colonels*

Cavett, Donald Leon, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Cohut, Victor Joseph, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Draper, Edward Stanley, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Greene, Willie Donald, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Licata, Ignazio Joseph, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Lynch, Charles Arthur, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Miller, Karl Jarman, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Nier, Robert L., Jr., **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Stewart, Michael Atkin, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Walker, Roger Lee, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.

Majors

Beard, Joseph Ranalder, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.
 Brown, Drew Hollis, **xxx-xx-xxxx**.

Coodey, Donald James, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Delameter, Richard Ward, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Edgin, Robert Louis, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Fletcher, Roland George, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Goforth, William Edward, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Haley, John Charles, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Hayes, Francis Gerard, Jr., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Heck, Dawson Eugene, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Hopkins, Sam Moore, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Jenkins, Robert Lloyd, Jr., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Johnson, Ralph Leonard, Jr., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Kelly, Charles Gabriel, III, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Kerley, Charles Glayde, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Kirby, Donald Glen, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Law, Lamont Worthen, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Lombardi, John Joseph, Jr., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Makryianis, Panos, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Medici, John Edwards, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Mirra, Anthony Henry, III, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Morris, James Edward, III, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Morris, John Lemuel, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Nakai, Leland Akira, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Newberry, Richard Stephen, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Perley, Gilbert Alexander, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Plummer, John Stephen, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Sagan, Lawrence Stanley, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Sanderson, Tramie Wayne, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Schmid, John Winn, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Singler, Richard Joseph, Jr., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Silvernail, Kenneth Lee, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Spina, Joseph Donald, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Stratton, Gary William, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Tremper, Jon Dewitt, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Upton, Henry, Jr., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Wojcicki, Alexander F., [xxx-xx-xxxx].

Captains

Askew, Alphonso Ray, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Lowry, John Douglas, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Wade, Steven James, [xxx-xx-xxxx].

*CORPS OF ENGINEERS**Lieutenant colonels*

Bierman, James N., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Boyer, Ernest Fritz, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Callison, James Clayton, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Cejauskas, Romas Benedict, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Chapman, Richard Grady, Jr., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Daley, Richard William, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Dereu, John Alfred, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Donahue, John Francis, Jr., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Dudley, Richard Edgar, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Erickson, Albert Johannes, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Evans, Charles Edward, Jr., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Feast, Joseph, Jr., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Fisher, Martin Charles, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Franklin, David, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Hagge, Gary Arnold, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Hansmann, Jack, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Heme, Walter Louis, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Hilton, Billy Leroy, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Klaczkiewicz, Ignatius J., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Koenigseker, Howard W., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Maitland, Tyrone George, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Malkasian, Mark Dowell, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Massa, Harold Alois, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Mattei, William Clement, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Mills, Thomas Martin, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Mouser, Thomas Merl, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Olmstead, Raymond Charles, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Owings, Douglas Leon, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Riddle, Arthur Wayne, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Rye, James Albert, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Sakado, Raleigh Toschichi, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Sims, George Murrell, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Singleton, James Lipscomb, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Skelton, Thomas William, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Unger, Larry Thomas, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Wahl, Jerome Joseph, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Wert, Harold Edwin, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Wilkins, James Morgan, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Willis, Timothy Malcom, [xxx-xx-xxxx].

Majors

Adams, Ben Stuart, Jr., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Allari, Ronald Lee, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Allen, John Dutton, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Allen, William Lester, [xxx-xx-...].
 Anez, Richard Michael, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Arenz, James Edward, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Armitage, Albert Cleo, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Aasher, Timothy Joe, [xxx-xx-xxxx].

Askew, James Hardy, III, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Baath, Werner Sigurd, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Baker, William Richard, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Barnes, Wendell Lee, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Bates, Charles Henry, III, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Becerril, Raymond Herby, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Beiniks, Andris Egils, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Beiter, Richard Harmon, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Belobradic, William M., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Bills, Peter Jon, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Birmingham, Irving, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Bowisby, Alan Douglas, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Brochu, Andrew Charles, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Brooks, Ronald Dean, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Brown, Denton Rowley, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Brown, Leneid Edward, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Brown, Michael Lee, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Buddenhagen, Charles M., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Burke, William Michael, Jr., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Burkhardt, Albert Dale, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Bussey, Joe Paynter, Jr., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Butler, Morey Ford, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Cake, Edward Harry, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Campbell, Phillip Truman, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Carlson, Steven Harold, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Carpenter, Terry Dewayne, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Carpil, Clive Caton, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Carroll, Philip Ward, III, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Casson, Milton Francis, Jr., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Chamberlain, Michael Leroy, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Chambers, Edward Sidney, Jr., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Chambers, Wilber Lee, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Cherry, James Frank, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Colio, Lloyd George, Jr., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Collins, Jan Corlyce, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Cook, Leon William, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Cox, Charles Rufus, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Cozier, Anthony Randolph, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Craig, Richard William, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Cross, Robert James, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Damico, Michael Amos, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Davidson, Ronald Elbert, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Davis, Thomas Glenn, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Demouy, Richard Wayne, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Denison, Dwight Phillip, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Dey, Harold Arthur, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Dobrozzi, David Andrew, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Dowell, John Thomas, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Doyle, Allan Grant, Jr., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Ducey, Donald Leo, Jr., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Dunn, Kenneth Joseph, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Edwards, Charles Royce, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Elliott, Ralph Earl, III, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Elliott, Wilmer Otis, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Ely, Richard Mountford, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Enfiejian, Terry Edward, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Eshenbaugh, Robert Allen, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Estridge, Joseph Mark, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Farber, Terry L., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Farr, William J., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Fedde, Cedric, Jr., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Feeley, Patrick William, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Fish, Lawrence Chaffee, III, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Flowers, George Allison, II, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Folger, David Michael, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Formo, Robert Allen, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Foster, Gerald Francis, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Fox, Theodore Claude, III, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Frankel, Philipp Michael, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Fravel, John Franklin, Jr., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Fritz, Mark Charles, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Fuller, Clark Wayne, [xxx-xx-...].
 Gannaway, Raymond Clifford, [xxx-xx-...].
 Gatlin, Robert Bruce, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Gaultney, Emory Harold, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Glazener, Thomas Walter, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Goodell, Richard Ross, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Grabert, Euclid Joseph, Jr., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Gray, Charles Dennis, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Greer, Robert Ray, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Griffith, John Baxter, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Groebe, Dennis George, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Guenther, Randolph Kent, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Hageman, William James, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Haigh, Bruce Whittemore, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Hambric, Harry Norval, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Hando, Robert John, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Hanks, Marvin Lynn, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Harris, James Raiferd, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Harrison, Gale Robert, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Heibel, David Michael, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Henry, James William, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Hernson, Walter Louis, Jr., [xxx-xx-...].
 Herring, John Leo, [xxx-xx-...].
 Hertenberger, Donald Ray, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Hey, James Edward, [xxx-xx-xx-...].
 Hoiland, Bobby Leon, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Hoiland, Wayne Richard, [xxx-xx-...].
 Howland, Frederick Paul, Jr., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Jeffers, Gerald Ralph, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Johnson, Charles Lee, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Kaster, Philip Gary, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Keelin, Owen Eugene, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Kelly, Edward Joseph, Jr., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Kendall, Charles Robert, Jr., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Kiely, Robert William, Jr., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Kincaid, Jules Stuart, [xxx-xx-...].
 King, James Earl, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 King, Thomas Walsh, [xxx-xx-...].
 Kirchner, Clarence Henry J., [xxx-xx-...].
 Knight, Gary Dean, [xxx-xx-...].
 Lamm, Frederick Warren, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Lamothe, Douglas Reginald, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Lang, Leon James, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Laux, Ronald Dayton, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Lawhorne, John William, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Lefew, Donald Lee, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Lewis, Joseph Albert, Jr., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Lexa, David John, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Liner, Harold Mahlon, Jr., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Lingis, Craig Harmon, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Locklear, Cecil Orlander J., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Love, Ronald Ray, [xxx-xx-...].
 Lowe, Francis John, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Lowe, Walter Eugene, III, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Lynch, Melvin Coley, Jr., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Lynn, Joseph Wilson, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 MacIntyre, John Deveri, Jr., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 MacNeill, John Joseph, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Magno, Richard Angelo, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Magrath, George, Jr., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Mahoney, Kevin Joseph, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Malone, William Frank, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Mansur, Thomas Dee, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Manuele, James Carl, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Martin, Richard Dale, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Martinez, Carlos, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Martinez, Louis John, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Mayer, Martin Albert, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 McDonald, Gary Dwight, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 McGee, George Knighton, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Mellon, Harry Humphry, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Miller, Marion Clare, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Miller, Nicholas Lee, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Miniciller, John Floyd, Jr., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Morel, Cesar Rafael Eduard, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Morgan, Gary Eugene, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Morris, Gary Lee, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Morris, Herbert Hassell, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Motes, John Lloyd, II, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Mullikin, William Phillip, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Mulvihill, John Michael, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Mundt, Bernard Charles, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Needham, Donald Edward, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Noren, Gareth David, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Oliver, Lawrence Edward, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Oltman, Joe Howard, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Ommundsen, Torbjorn, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 O'Neill, John Bernard, Jr., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Ostovic, Francis Branislau, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Ottesen, Robert Brian, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Overstreet, Darvis Lee, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Papapietro, Joseph G., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Patrick, James Carl, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Pawulak, John Dennis, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Perelesrodriguez, Jose R., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Perkins, Richard A., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Peters, William Thayer, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Piel, Leo James, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Piper, Charles Melvin, IV, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Prechtel, Earl Claire, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Price, William Jay, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Proctor, Arnold Gray, Jr., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Pyant, Louis Richard, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Quigley, Thomas Joseph, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Robcke, Erwin Diedrich, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Roberts, L. J., [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Rodgers, Gary Virgil, [xxx-xx-xxxx].
 Rushing, Rudi Barnett, [xxx-xx-xxxx].

Rutledge, Terry Edwin, XXX-XX-X...
 Saage, Leroy Leon, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Sauer, Joel Murray, XXX-XX-XX...
 Schluter, Darrell Lloyd, XXX-XX-XX...
 Schofield, Peter David, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Schrandt, William James, XXX-XX-XX...
 Schultz, Joseph Frederick, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Scott, Bert Rorick III, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Scott, Harold Hophieus, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Scott, Ted M., II, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Seibert, John William, III, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Sevier, John Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Sharf, Stephen T., XXX-XX-XX...
 Shaver, David Eugene, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Shockey, David F., XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Shumpert, Harvey F., XXX-XX-XX...
 Sigmon, Steven V., XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Simpson, Richard H., XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Sinn, Jerry Laverne, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Skender, Daniel Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Smith, Donald Brent, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Smoker, Ronald Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Southerland, Michael Ray, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Stahlberg, Gary William, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Stern, Clifford Henry, Jr., XXX-X...
 Stevens, David Finch, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Stevens, James Leroy, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Stoddard, Samuel, III, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Sullivan, John Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Sweeny, Edward John, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Swelgart, Leslie Gene, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Taubert, Louis Earl, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Taylor, Michael Stuart, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Taylor, Ronnie Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Taylor, Willard Lucian, III, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Thomas, James Edwin, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Thompson, George Ronald, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Thompson, Thomas Hall, XXX-XX...
 Tolson, Pierce Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Trombley, Richard Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Turner, Michael James, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Tyree, Ronald Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Vanslyke, Thomas Grier, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Vanzee, John Ronald, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Varchetto, Guy R., XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Vedell, Richard John, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Verhine, John Kenneth, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Vigliucci, Peter Anthony, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Wagner, Bryce Hedrick, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Walker, Wickliffe Wade, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Watanabe, Melvin Masaharu, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Welmer, Donald Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Wertz, Lewis Edward, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX...
 West, Winford Bruce, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Whaley, Charles David, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 White, Robert Wallace, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Willhouse, Donald Edwin, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Williams, Jerry Donald, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Williams, Otis, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Williams, Robert Duncan, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Williams, William Daniel, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Wilson, Dennis Ira, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Wilson, Don Adam, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Wolf, David Bruce, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Wolterding, Douglas Turner, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Wood, Douglas MacDonald, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Wood, Larry Glenn, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Wooden, David Larry, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Woodruff, Karl Ray, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Wrentmore, Robert Jay, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Wylie, Allan George, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Wyllie, Gordon Douglas, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Yanek, George Steve, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX...
 York, Thomas Alfred, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Zientek, Michael Edward, XXX-XX...

Captains

Allen, Richard Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Booth, John Leslie, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Castillo, Oscar Gonzales, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Charland, John Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Coffey, William Timothy, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Connolly, Michael John, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Draughon, James Ellis, XXX...
 Dregne, James Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Evans, Lloyd Alfred, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Hanssen, Robert Daniel, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Lewis, Robert Henry, XXX...
 Lockhart, Stephen Clyde, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Ricer, Terry Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Rigby, John Graham, XXX...

Roberts, Robert Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Schnabel, Mark Maring, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Simons, Charles Henry, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Sitar, John Dan, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Snowden, Frederick Carroll, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Spaulding, David Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Swartz, Ann Marie, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Wandier, George Tanner, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Watson, Christopher, Orndor, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Whitehead, Roy John, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Wright, Richard Alan, XXX-XX-XXXX...

*MILITARY INTELLIGENCE**Lieutenant colonels*

Abraham, Robert Lyndon, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Adamouski, Francis Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Anderson, John Edgar, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Boesze, Laszlo Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Brooks, Robert Lewis, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Brown, Francis William, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Brown, James Henry, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Cannard, Robert Scott, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Cisz, Stanley Theodore, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Cornell, Warren Davis, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Dwyer, Frederick Gaffney, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Eales, Lonnie Stewart, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Fitzgerald, Benedict F., XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Flynn, Michael Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Frankel, Alfred William, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Gallegos, Gonzalo Robles, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Gaugh, Robert Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Gibson, Joseph William, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Girard, Albert Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Hall, Thomas Arthur, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Harding, Kenneth Walter, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Holberg, Benjamin Elmer, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Holtzclaw, Robert Wesley, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Hughes, Jeremy Herbert, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Jenkins, Paula Frances, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Jones, Horace F., III, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Kallitka, Peter Frederick, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Kelly, Paul Francis, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Krebs, Philip Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Land, John Gerald, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Lent, John Gallivan, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Lonsdale, William Raymond, XXX-XX...
 Loomis, Richard Berkeley, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 MacGregor, James Bruce, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Manwaring, Max Garrett, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 McCarron, William Laing T., XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Medeiros, Emmanuel Robello, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Melanson, Leo Matthew, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Milnamow, Michael Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Moe, Gary Severt, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Morgan, James Everett, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Muia, James, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Naylor, William Henry, Jr., XXX-XX...
 Nelson, Jerry Brad, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 O'Brien Lawrence William, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Palmer, Terry, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Pflugrath, Charles Orion, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Powell, Robert Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Prichard, John Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Quinones, Ruben Dario, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Ralston, Maurice Howell, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Ray, Russell Hayward, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Rinaldi, John Henry, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Robertson, Henry Muir, II, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Robey, Richard Henry, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Roval, Alfred Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Rowe, James N., XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Ruddle, Charles Clifton, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Shelton, William Henry, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Smith, Colin MacGregor, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Smith, Lonnie Sasser, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Springer, William Henry, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Suzuki, Roy Mitsuaki, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Thompson, Donald W., XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Tobias, George, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Tyler, Robert Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Vandever, John Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 White, Florine Jones, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Wiecking, Charles McDougal, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 York, Steven Walter, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Yoshida, Roy Sadao, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Zarybenicky, Gary Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX...

Majors

Adamson, Donald Scott, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Aden, Jerry Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX...

Allen, Thomas Jerome, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Androff, David Kime, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Baggett, Robert Gordon, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Baker, Jon Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Baker, William Virgil, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Balzer, Danny Dale, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Banks, William Herman, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Barrett, Shaun Francis, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Barton, John Everett, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Bassett, Richard Haley, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Batten, Peter Russell, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Bearce, Terry Dean, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Beaaley, Joseph Randolph, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Beckett, Stephen Marshall, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Berg, Allan, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Bighia, Michael Emmett, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Black, Kenneth James, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Blackmon, Andre F., XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Biagg, Clyde Stephen, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Blankenship, Jimmy Lynn, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Block, James Leo, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Borowski, James George, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Bosco, David Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Bougas, Constantine Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Boyd, Lawrence David, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Bradford, Jerry Clarence, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Brandt, Drew Max, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Braudrick, Danny Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Bredeau, Peter James, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Bridwell, James Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Brown, Richard Bailey, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Brown, William Thomas, III, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Bruening, David Leigh, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Bryant, Calvin, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Buck, John Louis, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Burch, Herbert Ward, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Burnette, Gerald Douglas, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Burns, John Joseph, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Butler, Leslie Ernest, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Campbell, Charles Spencer, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Campbell, David Leonard, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Campbell, James Olan, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Capers, Randall Harper, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Carlin, John R., XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Carson, Concetta Lucy S., XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Carson, Daniel Clyde, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Cates, Ronnie Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Caylor, Larry Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Chambers, Jackson Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Chikosky, Matthew Adam, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Christ, Patrick Jack, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Chrzanowski, Stanley Roman, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Chung, Milton Nyuk On, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Ciccarello, Nicholas J., XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Clark, Gerald Edmund, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Clark, John Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Clark, Lloyd Wayne, Jr., XXX-XX...
 Cole, Bruce Hugh, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Cole, Thomas Gregory, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Colvin, Clinton Owen, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Comaux, Ronald Wadz, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Conaty, Peter Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Cook, John Lewis, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Cook, Robert Wilson, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Corr, William Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Cowley, David Eugene, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Crews, Norman Frederick, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Crowell, Allan Estes, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Culberson, Walter Jack, III, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Curn Kendall, Christopher Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Dahl, Carroll Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Davis, Benjamin Moseley, II, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Davis, George Paris, III, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Davis, John Bartow, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Davis, Wayne Arthur, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Day, Daniel Dale, XXX-XX...
 Deeny, Dennis Albert, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Dollarhide, Roger E., XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Duncan, Dale Eugene, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Dunn, John Galbreath, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Durham, Reginald Ervin, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Durrence, James Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 East, Bruce William, XXX...
 Edell, Lawrence Albert, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Eichholz, William Ralph, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Ellis, Robert Clarence, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX...
 Ellison, Harold, III, XXX-XX-XXXX...
 English, Ronald Eugene, XXX...
 Esau, Palmer Murray, XXX-XX-XXXX...

Faircloth, Douglas Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Felling, Richard Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Ford, Terrance Martin, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Forkenbrock, Ronald John, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Fox, Gerald, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Froehlich, Charles Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Gaines, John Henry, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Gant, Arlin Walter, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Ganz, Gerald Frank, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Gardner, Walter Neal, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Gargiulo, Mario, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Gembara, Andrew George, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Genovese, Sam Anthony, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Gibson, Geoffrey Bruce, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Gloukhoff, Theodore, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Glynn, Francis Matthew, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Godfrey, William James, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Gore, Edward Harlan, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Gorman, Daniel Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Gorrie, John Edward A., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Govoni, Richard Albert, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Gray, Gary Otis, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Gray, Woods Eastland, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Gregory, James Byrne, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Griffith, Randall Francis, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Groskopf, Paul Van, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Gruenhagen, Gary Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Grunden, John Bruce, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Gunderson, Victor W., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Gutbrod, Kenneth William, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Hall, Cyrus Bach, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Halstrom, James Gordon, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Hanlon, Thomas Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Hansen, Kal John, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Hardee, James Curtiss, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Harding, Robert Anthony, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Harju, Lawrence Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Harlan, Robert Austin, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Harris, Frank Morton, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Hasse, John Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Hauser, William Carson, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Heaney, Michael Francis, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Heise, Robert Anderson, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Helpert, Eric Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Hinkle, Paul Christopher, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Hoadley, Erwin Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Holland, John Edison, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Hollins, James Roger, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Hudson, Gabriel Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Humenik, Michael David, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Igieheart, James Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Ireland, Michael Farrar, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Jackson, Bruce, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Jacobson, Victor Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 James, Robert Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Jarman, Kenneth Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Johnson, Edward Charles, XXX-XX-...
 Jones, Bobby Wayne, XXX-XX-...
 Kaufmann, Andrew Frederick, XXX-XX-...
 Kehayas, Anthony Whitsey, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Kells, Thomas Johnston, Jr., XXX-...
 Kennedy, Austin John, III, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Koltz, Roger, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Lamonica, Manuel George, XXX-...
 Landers, Eldon Ray, Jr., XXX-XX-...
 Lawhead, Gerald Ralph, XXX-XX-...
 Lawrence, Mark Dugan, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Layton, Richard Lee, XXX-XX-...
 Lee, Carlton David, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Livoti, Charles Beverton, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Loendorf, Walter Matt, XX-...
 Longazel, Thomas Mark, XXX-XX-...
 Love, Ronald Marvin, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Lustig, Leon Earl, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Lyng, James Patrick, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Mance, Howard Ernest, III, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Manson, Robert James, Jr., XXX-...
 Mark, William Yen, Jr., XXX-X-...
 Mathias, Montgomery Ross, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Maxell, Robert Lewis, XXX-XX-...
 McAuliffe, James, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 McBride, Samuel Douglas, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 McGuire, Glenn William, XXX-XX-...
 McKay, Robert Donald, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 McLaulin, Thomas Martin, XX-...
 McNair, Robert Lee, XXX-...
 McNear, Thomas, XXX-XX-...
 Mikeworth, Ronald Gena, XXX-...
 Miller, Charles Allyn, XXX-XX-...
 Miller, Richard Bradley, Jr., XXX-XX-...

Miller, Rodney Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Miller, Walter B., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Mitchell, Andrew Douglas, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Mitchell, Elizabeth, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Moneyhon, Darwin James, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Moore, Lee Ann, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Morrison, Marvin William, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Morton, Hazel Louise, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Mrzyglod, John Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Mueller, Alverne Claude, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Mullis, Varon Barr, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Murphy, James Phillip, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Nasbe, Roderick Peter, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Navratil, Ronald Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Neely, Robert Layman, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Nugent, John Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Nunley, Chesley Oren, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Olander, Thomas Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Olen, Michael Allan, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Oshea, Michael Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Owen, John Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Paquette, Donald Francis, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Peden, Robert McNeely, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Peterson, Jerome, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Peterson, Roy Eugene, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Powell, Leonard Holland, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Rath, Michael Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Rath, Robert Ronald, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Rathyen, Wayne Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Raub, Allen Louis, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Rawley, Vonda Raynell, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Rehwinkle, John Alan, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Richardson, James Larry, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Robertson, Charles L., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Robertson, Gary Lynn, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Roe, John Frederick, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Roeber, Thomas John, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Rooney, Laurence James, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Royer, Lawrence Bickel, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Rutland, Elbie, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Ryan, John Edward, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Sallaberry, George John, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Savittiere, Joseph A., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Schmitt, John Anthony, II, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Schuler, Arthur Edward, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Seagle, Bruce Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Seamans, Randy G., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Seay, Ralph Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Seiber, John Franklin, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Sewell, James Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Shideler, Marc Karl, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Shoemaker, Francis D., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Siller, John D., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Silvestris, Francis N., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Simmons, James Larue, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Simmons, Patrick L., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Smith, Bradley Wyatt, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Smith, Jessie Ray, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Snow, Darryl Jeffrey, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Snyder, Charles Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Stansfield, Jerry Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Staub, Harry Kenneth, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Stein, Gary Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Stephenson, Ronald Brian, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Sterling, Dean Anthony, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Stevens, Halbert Fowler, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Stokes, Orville Texal, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Streb, Gary Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Streeter, Theodore H., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Stroud, Joe Travis, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Sullivan, Eugene Vincent, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Thomas, Ira B., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Thomas, Mark Franklin, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Thompson, Michael A., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Thurston, William Wallace, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Tolman, Scott B., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Tom, Ronald Gee Sun, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Travis, Robert Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Tvrdy, Joseph F., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Tyndall, James Donald, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Urban, Richard Stephen, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Urquidez, Bias, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Valette, Paul A., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Vance, Timothy William, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Vanderloo, David Arthur, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Vangundy, Daniel F., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Vanhooy, Francis S., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Verseput, Gary Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Vore, David A., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Waldman, Jay Howard, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Walker, Vestal Dan, XXX-XX-XXXX.

Warmington, Alan Roger, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Warren, Barry George, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Werling, Timothy Edwin, XXX-...
 Westernman, Frederick R., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 White, Larry Dwain, XXX-XX-...
 Whittaker, Glenn Warren, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Wilker, Dennis Brooks, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Willets, James Forrest, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Williams, Matthew, III, XX-...
 Williams, Roger Freeman, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Wilson, William Henry, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Wright, Jeffrey William, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Xiques, Brendon Augustus, XXX-XX-...
 Yancey, Charles Emerson, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Yarbro, Roger Norman, XXX-XX-...
 Captains

Acker, Richard Bruce, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Baker, Charles Edmund, XXX-XX-...
 Bayer, Paul James, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Bell, Kenneth Victor, Jr., XXX-...
 Bodkin, Richard Arthur, XXX-...
 Borrego, Eugene Thomas, XXX-XX-...
 Boudreau, Thomas Francis J., XXX-XX-...
 Cook, Weston Franklin, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Diver, Michael John, XXX-XX-...
 Flavin, James Richard, XXX-XX-...
 Ford, Shirley Oates, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Glasier, John Arthur, XX-...
 Hartz, Daniel Karl, XXX-...
 Hodges, James Wilson, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Kerrick, Charles Ernest, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Kogle, Mark L., XXX-XX-...
 Koss, Robert James, XX-...
 Martel, Andre Rosaire, XXX-...
 Martin, William George, XXX-XX-...
 Metteemccutcheon, Ila, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Milewski, John Charles, XXX-XX-...
 Moore, Jack Stewart, Jr., XXX-XX-...
 Mooring, James Callis, XXX-XX-...
 Morgride, Ralph Leroy, XXX-XX-...
 Murphy, Terry Edward, XXX-XX-...
 O'Grady, Kevin Francis, XXX-XX-...
 O'Leary, James Allen, XXX-XX-...
 Parker, Theodore Patrick, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Patten, Norman Bennett, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Platt, Albert Earl, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Reuss, Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Shiroma, Maurice Keith, XXX-XX-...
 Stephens, Gary Roy, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Street, Bernard Herbert, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Vgon, Patton, Sing Lee, XXX-XX-...

MILITARY POLICE CORPS

Lieutenant colonels

Bates, Jimmy Neil, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Berry, James Lee, XXX-...
 Cunningham, William Robert, XXX-...
 Glick, Charles Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Haas, Robert Thomas, XXX-XX-...
 Kavanagh, James Michael, XXX-XX-...
 McKinney, Clarence Lamar, XXX-XX-...
 Pegg, Robert Walter, II, XXX-...
 Short, James William, XXX-XX-...
 Sill, Glenn Ernest, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Simpson, Albert Franklin J., XX-...
 Stevens, Henry Franklin, Jr., XX-...
 Tracy, Robert Gens, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Trisko, Ralph Frederick, XXX-XX-...
 Turner, Phillip Bell, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Weaver, William Cowan, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Westerkamp, James Francis, XXX-XX-XXXX.

Majors

Amoroso, Frank Pasquale, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Arnold, Robert Vernon, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Atchison, Joseph Sanders, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Ayres, Robert Hankins, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Baker, Robert Henry, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Barnes, El Cartio, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Bernethy, James Irving, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Boit, William Douglas, XXX-XX-...
 Borella, Douglas Jay, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Boyce, Herbert Peckham, Jr., XXX-XX-...
 Brown, Charles Benjamin, XXX-XX-...
 Burch, Linda Grace, XXX-XX-...
 Burns, Jimmie Lee, XXX-XX-...
 Cannon, Robert Elmo, XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Carwile, Frederick Holland, XXX-XX-...
 Christopherson, Thomas A., XXX-XX-...
 Cobb, Michael Sherwood, XXX-XX-...
 Cohen, Robert Lewis, XXX-...

Colbert, Richard Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Coles, Timothy Glessner, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Connor, John Alan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Crassweller, Roger Mark, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Curtis, Barbara Gebhardt, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Day, Jack Willis, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Deluca, Guy Dominic, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dennis, Timothy Andrew, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Donohue, John Thomas, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dunn, Gregory Martin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dymke, John Rudolf, XXX-XX-XX...
 Fogarty, Dennis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Foley, David Ward, XXX-XX-XX...
 Foster, Dennis Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Frey, Terry Clay, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gasko, Gerald Matthew, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gillespie, John Jacob, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Glatte, Horst Hans, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gossard, Lynn William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Graf, William Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Greer, David Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Grossman, Charles Donald J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Haller, William Clifford, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hammell, John Matthew, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Harper, Brian Earl, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Held, Billy Herman, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Henn, James Francis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hilliard, Darrell Gene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Holland, Charles Allison, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hughes, Frederick Scott, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Italia, Ralph Herbert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 James, Gary Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Johnston, Michael Lief, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kelley, Lonnie Rey, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kiley, James Edward, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Krushinski, Dennis Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lane, Carl Hagan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Litchfield, Charles F., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lizotte, Brian Stanley, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Loveless, Michael Eugene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Majchrzak, Zbigniew M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Majors, James Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mansky, Henry Paul, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Martin, Dorothy Anne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McCann, Terry Alan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McKeon, Kevin Ryan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Michaelis, Marc, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mulligan, George Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Neal, Paul William Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nichols, Douglas Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nickels, Ronald Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nielsen, Niel Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 O'Neill, Patrick Shannon, XXX-XX-XXXX
 O'Neill, Richard Arnold, XXX-XX-XXXX
 O'Toole, Timothy Dean, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Peterson, Duane Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pritchard, Robert Nelson, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Reisz, John Benjamin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Richardson, Randall Moore, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Roth, Archie William, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rule, Ronald Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rupp, Gary Gens., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schmidt, Dennis Herbert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schwepple, John Erich, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Seals, Larry Dennis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sheehan, Jane Frances, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Shirley, Otis Allen, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sim, David Gordon, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Storey, Barry David, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sturm, Henry Benvenuti, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Symonds, Walter Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tarmann, Michael Frank, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Taylor, John Henry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Thomas, Ralph Augustus, Jr., XXX-XX-XX...
 Timberlake, Richard F. I., XXX-XX-XX...
 Topping, Edward Odelle, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Traxler, Robert M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Walker, Robert Dowling, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Waltman, Gerald Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Watts, Thomas Aron, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Whiddon, Gerald Taylor, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Williams, Donald Everett, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Williams, William Earle, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wright, Robert Alexander I., XXX-XX-XXXX

Captains

Craven, James Moffett, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hawkins, James Malcolm, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Huke, Henry Robert, III, XXX-XX-XX...
 Kellar, Vera Gene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Long, John Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lyons, Wickie Lindburgh, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Phillips, Linda Carol, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ratliff, Johnnie Nathan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Roling, Michael Aloyisius, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sawyer, Gary Jefferson, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Ronald Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX

SIGNAL CORPS

Lieutenant colonels

Agee, Robert Taylor, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Allman, Edmond Albert, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Andersen, Martin, Jr., XXX-XX-XX...
 Baker, Bruce Williams, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Barnett, Richard David, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Barr, Dale Darris, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Basta, James Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Biggs, Willie Maurice, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Blair, Melvin Russell, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bruning, Theodore Lawrence, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bubnik, Robert Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Byers, Donald Muriel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Camarinos, William John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Carr, Wesley Daniel, XXX-XX-XX...
 Carrier, William Stephen, I, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Contos, Charalampos, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Daniel, James Lonnig, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dawson, Richard Alden, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dean, Luther Bruce, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Delimitros, James Herman, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Essex, George Huey, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fowler, Melvin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Grimm, James Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hamilton, Edward Patrick, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Harris, Jimmie Neal, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hatfield, Gary Loren, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hays, Melvin Monroe, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Holton, William Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hoyle, Thomas Leonard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Johnson, John Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lyles, Sammie Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Martin, Thomas Sherwood, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Marx, Robert Donald, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Massey, Marvin Howard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Meier, William Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Moorehead, Robert Leslie, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Moseman, James Forman, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Motz, Wayne Lewis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mueller, Edmund Louis, III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ohlenburger, Clifford Char., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Osborne, Tommy Taylor, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Parker, Harold Phillip, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Paruti, Alexander, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ply, Homer Cash, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Reublinger, Richard Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ryan, James Duncan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Scharf, James David, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Selzman, James Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sexton, Charles David, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sims, Thomas, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sniadach, Louis Martin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Steele, William Taylor, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stein, Harry E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stinson, George Winford, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Thornton, Rufus, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tigges, Kenneth Dale, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Turpin, Thomas Gordon, XXX-XX-XX...
 Upton, Kevin Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wahlgren, Arlen Burt, XXX-XX-XX...
 Wheelock, Eddie Dean, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Williams, Charles Henry, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wilpuetz, Robert Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX

Majors

Abercrombie, Charles Clint, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ackerman, Michael Warren, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Adamson, Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Akob, Guy Mot., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Aldous, Walter Daniel, XXX-XX-XX...
 Allen, Lawrence Hugh, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Allreding, Martin Ray, XXX-XX-XX...
 Allman, James William, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bailey, William Roger, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Balogh, Zoltan, John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Barr, George Hall, XXX-XX-XXXX

Barron, Jesse Lewis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Barth, Paul Alexander, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Beasey, James Lloyd, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bell, Robert Edmund, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Betts, Ronnie Walton, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Blake, Charles Franklin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bouteille, Steven Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bower, Harold Frederick, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bowser, Victor Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Boykin, Ronald Russell, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Brooks, Maurice, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bruse, Herbert Walter, XXX-XX-XX...
 Bryant, Robert Howard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Burbage, Leslie Earl, XXX-XX-XX...
 Burton, Emory Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Busbee, James Larry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Caley, David Bruce, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Carnahan, Timothy Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Chamberlain, Jack Dorn, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Clapp, Kenneth Martin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cole, James Lee, XXX-XX-XX...
 Coleman, William Edward, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Conroy, William Clark, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cooper, Charles Bradford, XXX-XX-XX...
 Copeland, Donald Patrick, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Corbett, Thomas Vernon, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Corduan, Erich, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Coxey, James Milton, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Craig, David James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Crapse, Lester Eugene, Jr., XXX-XX-XX...
 Crawford, James Lamar, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cruz, Richard Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Curran, Wilburn, Allen, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Daniel, Michael Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dauley, James Francis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Davis, Daniel Carr, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dooley, Francis Douglas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dooley, James Edgar, III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dotson, William Arvil, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Downs, Joseph Norbert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Doyle, Nicholas Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dugas, John Louis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dunn, Bobby Jean, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Durst, Reinhart Dawn, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dworin, Elliott Matthew, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Edwards, Ronald Clair, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Elissagaray, Roger Dominique, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Estes, Thomas Newton, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ewing, Jochen Heimut, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Finch, Steven Dale, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Flannagan, Theodore Ray, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Follmer, Andrew Crawford, I, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fowler, Shelby Atlee, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fritz, Charles Raymond, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gagliano, Douglas John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gaither, Larry Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gallenbeck, Curtis Ellery, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gamble, Keith Carter, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Garrett, Kenneth Obrian, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gassan, Ned David, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Geiger, David James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gipson, Ronnie Bass, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gonski, Anthony Francis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gordon, Thomas Daniel, XXX-XX-XX...
 Gorman, Andrew Aloysius, XXX-XX-XX...
 Grabher, Carl Raymond, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gray, Phillip Norman, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Greca, Philip Erin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gruber, Ernest Irvin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Guinn, Rector Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gundelfinger, Richard Albe, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gwin, David Christopher, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hall, Gregory Vaughan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Holloway, Gary Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hamilton, Ralph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hancock, Don Nixon, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Handley, Hugh Warren, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hardy, Joseph Nathaniel, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hartman, Joseph Barnett, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Haskell, Robert Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Healy, Henry Gravelle, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Heaton, Robert George, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hellstern, Bruce Karl, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Herron, Robert Brian, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hill, Craig Knight, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Holland, Joseph Bernard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Holzler, Charles Raymond, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Honey, Michael Gerald, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Horner, Thomas Micheal, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hughes, Barry Tucker, XXX-XX-XXXX

Hughes, Jackie Alexander, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hunt, Robert Earl, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Huntington, James Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ideue, Marvin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ikner, Jerry Donald, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Iskrzak, Andrew Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jackson, Thomas Kay, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jacobs, Marlin Lywood, XXX-XX-XXXX
 January, Michael D. C., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Johnson, Jerry Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jones, Charles Bernard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jordan, James Franklin, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Justice, Clyde Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kain, Edna Marie, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kasperbauer, Patrick Jerome, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Katsos, James John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kaufman, John Haywood, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Klenke, Donald Vincent, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Keesee, Dwight Dea, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kelley, James Wallace, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kertnar, August Ernest, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Klar, James Cyril, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Klenke, Donald Vincent, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Klevan, Raymond Arnold, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Klockow, Lee Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kouchi, Roger, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kovach, Roger Stephan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Krepa, Larry Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kublak, Stephen, III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lane, James Henry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lang, Thomas Francis, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lanier, Lance Baxter, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lehman, Franklin Ralph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Levy, Alan Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lewis, Donovan Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lewis, Labaron Lafayette, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lindhorst, Joseph Ray, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lising, Douglas Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lopez, Alfred Alvin, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Love, Glenn Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 MacPherson, Robert Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mandel, Michael Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Manning, Willie Lester, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Marinaccio, Stephen Arthur, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Martell, Thomas Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Martin, Louis Scott, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Martin, Todd Aaron, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Masiowski, Walter, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Matlock, Andrew, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mattox, Leonard Morris, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McCarson, Michael Jack, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McCaslin, Charles Adrien, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McCrary, Dennis Ridgley, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McCrory, James Cullen, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 McKan, James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McKinney, Eugene Ralph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McLain, James Edward, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 McNeal, Robert Lawrence Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mellon, James Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Melvin, William Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Miller, Michael Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mills, William Herbert, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Montgomery, Alan Duncan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Murphy, Charles Nathan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Murphy, Robert Francis, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Murphy, Terry Dennis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Myers, Joel Noland, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Myers, Roger Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nelson, Raymond, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nesmadny, Adrian Monroe, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Netherland, William Harris, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Newland, Michael Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ogden, Frank William, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 O'Grady, Michael James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Olsen, Loren Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Olson, Philip Andrew, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 O'Malley, Edward Patrick, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Osborne, Robert Gatewood, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pape, Nicholas Francis, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Parr, Sanford Elliott, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Patterson, Robert Walker P., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Peterson, Ronald John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pickette, Charles Bruce, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pittman, William Robert, II, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pia, John Angel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Poynter, Douglas Harley, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pruitt, Hobert Lee, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Quinn, John Byrd, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Reale, James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Reed, Thomas Herman, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Reeves, John Byron, XXX-XX-XXXX

Riegler, Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rockwell, David William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rodriguez, Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rogers, Edward Hardin, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Romanus, Charles F., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rupp, William Nathaniel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Russell, Kendall Alger, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ryan, Richard Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Salter, James Carl, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sanders, Hugh Pinckney, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sandrock, Donald Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schell, Carl Edwin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schmidt, Ronald Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schroeter, Merle Gene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Seegar, Ronald Benjamin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Semanek, James Curtis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sewell, Bert Ward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Shaffer, James Ray, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Shepard, Charles Odis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sherman, Winfield Gerald, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Simms, John Herbert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sittler, Wayne Lloyd, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, John Roden, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Theodore Augustus J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, William Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sommers, Arthur Alvin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Springfield, James Herman, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stanley, Stanley Fagan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stevens, Howard Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stromquist, Lenard Pete, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Strutzel, Timothy Daniel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sumi, Eugene Sho, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sutherland, Gary Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Swint, Jerry Albert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tarker, Alexander David, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tarleton, James Waterman, I., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tavares, Philip Terence, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Thompson, James Lamont, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Thompson, Richard Steven, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Thompson, Walter Howarth J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Thompson, William Garfield, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Timmons, Wesley Farrell, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tingle, Earl Lester, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tomko, James Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tomlin, James Christopher, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Townsley, Harry Miller, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Turner, William Martin, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Underwood, Ernest Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Vandenberg, Lynn Calvin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Veitum, Lee Donald, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Vestal, Daniel Ray, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Villasenor, Peter Victor, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Volk, Arthur James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Walker, Gary Clyde, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Walker, Joseph, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Walsh, Gregory Leo, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ward, Frank England, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Warren, David Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Warsaw, Frederick Douglas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Watts, Walter, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Weaver, William Francis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Weber, Charles Rudolph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wetzel, Robert Edward, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Whisman, Richard Dale, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wildman, Lowell Dewayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Williams, Dennis Vance, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Williams, James Lawrence, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wilson, Dean E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wilson, Harold Andrew, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wise, David Roddy, Sr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Yancey, Robert Vanstone, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Yensan, David Arthur, XXX-XX-XXXX
 York, Roy Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Young, Sammie G., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Young, Stanley Ross, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Youngblood, Jesse Clifton, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Zoelle, David Lawrence, XXX-XX-XXXX

Captains

Brecher, Harold Jerome, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cavanaugh, John Patrick, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Daugherty, Stephen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ellis, Van Shaver, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Faver, Patrick Leightner, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Goone, Richard Lawrence, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hayes, Arthur John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hughes, Donald William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Josue, Allan Bernard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lemons, Michael Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Linn, William Jeffrey, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Manning, Wayne Eugene, XXX-XX-XXXX

Patzer, James Ralph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Perry, Chatty Dixon, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Prickett, John Frederick, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Reichler, Thomas Harold, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Raymond, Dennis Kenneth, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Richardson, Larry Lynn, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rutherford, Gary Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Salatti, Nicholas Alden, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Jack Edward, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX

ADJUTANT GENERAL'S CORPS

Lieutenant colonels

Asiello, John Francis, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Barry, Robert Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bauer, Daniel Eugene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Carpenter, Eugene Howard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Chappell, Isaac Hardeman, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Clark, William Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Collins, Clifton Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Curau, Joseph Patrick, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Devarona, Jose Raul, Sr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Donovan, George Gerald, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dundee, Richard Dean, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Evans, Harold David, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fleming, Andrew Peter, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hagaman, David Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hendricks, Blaine Ronald, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hill, Michael Augustus, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Huber, John Henry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Irving, John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Long, Regina Maria, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McCown, Ronald Owen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McGrath, Eugene M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 McKenzie, Melvin Reade, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pitts, John Henry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rethlake, Ralph John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Richmond, Laura Jane, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schneider, Walter Martin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sizemore, Michael Everett, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Stephen Bollinger, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Toth, Joseph Andrew, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tutor, Chester D., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tyson, Demarious Frederick, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Williams, Nancy, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Winkler, David Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Yoder, Roberta Anne Britte, XXX-XX-XXXX

Majors

Addonizio, Anthony, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Alford, Luther Vernon, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Alston, Douglas Kay, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Archer, Robert Gould, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ashley, Robert Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bailey, Claud, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Barnett, Johnny Mack, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Barrier, William Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Becka, Mary Alice, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Beiriger, Richard Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bennett, Bernard Timothy, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Berry, Kenneth Scott, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Biggers, David P., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Blacker, Carlton Roger, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Boehm, William Walter, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Boekhout, Joderik Carel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Booker, Marshall Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Booth, Gordon Howard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bower, David William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bowers, Kriss Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bristol, Philip Warren, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Brown, Ronald Olan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Brumback, Larry Ross, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Burke, Joseph Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Burpo, Frank Warren, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bushely, Howard Wallace, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cannell, Gordon Harry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Carrell, Dennis Dee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Carson, Karl Frank, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Carter, Jerry Catavia, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Chitty, Daniel Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cline, David Dee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cole, James Garland, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Conway, John Louis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Copley, Patrick Neville, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Corcoran, Timothy Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Courtney, Ronald Raymond, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Crane, Robert Curtis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Creger, Richard Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Crocetti, Ferruccio Mario, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cuneo, Kenneth Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cushing, Frank Noland, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cutting, John Douglas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Davis, Ronald, XXX-XX-XXXX

Doucette, Vincent Patrick, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dragoo, Lynn Francis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Duetgen, Gloria America V., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Duncan, Silas Edwin, III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dundas, John Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dupay, Arthur Pierre, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Elliott, Robert James, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Espinoza, Charles Roldan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fehrs, William Leslie, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fitzgerald, Cecilia Ann, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fitzgerald, Wayne Robert J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Flanz, Joseph Nathan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Forsyth, Michael Jonathan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fortis, Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Freund, John Walter, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Frome, Victor Joseph Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Garrett, Lawrence Daniel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Godfrey, Linda Kay Cooper, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gossard, Marion James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Goswick, Joseph Willard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Grace, Arthur Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Green, Cecil Alfred, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Greene, Charles Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Griffin, James Evans, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hagan, Larry Kenneth, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hall, Charles Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hall, Donald Earl, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hamilton, Larry Dale, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hardy, Joseph Carl, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hartjen, Gail Marie, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hatch, Charles Thompson, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Henning, Stanley Eugene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hess, Hubert Barnes, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hinson, Ben Adams, II, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hodge, Glenn Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hofmann, Patricia June Har, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hornor, Mary Kay, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hosemann, David Daniel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jackson, Charles Andrew, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jackson, Mary Elizabeth, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jacobs, Jimmy Oneal, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jewell, Elwood Lester, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jimenez, Michael Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Johnson, Bobby Ray, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Johnson, Jay Arnold, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Joseph, Donald Gregory, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kazor, Walter Leo, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kerestes, Harold Hamilton, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kessler, Doris Henrietta, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lacquette, Dennis Fay, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lancquette, William Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 MacIntosh, Donald Kenneth, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mahan, John Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Maichel, Farrell Deane, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Manning, Laurel Roberts, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Marino, Charley, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Marsano, Jesse James Alex, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Marshall, Michael William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Martindale, Robert Andrew, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mazzetti, Roderick Stewart, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McClellan, Worley Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McGrath, Eugene, Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McKenty, Samuel Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McNeese, Michael Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Miller, Curtis Parker, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mitchell, Caryl Arden, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Morton, Samuel Chandler, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Moss, David Frederick, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mower, David Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mudd, Mary Marguerite, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mulligan, Arthur G., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mullis, Anne Buehler, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mylett, Clifford D., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nance, William Byrd, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Newton, James Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nuckles, Birdie Jean, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Olson, Gary Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ortiz, Rafael Cristobal, XXX-XX-XXXX
 O'Sullivan, Daniel Frederic, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Owens, Ben, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ownbey, Kenney William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Paasch, Kathleen Ella, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pancake, James Timothy, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Paske, Charles Herbert, III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Phillips, David Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pierce, Kenneth Irving, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pillsbury, Nora Elizabeth, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Poertner, George Ronald, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Porter, Matilde Matta, Negr, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Priore, John Anthony, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pueppka, Dennis Arnold, XXX-XX-XXXX

Radoll, John Vincent, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rawalt, Michael Alan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Redding, G. A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rhodes, Donald Gaylord, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rice, Randolph Vincent, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Roberts, Delvis Burton, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Roberts, William Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rohloff, Charles William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ruiz, Napoleon Nicholas, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sammet, John King, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sawyer, John Stephen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schneider, Keith Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schneider, Phillip Karl, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schultz, Fayrene Johnson, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schumacher, Daniel Laurence, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Scudder, Christopher Eric, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Serafini, Stephen Douglas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Shelburne, Lesley Bryan, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Shields, Joel Gene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Shipe, Wayne M., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Shoemaker, James, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Shoups, Thomas A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Skelly, Carol Marguerite, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Skinner, James Franklin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Slinkard, Richard L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Daniel F., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Richard H., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Snead, Ronald B., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Spears, Albert Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Spriggs, Purnell John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stemmons, George Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stevenson, James Edward, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sumrall, George Leonard, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tabata, David Senji, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tate, James Ellis, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Thomas, Harry Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Thompson, Bobby Gene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Thore, Michael Norman, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tlonda, Theodore Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tobias, Terrance Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Traub, Donald Russell, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Trotter, Robert Frank, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Troxell, Joseph K., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Vanhoesen, William D., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Venable, Tileston K., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Watts, William N., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Weaver, Edward F., XXX-XX-XXXX
 West, Donald E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Whitefield, James C., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wilcox, Howard E., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wilkes, Joseph F., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Woodworth, Robert A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wray, Charles D., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Younger, Robert J., XXX-XX-XXXX

Captains

Brittain, Philip Daniel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Coleman, William David, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Devoti, David Frank, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fleury, Lyne Marie, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Floyd, Arthur Louis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Friedrich, Andreas Imre, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gentry, Wilbert Louis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hill, Terry Clayton, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Katayama, Wayne Yukio, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kidd, Judith Annette, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kinnamon, Wayne Leon, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McCormick, Thomas Ward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Noegel, Marvin Edward, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Paradise, Kenneth Ronald, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Poggemeyer, Ronald Mel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ross, Leanita, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Scarborough, James Wesley, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Selvies, Michael Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Szabo, Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tufts, Thomas Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Urban, Edward A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 York, Arthur L., XXX-XX-XXXX

FINANCE CORPS

Lieutenant Colonels

Beyer, David J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Buster, Robert Willard, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Entrekkin, James H., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ferguson, Arthur D., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gonzalez, Rodriguez Francis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Granger, Richard B., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Laborenz, Astrid B., XXX-XX-XXXX
 McNeill, Elaine, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Moody, Stanley Ray, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Morris, John Alan, XXX-XX-XXXX

Pfannmuller, Walter H., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, James K., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stenzel, George Oswald, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX

Majors

Adams, John E., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Baldassari, Louis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Barnes, Dave E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Beck, Lois M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bowden, David Douglas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Braswell, Bille Edmund, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Candiogios, John Anthony, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cates, J. Mac, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Collins, Robert Lynn, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Connolly, William Francis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Crouch, Ronald Arferd, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ellerman, Margaret Louise, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Frascatore, James Lawrence, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fudold, John Harlan, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Granville, William Walsh, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Griffin, Richard Leroy, III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hansen, Eugene Theodore, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hanson, Verne Burdette, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Harrison, Ralph Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Harwood, John Davis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hauser, Billy Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hyek, Irene Anne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Indelicate, John Albert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jackson, John Phillip, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Janiga, Degnan, Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Johanson, John Nils, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lebeda, Gregory Dirk, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lock, James Leonard, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 MacLean, Edward William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mark, Robert James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Massman, Lawrence John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mathews, Charles Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Matich, Nenad, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McCormick, Frank Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Miller, Richard Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Moran, John Leroy, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Morton, George Bowlin, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Murrah, Edmund Jerome, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Newman, Dan McDowell, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nordaune, Kenneth Sherman, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Palmer, Daniel Warren, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Payette, Paul Foster, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Poche, Charles David, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Prosser, Gerald Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rehorst, Thomas Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Richards, Willard O'Brien, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rivard, Victor Don, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rowe, Clarence Eugene, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rudd, John Herman, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sandt, David George, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schultz, Robert Urena, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Shera, James Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sherwood, Robert Emerson, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Ronald Carl, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stephens, James Douglas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Taylor, Anthony Ray, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Trudell, Richard Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Vaughn, James M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Vinson, George Eldon, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX

Captains

Capestan, Pedro Luis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cowardin, Clinton Lewis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jones, Anne Marie, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jones, John Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Morton, Craig Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Quinn, Thomas E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schumann, Edward Daniel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wright, James Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX

ORDNANCE CORPS

Lieutenant colonels

Bowers, Paul Grady, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cain, Mack Hayward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ciraulo, Robert Leon, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Davis, Dale Arlen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Green, James Edward, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gretka, John Francis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hair, Dwight Eugene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hatcher, Clarence L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Horner, Gordon Dale, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hueffel, Robert Judson, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Keyes, Alfred Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Leisen, Jacob William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mabry, Richard Mauldin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Martin, Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Maxwell, Norman Voynie, XXX-XX-XXXX

Morris, James Leslie, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nikazy, Eddie Max, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Palaschak, Richard George, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Passarelli, John, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Patterson, Doyling Gene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Santos, Agapito, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Dale D., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Southern, Kenneth Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Titus, David Ralph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Weller, Donald L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Williams, Buford Max, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Woodson, Robert Llewellyn, XXX-XX-XXXX

Majors

Adams, Christopher Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Anazagasty, Ralph Angel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Anderson, Bruce Barton, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Anderson, Terry Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Andrew, Gary Franklin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Andrews, Norman John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Armbright, Larry Warren, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Arnold, Robert Rae, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Baker, Douglas Ray, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Baker, Leonard Mark, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Baker, Robert William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bartosh, Larry James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Beam, Kenneth Madison, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Benick, Ronald Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Best, Jay Phillip, III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bird, John Stanley, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Block, Peter Spencer, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Boozer, James Daniel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Boyd, James Thomas, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bramblett, John Russell, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bright, George Elmer, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Briseno, Raul, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bryant, Mark Allian, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bullock, David Thomas, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bynum, Cleophus Early, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Casias, Richard Andrew, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cheatham, Ronald Carvill, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Chism, Benny Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Chobrda, Martin Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cloud, Marcus Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cox, Larry Van, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Crites, Jerry Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Crocker, Gerald Edwin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Crow, James Lynn, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dalbom, John Dale, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Daly, Michael William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Davies, Michael Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Davis, Felton Leon, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Denney, Joel Carter, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dixon, Robert Walter Junio, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Donahue, Joseph John, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Downey, John Martin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Drugley, Gary L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dull, David Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dutton, Richard Samuel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dziedzic, Gene, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Emiling, David Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ervin, William Jackson, III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Evans, Christopher Lloyd, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fletcher, Michol Roy, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fleury, James Joseph, XXX-XX-XX
 Flickinger, Lowell Kennedy, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Frye, James Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fulton, William Henry, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Funk, Thomas Gregory, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gailey, Charles Kenon, III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Galysh, Roman Lubomir, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Garcia, Elias Felipe, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gauger, Raymond Arthur, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gluth, David Otto, XXX-XX-XX
 Goodbody, Emmet Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Griffard, Mark Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Guenther, Wayne Wilburn, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hallstrom, Gregory Alan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hatcher, Clarence Leon, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Helton, Eddie Douglas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Henderson, George Francis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hindman, Franklin Frederic, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hinebaugh, James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hiroto, Christopher Toshio, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hirt, Paul Joseph, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hogan, John Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Howard, Michael Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hughes, James Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hune, Baugh James C., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hunsucker, James Randolph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Huval, Danny James, XXX-XX-XXXX

Jordan, Norris Steven, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jurca, Michael Anthony, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kawakami, Charles Edwin T., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Klebler, Robert Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 King, Lawrence Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kirby, Patrick, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kirby, William Meredith, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kirsch, Norman George, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kleager, Jerald Eugene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kocik, Max, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lalacona, Nicholas Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Maase, Brian Scott, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Madigan, Larry Allan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Maki, James Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Manula, Thomas Dale, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Marlow, Larry Griffin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Martin, Roger Lynn, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Masters, Roy Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McCane, O. B., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 McCray, John Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McGlynn, Franklin Joseph J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 McHenry, Robert Harold, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 McLeod, Hugh Scobie, III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McMahan, Daniel Luther, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Megahan, David Arthur, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Miller, Brent Robinson, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Miller, Michael Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Miller, Nelson Alvin, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Minno, Jeffrey Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Murphy, Michael Jude, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Myers, Robert John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Newman, Brian David, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nielsen, Peter Lawrence, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nowicki, Michael Louis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Owen, Morey, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Padialmercado, Ivan Luis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Parr, Francis Xavier, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pazak, Michael George, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pendergast, Michael Richar, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pepin, Armand Omer, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Peterson, Alvin Theodore, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pettibon, Thomas Woodrow, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Phyllis, John Kennedy, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Polvino, Charles James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Powl, Theodore Guthrie, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Priddy, David Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Purcell, Gerald Louis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Renner, Steven Ernest, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rhylander, Kenneth Warren, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ritter, Willie Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Robinson, Julius C., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rodgers, Jerry Devon, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rogala, John Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rogers, Ronald Radford, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sabin, Ashley Fishburne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Scarfo, John Baptist, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schatz, Walter, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Setcavage, Paul Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sherrill, Samuel Whitsitt, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sherwood, Richard Irvin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Shoemaker, Stephen Jay, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sims, David Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sipes, John Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Skinner, Thomas Alan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Snow, Stephen John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Southworth, William Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sowell, Thomas Bruce, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Springer, Thomas Frank, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sproul, Alexander Erskine, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stewart, Lawrence James, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stplier, Robert Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Strickland, Edward Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Swindell, General Benjamin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Swofford, James Edwin, II, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Szelia, Edward Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Templeton, Scott Herbert J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Thompson, David T., Sr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tinsley, Wally Joe, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Titunik, Steven Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tolson, Jarvis Hartley, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tommervik, David Raymond, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tompkins, James Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Turner, Frank Nelson, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Vernon, James Ellsworth, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Waldron, Harry Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Walker, Robert James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ware, James Harvey, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Weekly, Terry Morris, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wilkins, Timothy Mark, XXX-XX-XXXX

Woodward, Robert Bruce, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Workizer, Daniel Turner, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX

Captains

Brueckman, James Arthur, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cachero, Francisco Sagun J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cantey, Samuel Ervin, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Chappell, Samuel Lawrence, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Filbey, Robert Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gibb, Harry Bernard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hallock, Scott Alan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kalb, Charles Francis, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lee, Brian Francis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Maurer, Michael Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mercer, Bruce Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Moore, Harold Dean, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Morgillo, Michael Luciano, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nolte, Marvin Craig, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Prescott, Daniel Marshall, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rae, Jeffrey Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Runyan, John Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, John Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Strobel, Dennis Alan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Todd, David Butler, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Twing, Charles Leroy, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wells, George William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wood, Michael Browning, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wright, William Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Zachry, Guy Cecil, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX

*QUARTERMASTER CORPS**Lieutenant colonels*

Askew, Lattice, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Barnes, Russell, Milton, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bayer, James William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Blair, Arnold Gans, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Carmichael, Gordon Elkes, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cofield, James David Junio, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Comfort, Harold James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cramer, Ned Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Curran, Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dahlke, Milton Melvin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Davis, Vernon Bethea, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dwyer, Peter, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Elliott, Lynn Blaine, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Estes, Glen Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Foreman, Theodore M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Frank, Norma Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gallagher, William David, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gloskowski, Edward Peter, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gudmundson, Brent Martin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hansen, Wilburn Pat, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Harrington, Bobby Cole, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jackson, Judith Gail, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jenison, William Donald, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Johnson, Lloyd Melvin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Katzenmeyer, Hardy Albert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 MacKay, Frederick Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Malmon, Joel Jacob, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Major, Frank, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McGrath, Catherine Ellen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Porter, Robert Owen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rush, Gene Walter, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smiley, David Bruce, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Starnes, Jerry Roger, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Thomason, Glen R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wartick, Dean Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Watson, James Everett, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wilson, Doane McKinstry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wilson, Wilson Warren, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Zamenick, Stephen J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Zeamer, Aaron Craig, XXX-XX-XXXX

Majors

Acosta, Gerardo, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Allen, James Douglas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Amidel, Michael Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Atkinson, Richard Jay, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Blair, Joseph Andrew, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Boozer, James D., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bowman, Leslie Wilson, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bugert, Judith Rita, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Burkett, Frederick Jeffery, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Buster, Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Calame, Peter Louis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Calhoun, Norman S., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Callahan, Joseph James, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Camerano, Anthony Gerald J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Carnes, Ambrus Durward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Carr, Terry Ray, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Caruthers, Robert Stanley, XXX-XX-XXXX

Castillo, Patricio Bernard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Caviggia, John Dennis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Celeste, Richard Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Chancellor, Charles David, I, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Copeland, Wesley Berry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Corder, Phillip Craig, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Crawford, Cheryl Anne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Davis, Argus Daniel, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dean, Donald Gary, XXX-XX-XXXX
 DeLuca, Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Domenico, Jay Anthony, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Doran, Thomas Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dueñas, Anthony Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dutt, David G., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ellis, Richard Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 English, William Haney, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fisher, Thomas Clayton, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Foreman, Richard Patrick, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Frazier, Richard Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gallenbeck, Curtis E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gamble, Lee Clanon, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gates, Richard William, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gibbs, Harold Nixon, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gomez, Lawrence John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gott, E. Lorraine, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Graupmann, Weldon T., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Greer, William Alton, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Grogan, James Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gund, Walter Donald, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hamner, Ronald Park, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Harrington, Joann Marie, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Harris, Samuel Earl, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hart, Jamie Douglas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hayes, Henry Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Haylett, Frank William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Henderson, Kenneth Sherwin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Henderson, William Ernest, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hershey, William Edward, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hibbs, Jack Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hine, Robert Earl, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hogue, Stuart Lucien, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Holland, James Hallie, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Holley, Richard Patrick, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hugins, Robert Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hughes, Charles Wilson, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Humphrey, Gilbert Gene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hunter, Devra Ann, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Isom, Frank, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Janssen, Arwin John, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Johnson, Harry Watkins, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kelly, Cathy, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kokolakis, James Harry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kunkle, Donald Wilson, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lafrance, Dianna Marie, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lane, William Terrence, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lebaron, Russell Samuel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lightfoot, James Walter, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lotero, Ronald Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lovelace, David Eastman, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lovelace, Robert Lloyd, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Malik, Robert Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 March, Ronald Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Marcone, Thomas Anthony, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mason, Donald, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mateer, Robert Francis, III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Matherne, Joseph Gabriel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Maurer, Klaus Juergen, X, XXX-XX-XXXX
 May, James Perry, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 McAnally, Loren Vee, XX, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McDougal, Norma Lester, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McDougall, William James I., XXX-XX-XXXX
 McGee, Stephanie Ann Rast, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McGovern, Frank Patrick, XX, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McKnight, John Edward, XX, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McLean, William Stewart, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Meredith, David Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Messina, Louis, III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Milan, Ben R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mills, Lane Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nedeca, David W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Noll, Rudolph Asher, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nunes, Margaret Yates, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Okabayashi, Rodney S., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Orlando, Anthony John, XX, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Outier, Henry Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pace, Orville Clarence, Jr., XX, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Page, Stephen R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Patterson, Don Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Peters, Stephen John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Peterson, Charles Albert, XXX-XX-XXXX

Pitaro, Francis Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Plummer, Robert Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Price, Terrance Eugene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Prutzman, Albert Garfield, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Quinian, O'Neill Patrick, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rexrode, Thomas Owen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Riffe, John Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Robinson, John Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Robinson, Turhan Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ross, Robert Moss, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schilkens, Charles Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schumacher, David Wallace, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Scott, James Ernest, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Seaberg, David Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Seffens, Stephen Kent, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sension, Charles William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Shaw, David William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Singleton, Eddie Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Wister Gerald, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smyre, Lee Roy, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stormer, Robert Leslie, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sydnor, Otha Lewis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Talley, James Ray, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Thompson, Oliver Leo, III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Thompson, Thomas Edmund, Jr., XXX-X-XXXX
 XXX-XXXX
 Truman, Harry S., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Vanbuskirk, Barry Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Vazquez, John Henry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Webb, Johnnie Edward, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wheeler, Donna Gale, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wiggins Charlie, J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wilder, Edward Macario, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Williams, Felix Earl, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Williams, James Larry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Woodruff, David Eugene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Yates, Gary Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Young, William Basil, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Zamudio, Jack Ramon, XXX-XX-XXXX

Captains

Bell, Donald William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bennett, Clifford, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Branch, William Raymond, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Calamaio, Craig A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Finnicum, William Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gund, Walter D., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hunter, Stephanie Sue, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Johnson, Carolyn Louise To, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kreps, Ruth Ann, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Newton, Horace Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ogilvie, Raymond Wellesley, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Plummer, Robert C., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Read, Joyce Louise, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Singleton, Eddie L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stanek, Joseph Frank, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Taylor, Edward Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Vincent, Eldridge Joseph, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wilbon, Roderick Lanice, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Williams, Michael Burr, XXX-XX-XXXX

*TRANSPORTATION CORPS**Lieutenant colonels*

Birmingham, Dennis Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Buford, Lauren Delos, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Clay, James Earl, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dilg, James Walter, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dutter, Wilbert Andrew, XXX-XX-XXXX
 French, George Dewey, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Flechione, Francis Pasqua, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Grist, Jesse Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hall, Gary Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Heffner, Lewis Ray, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Koshinsky, John Foster, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Labat, Pierre Denis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lewis, Carlos Gerald, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McAdams, Louis Alonza, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Poarch, Henry Harrison, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Royal, Luther, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sanders, Purvis Lara, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schulz, Rodney James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Scott, Roosevelt, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sobel, Robert Lewis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Speidel, Richard Rinehart, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wakefield, Thomas Carroll, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wilson, Daniel Bruce, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wilson, Grady W., XXX-XX-XXXX

Majors

Abbott, Danny Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Adkins, Kenneth Nix, XXX-XX-XXXX

Agee, William Mastin, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Allen, Daniel Kenneth, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Anderson, Walter Stephen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Atwood, Walter Woodrow, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Baggett, Joseph Walton, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bailey, Wayne Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Baldwin, Jerald Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bect, Silas Earl, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Beckmann, Elen Cecile, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Beebe, Richard Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bennett, James Henry, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bennett, Marshall Scott, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Birdsall, Calvin Grigg, III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Blakeslee, William Pease, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bracken, Samuel George, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Branyon, John Samuel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Breckons, Walter Clyde, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Brooks, Daniel Hamilton, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Browell, Gary Ardene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Brown, Walter Tyrone, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bruns, Donald Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bryan, John Patrick, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Buckley, David Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Calhoun, Norman Sayman, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Calvert, Peter Dimock, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cannom, Robert James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cary, Bruce Barbour, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Chamberlain, Steven Leon, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ciccone, Richard Grant, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Clark, William Hill, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Clay, James E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Coker, Terry Jay, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Colucci, Kenneth Francis, XXX-X-XXXX
 Combs, Robert Mack, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Considine, Thomas Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cook, John Louis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cooper, Clayton Wilce, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Copping, George Francis, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Crider, Thomas Kevil, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Culverhouse, Jerry Roger, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Curtin, Stephen Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cyr, Thomas Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dana, Thomas Newell, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Deay, William Russell, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dempsey, Ross Miller, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dente, Jerome Leon, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Desjardins, Paul Bernard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Devito, Joseph Frank, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dhuyvetter, Tony John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Diaz, Franklin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dickerson, Herbert Lester, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dubose, Samuel Alexander, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dunn, Dennis Joe, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ebbinga, Clarence Theodore, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Eckard, Sidney Douglass, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Edwards, Richard Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Egan, Donald Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ellis, Robert Earl, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Everts, Robert Scott, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fales, Larry Roger, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ferguson, Peter Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fernandez, John Frederick, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fichter, Thomas Albert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fillmore, Benjamin Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fluty, William Corbett, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Foster, Jerry Don, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Foster, Ralph Lamar, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fouik, Tom Bond, III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Foye, John Douglas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Francisco, Vaden Burdette, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gates, Raymond Irving, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gebbie, Stanley Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Geer, John Monroe, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Giordano, Stephen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Golden, James William, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gonano, Arnold Leo, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gordon, Elton Taylor, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Grant, Curtis Joel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Green, Gerald Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Green, Larry Glenn, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Green, Lorane, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gunnin, Larry Eugene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Guppy, Christopher McClain, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hampton, Jules Wilson, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Harris, Eddie Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hatcher, Daniel Pierson, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Haupt, Berdean William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Healy, Dennis William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hickel, Lance Kelbaugh, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hill, Silas Wesley, XXX-XX-XXXX

Hillis, John Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Holley, Donna Joyce, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Holmgren, Larry Leon, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hough, Fredric Gary, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hudspeth, David Lewis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hudspeth, Lewis Albert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Isbel, Ronald Paige, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ivey, Ramon Anthony, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jacobus, Charles Henry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jarvis, Allen John, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Johnson, Gary Dwayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jones, Ralph Cedric, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jordan, Van Patrick, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kaiser, Van Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kilbourn, William Ray, XXX-XX-XXXX
 King, Richard Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kirkham, Robert T., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kisler, Alvin Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kleiman, Robert Joel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kramer, Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kreutz, James Roden, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Krobart, James Albert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lake, Peter Hanslip, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lame, David Warren, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lang, Albert George, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Leaman, Jeffrey Scott, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Leedy, David Ballou, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lindquist, John Warren, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lutz, Joseph J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Magrosky, John Joseph, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mansa, Patricia Obryen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Martin, Larry King, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Maynor, Kynis, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 McClintock, David Anthony, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McCloskey, Edwin Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McHenry, Michael Clark, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Medvitz, Charles Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Minter, Dennis Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mix, Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Montgomery, Rolland R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mooney, Edward D., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Moore, Tom Denson, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Moore, Winston, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mowrey, Jake Duane, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Moyer, Daniel Leonard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nadeau, Victor Gerald, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nedela, David Warren, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Neperely, George Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nimblett, Donald William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nothtine, Charles Louis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nuttall, Edward Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 O'Brien, Edward J. W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Obrien, Edward J. W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Olson, Lawrence Andrew, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Otto, Norman John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Parr, Bernard Andrew, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Parris, Gary Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Payne, Jan Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Peake, Troy William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Perelliminetti, Jules Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Phelps, Patrick Francis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Polanski, Christopher Step, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Porter, Charles Oscar, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Poulin, Roger Floyd, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Poulos, Richard Gary, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Powell, Stuart Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rahn, Ronald Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rawls, Jester William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Revelle, Anel William, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Richards, Clark David, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rogers, Royal Pittman, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rosenberg, Terry Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Salger, Glenn Arthur, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sapko, Joseph Enoch, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Savacool, Edwin Myron, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Scalf, Cecil Floyd, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schneider, Ronald D., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schumacher, Howard Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Seife, John Keith, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sherfey, Kenneth Leroy, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Shields, John R., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Shipley, Berchard Ray, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Shull, Robert Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sibbie, George Merwin, X...
 Silva, Richard H., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Simon, Gayle K., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Singleton, James W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sinnott, William Q., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Skelton, James Paul, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Donald Lamar, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Jimmy B., XXX-XX-XXXX

Snow, Jimmie Doyl, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Spring, James Leroy, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Starr, Jacob E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Steyr, Frank Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stoker, Darrell Johnson, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Summerlin, Ronald Gene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tapp, Jack Carlton, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Taylor, William Bradford, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Taylor, William Gary, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Thomas, Douglas Grant, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tish, Thomas Luvern, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Valentine, Christopher R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Vassett, Frank Joseph D., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Verdoorn, Ronald John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Vetrano, Joseph Peter, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wade, Bobby Merrell, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Walls, Russell Kenneth, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Watson, Norman Burl, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Watt, Jimmy Albert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Welch, Donald Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Welch, Lawrence Russel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Welter, Robert Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wentz, Robert Walter, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Werner, Bruce Gerald, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Whitacre, Charles Jerry, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 White, Robert Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 White, Walter Wallace, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wler, Henry Winston, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Williamson, Bruce Clett J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Williamson, Robert Louis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Woolf, Samuel John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wothe, John Werner, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wrinkle, John Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wyks, Edward Earl, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wyn, Dennis Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Yeaw, Truman Carl, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Young, Wesley Mitchell, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Zakszeski, Charles Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Captains
 Barton, Stephen Patrick, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Drake, Michael William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ganslen, Gregory Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hansen, Paul Allan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hulgan, William Roy, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kitchens, Dwight Rudolph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Maslowski, Daniel Francis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Parsons, George William, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Poole, Ronald Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Robbins, Robert David, XXX-XX-XXXX
 CHAPLAIN'S CORPS
 Colonels
 Burtrram, Danny W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Darcy, Richard L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Osborne, Martin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wichmanowski, Walter F., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lieutenant colonels
 Brown, Charles J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Higgiston, Malachy J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Majors
 Abel, Donald W. W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Abramowitz, Marc A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Adkins, Patrick J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Alexander, Kenneth L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Allison, Donald E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Allyn, John K., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Anderson, Bruce D., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Anderson, Christen V., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Anderson, James R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Anderson, Lindell E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Arold, Richard J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Arturetmendez, Antonio, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Axelrod, Harold, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bannan, Daniel E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Banner, Ernest A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Barkey, Paul E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Barnett, Dillmus W., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bauer, John A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Baver, John J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bell, Nicholas D., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Belton, Robert T., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bendick, Robert E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bennett, Stephen L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Benonis, Richard R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Berndt, Leander P., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Berry, Barton D., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bickley, Hugh J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bigsby, Jon R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bobbey, David M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Boone, William R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bouleware, Alton W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Broyles, Michael L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bundick, Bobbie J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bennett, Thomas T., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Butler, Bede J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Butler, Ignatius W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Callahan, Rodney D., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Campbell, Robert L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Caple, William J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Case, William R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cheyne, William B., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Chilien, Michael D., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Christy, Peter K., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Clark, William J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Colbert, Douglass G., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Colley, Joe R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Conner, Gerald W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cooper, John H., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Corbett, Clarence, L., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cottemond, Charles A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cottingham, John G., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Croke, Alfred M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 D'Agostino, Carl L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Davidson, Donald L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Davis, Charles J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Davis, Daniel O., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Davis, Elvernice, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Davis, Kenneth K., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dech, Merle R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Decker, Thomas R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dood, Paul W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Doerbaum, Lloyd A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Doman, Thurman S., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Donahue, Daniel J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Donovan, Richard N., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Douthit, Troy O., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Duncan, Francis J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dunham, Craig R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Durham, James A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Earles, Gerald, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Eberle, William B., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Erbach, William W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Farr, David R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Flaska, John A., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Florez, Juan S., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fox, Jamespa, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gagliardo, Anthony F., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gillespie, Kenneth F., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Glazier, Frederick L., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gleaton, Cal D., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Goforth, Billy S., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gogl, George L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Golden, David O., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gover, Donald W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Greenebaum, William A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Greka, David E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Guebmeier, Mark H., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Guesnier, Rene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Guidry, Raymond J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hall, Robert D., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hamperzonian, Jerry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hannum, Harold M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hanson, Uvgene R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Harris, William C., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hartlage, Albert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hatler, Gaylord E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Henry, Willis L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hepner, Theodore W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hicks, Herbert H., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hines, Thomas E., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Holland, Jerry H., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Horton, Lawrence C., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Howard, David R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hultberg, William J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hume, Kenneth E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Humphrey, Roland Q., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Imberi, Anthony M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Itokazu, Kiyochi, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Iverson, Virgil G., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jankowski, Daniel C., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jansen, Donald J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jenkins, Robert J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jennings, Ervin J., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Johnson, Raymond W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Johnson, Richard C., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jopp, Frank G., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Joseph, Ray K., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kalsing, John J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Keizer, Herman, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kelly, John R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kennedy, Daniel F., XXX-XX-XXXX

Klemele, Leroy, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kim, Stephen K., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kjosa, David L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kohn, Homer L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Koss, Saul H., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kramer, Albert E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Krenitsky, Elias, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Latorre, Stanley E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Laveroni, Alfred F., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lehrer, Wayne J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lincoln, John F., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Litorja, Marvin C., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Livermon, William R., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lizor, Joseph S., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lokkesmoe, Robert G., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Longval, Anthony, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lucas, Thomas L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ludwig, Ralph E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lynch, John J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ludlow, Roy W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lynn, Kenneth L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 MacFarlane, Arne A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Maddox, Fred L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Malley, John C., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Malone, Jerry E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Manning, Benjamin C., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Marcantonio, Clement, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Marshall, Charles J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Martin, Richard J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Martin, Robert J., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mason, Alexander M., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Matheny, Michael J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Maurer, Lewis L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mayer, Gary E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 McAllister, Grant H., XXX-XX-XXXX
 McCaffrey, Daniel J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 McCall, Dan C., XXX-XX-XXXX
 McCrane, Thomas R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 McLean, Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McMichael, John P., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Medlock, Ralph E., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Messersmith, Dale E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Miles, Joel L., Sr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Millard, Stanley N., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Miller, Paul M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Montondon, Francis W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Morgan, Paul W., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mumper, Edward J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Naughton, Thomas J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Neshiem, Vaughn R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Newton, Alvin L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nichols, George H., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Norris, Paul S., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nondorf, Aloysius J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Northrop, Clyde M., III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 O'Connell, David A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 O'Lenny, Patrick J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ornburn, Frank M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 O'Sullivan, Daniel, XX...
 Oswandel, Roy W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Paulson, Everett W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pawlaczek, Andrew W., XX...
 Payne, Delbert G., XX...
 Pedder, Glenn C., XX...
 Phelps, Paul E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pingel, Gilbert H., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pointer, Louis W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Polito, Victor V. J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pridgen, Lamar B., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pugh, Loren D., XX...
 Quinlan, Matthew A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Renfrow, Kenneth E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rogers, James E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Richter, Robert J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rittenbach, Leroy C., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Roberts, Robert D. W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Robinson, Gall J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rodrigues, Anthony V., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rogakos, Constantinos P., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sackett, Gary W., XXX-X-XXXX
 Saddler, Jesse G., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Samsa, Bertin L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sanford, Gary T., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schaefer, Bernard J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schalm, Roger B., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schellenans, Francis J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schmid, Wayne L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schmidt, Raymond F., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Seifried, Kenneth A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Shaddix, John T., XXX-XX-XXXX

Shimek, Andrew A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Silverstein, Philip, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Simeone, Francis P., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sirotko, Theodore F., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Slater, Dennis W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Charles M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Douglas T., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Frederick C., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Gerald H., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Paul H., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Thomas R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Speer, Robert H., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Spiller, Jimmie, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stake, John K., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stallings, Bennie A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stephens, Gerald N., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stephenson, Douglas R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stevens, Raburn L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Suellentrop, Daniel M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sullivan, Edward J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Swedlund, John D., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sydnor, Calvin H., III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tarbet, Robert M., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Taylor, Frederick A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Teer, John F., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Teodoro, Pablo, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tessman, David H., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Thompson, James R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Thoni, Philip F., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Thorne, Carroll W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Timm, Harry W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Trebus, Louis R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tumpkin, Joseph L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Turkelson, Donald R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Turnbow, Frankie L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tyson, Charles A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Vanscoy, Leonard H., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Vickers, Marvin K., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Voges, Ethan C., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Vogt, Robert H., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wade, Henry G., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wallace, Jack A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Walsh, Thomas M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Warne, Thomas M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Weaver, Jerry A. G., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Webb, Jerry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wedel, Larry R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Welch, Thomas D., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wells, John A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wells, Morris F., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Weyland, John J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Whalen, Frank J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Whaley, Richard H., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Whitaker, Dennis R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 White, David A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wichner, Erwin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wideman, Fletcher D., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wiens, Curtis J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wilkins, Lafayette T., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Williams, John C., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wilson, Donald G., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Worman, Jeremiah F., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Young, George B., XXX-XX-XXXX

Captains

Grant, Anderson, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hammann, William H., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Howard, David L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kerns, Carter L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mitchiner, Thomas W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Moore, Lowell, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Roberts, David F., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Roberts, Jimmie A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Thornton, Jesse L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Walker, Larry A., XXX-XX-XXXX

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS

Lieutenant colonels

Bailey, James E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nichols, John J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Scanlon, Jerome W., XXX-XX-XXXX

Majors

Barbee, Jon R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Beardall, Charles W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Blakely, Richard S., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Brooks, Clifford D., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Brown, Patrick P., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Byler, Charles A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Caron, William J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Casey, Peter E., XXX-XX-XXXX

Burton, Richard C., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cole, Joe A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Denny, Michael C., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Discharry, Michael J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Doyle, Brooks S., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Duffy, Thomas J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Duterroll, Jerry G., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Flevet, Harold E., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Finnegan, Richard N., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Frick, Ralph J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ganstine, Robert D., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Goo, Lester M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Graham, David E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Green, Brent P., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hamelin, Norman J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Holman, Jacob J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hough, Richard J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jackson, Robert H., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Keefe, Thaddeus J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kuklok, James G., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Loh, Kom F., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Long, John W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lundberg, Steven B., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Markert, David O., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mosier, Jerome M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mulderig, Robert J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nealey, Vincent C., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Norton, James M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nyman, William E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pangburn, Kenneth D., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Peiuso, Andrew J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Phillips, Stephen S., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pollard, Ivy J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Porter, Steven M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Reade, Robert M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rhodes, Robert C., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Saynisch, Stephen V., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Scanian, Gerald M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Seggar, Ruurd C., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Short, Robert J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stokesberry, John G., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Thompson, Paul G., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wagner, Frank J., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Warner, Ronald A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Zucker, Karin W., XXX-XX-XXXX

Captains

Allan, Edward G., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Anderson, Stephen P., XX...
 Babolan, Richard, X...
 Black, Owen H., XX...
 Blackburn, David J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Braga, James A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Brewer, Garry L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Carey, Connie L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Carey, David, XXX-XX-XXXX
 DiGiammarino, Frank J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Drach, Susan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Estey, Russell S., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Goudeaux, Nolan, XX...
 Gourlay, Thomas H., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Greczniel, Hort G., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Haney, Stephen R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hayn, Linda S., XX...
 Hebl, Kevin J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Horton, Victor L., XX...
 Kaczynski, Stephen R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kane, Stephen R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kelly, Michael T., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kennerly, Phillip L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lee, Joseph K., Jr., XX...
 Longbottom, Harry W., XX...
 Malley, Stephen S., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Matzkind, Roger S., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Meyer, Kent R., XX...
 Morant, Blake D., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Parise, Robert J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Perolman, Gary M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Petroff, Nicholas J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pianelli James, V., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Price, Wayne H., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Raezer, Timothy A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Reed, Steven L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rogers, Kathryn J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sargeant, Kimball J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Shaw, John D., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sirmans, George A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stein, Jack A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stevens, Michael L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sumner, David W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Switzer, Joseph J., XXX-XX-XXXX

Wilder, Charles J., II. XXX-XX-XXXX
Woodling, Dale N. XXX-XX-XXXX

ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

Majors

Ashley, Robert Leroy, XXX-XX-XXXX
Barefoot, Diana Maio, XXX-XX-XXXX
Bartlett, Jo Anne, XXX-XX-XXXX
Briley, Jackie Wyane, XXX-XX-XXXX
Carlson, Dawn Eileen, XXX-XX-XXXX
Dineila, Elizabeth C., XXX-XX-XXXX
Franklin, Ronald James, XXX-XX-XXXX
Graham, John Parry, XXX-XX-XXXX
Greathouse, David Guy, XXX-XX-XXXX
Mills, James Lee, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
Ranger, Donna Jordan, XXX-XX-XXXX
Redell, Rita Wolf, XXX-XX-XXXX
Ritter, Richard C., XXX-XX-XXXX
Thomas, Clorice D., XXX-XX-XXXX

Captains

Ambrose, Lona Kay, XXX-XX-XXXX
Neveux, Catherine Joan, XXX-XX-XXXX
Smotuk, Michael Andrew, XXX-XX-XXXX

ARMY NURSE CORPS

Colonels

Gorman, Elly Patricia, XXX-XX-XXXX
Metz, Martha Louise, XXX-XX-XXXX
Nurse, Joyce Juanita, XXX-XX-XXXX
Randall, Delores Hamer, XXX-XX-XXXX

Lieutenant colonels

Antilla, Betty Joan, XXX-XX-XXXX
Bowie, Reuben Amanda B., XXX-XX-XXXX
Brazier, Robert Evans, XXX-XX-XXXX
Bredemeyer, Laura Jane, XXX-XX-XXXX
Bryant, Marjorie Mae, XXX-XX-XXXX
Buzzard, Rita V. Naranjo, XXX-XX-XXXX
Cherrington, Raymond H., XXX-XX-XXXX
Clutter, Lenna Mae, XXX-XX-XXXX
Coggin, Laura Jacqueline, XXX-XX-XXXX
Crowley, Maureen Alice, XXX-XX-XXXX
Croy, Gail, XXX-XX-XXXX
Cudnochufsky, Eugene R., XXX-XX-XXXX
Downey, Doris Pauline, XXX-XX-XXXX
Earnest, Ralph Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
Eckels, Ann Delaney H., XXX-XX-XXXX
Estes, Zane Elwood, XXX-XX-XXXX
Feske, Mary Ann, XXX-XX-XXXX
Fico, Karen Kay, XXX-XX-XXXX
Fortson, Shirley E., XXX-XX-XXXX
Franks, James Leonard, XXX-XX-XXXX
Green, Dolores, XXX-XX-XXXX
Haag, George Phillip, XXX-XX-XXXX
Kohl, Michele, XXX-XX-XXXX
Kuttner, Jean May, XXX-XX-XXXX
Lewis, Otis Hulon, XXX-XX-XXXX
Mathews, Charles Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
McCann, Sheila Anne, XXX-XX-XXXX
McDunnah, Carlyle Dean, XXX-XX-XXXX
McQuail, Claire Marie, XXX-XX-XXXX
Metcalfe, Martha Elaine, XXX-XX-XXXX
Miller, Evelyn Shirley, XXX-XX-XXXX
Mino, Thomas Arthur, XXX-XX-XXXX
Moskovites, John Peter, XXX-XX-XXXX
Nooney, Nancy Nobleece, XXX-XX-XXXX
O'Neill, Marie Ruth, XXX-XX-XXXX
Pugh, Calvin Clark, XXX-XX-XXXX
Purcell, Shirley Ann T., XXX-XX-XXXX
Reed, Jack Olvine, XXX-XX-XXXX
Robbins, Dolly Marie, XXX-XX-XXXX
Rosadotero, Adolfo, XXX-XX-XXXX
Smith, Lucille Ann Letz, XXX-XX-XXXX
Snell, Frank Washington, XXX-XX-XXXX
Snyder, Helen Rose, XXX-XX-XXXX
Springmier, Joyce T., XXX-XX-XXXX
Sullivan, Gerald Eugene, XXX-XX-XXXX
Throwe, Gerald Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
Verret, Blaise Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX
Walker, Prince Albert J., XXX-XX-XXXX
Walsh, Edith Virginia, XXX-XX-XXXX
Webster, Edith Heer, XXX-XX-XXXX
Welton, Nellie Loretta, XXX-XX-XXXX
Wheeler, Peggy Louise, XXX-XX-XXXX

Majors

Arndt, Judith Martha, XXX-XX-XXXX
Ashburn, David Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
Aurell, Dinah Lyn, XXX-XX-XXXX
Barron, Velma J., XXX-XX-XXXX
Bassett, Patricia Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX

Bayliss, Susan Ellen, XXX-XX-XXXX
Beach, Donald Marshall, XXX-XX-XXXX
Bell, Elizabeth Ann, XXX-XX-XXXX
Bennett, John Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX
Biebesheimer, Ellen E., XXX-XX-XXXX
Bird, Carita Ann, XXX-XX-XXXX
Birdseye, Helen Marie, XXX-XX-XXXX
Blomberg, Olof Samuel, XXX-XX-XXXX
Borman, Barbara Jean, XXX-XX-XXXX
Bradley, Barbara Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
Branson, Roberta Randal, XXX-XX-XXXX
Brown, Margaret Jean L., XXX-XX-XXXX
Bryant, Lina Sue, XXX-XX-XXXX
Burns, Pamela Koponen, XXX-XX-XXXX
Camp, Virginia Ann Rako, XXX-XX-XXXX
Capps, Erie Dianne, XXX-XX-XXXX
Cline, Margaret Easterd, XXX-XX-XXXX
Coffey, Shirley Eileen, XXX-XX-XXXX
Cogan, Phyllis Breen, XXX-XX-XXXX
Coil, Leslie Diane, XXX-XX-XXXX
Conrad, Barbara Jean, XXX-XX-XXXX
Conte, Jacqueline Rose, XXX-XX-XXXX
Cooper, Helen Marva, XXX-XX-XXXX
Craft, Mary Sheldon, XXX-XX-XXXX
Creider, Sherry Darnall, XXX-XX-XXXX
Criswell, Mary Lou, XXX-XX-XXXX
Crittenden, Frances Lou, XXX-XX-XXXX
Cullinan, Barbara Jeann, XXX-XX-XXXX
Curry, Laura Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
Darcy, Darlene E., XXX-XX-XXXX
Davis, Shirley Gamble, XXX-XX-XXXX
Deardorff, Mary Thereas, XXX-XX-XXXX
Demi, Howard Lewis, XXX-XX-XXXX
Deponti, Rebecca Jean P., XXX-XX-XXXX
Devore, Donna Jean, XXX-XX-XXXX
Domallik, Walter Anthony, XXX-XX-XXXX
Dunlap, John E. Dodd, XXX-XX-XXXX
Echevarria, Carlos A., XXX-XX-XXXX
Eisaman, Charlotte C., XXX-XX-XXXX
Elliott, Barbara Jean, XXX-XX-XXXX
Elliott, Carol Jean, XXX-XX-XXXX
Estepp, William Sanders, XXX-XX-XXXX
Evans, Jane Elizabeth, XXX-XX-XXXX
Exum, Patricia Smyth M., XXX-XX-XXXX
Feefer, Ross Frank, XXX-XX-XXXX
Fitzgerald, Patricia A., XXX-XX-XXXX
Funk, Donna Karrer, XXX-XX-XXXX
Garlock, Cynthia Ann S., XXX-XX-XXXX
Giusto, Joan Ann, XXX-XX-XXXX
Glenn, Lucille, XXX-XX-XXXX
Golson, Patricia Szalay, XXX-XX-XXXX
Greenlee, John Wilson, XXX-XX-XXXX
Griffith, Lessie A., XXX-XX-XXXX
Gwaltney, George Allan, XXX-XX-XXXX
Hadersbeck, Rita Elmer, XXX-XX-XXXX
Hammond, Jean Elizabeth, XXX-XX-XXXX
Hill, Beverly Ann Mehl, XXX-XX-XXXX
Hughes, Harold Power, XXX-XX-XXXX
Jew, Colleen Lorretta L., XXX-XX-XXXX
Johnson, Grace Phyllis, XXX-XX-XXXX
Johnson, Mary B. W., XXX-XX-XXXX
Johnson, Susan Jayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
Jolivet, Jo Ann, XXX-XX-XXXX
Jorgeson, Lynn Patricia, XXX-XX-XXXX
Karabasz, Clare Marie, XXX-XX-XXXX
Keegler, Linda Chapin, XXX-XX-XXXX
Keeler, Jill Rolf, XXX-XX-XXXX
Kelly, Marjorie Mary, XXX-XX-XXXX
Keneson, Edwin Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
Klidea, John, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
King, Mary Jo, XXX-XX-XXXX
King, William Henry, XXX-XX-XXXX
Knight, Frazier L., XXX-XX-XXXX
Knop, Richard John, XXX-XX-XXXX
Kossman, Marcia Louise, XXX-XX-XXXX
Kulm, Margaret Mary, XXX-XX-XXXX
Kutzorik, Barbara Jean, XXX-XX-XXXX
Larchey, Mary Catherine, XXX-XX-XXXX
Lee, Mary Ellen Koca, XXX-XX-XXXX
Lee, Vivian Zella W., XXX-XX-XXXX
Lindecker, Howard James, XXX-XX-XXXX
Lockett, Mildred O., XXX-XX-XXXX
Lownie, Jacqueline Kay, XXX-XX-XXXX
Mallory, Jerilyn Janet, XXX-XX-XXXX
Marshall, Judith Mary, XXX-XX-XXXX
Martin, Doris, XXX-XX-XXXX
Matteson, Joann, XXX-XX-XXXX
McBride, Patricia Bolon, XXX-XX-XXXX
McLeskey, Theodora F., XXX-XX-XXXX
McMarlin, Susan Ann, XXX-XX-XXXX

Meyer, Joanne Carol, XXX-XX-XXXX
Miller, Esther Ruth, XXX-XX-XXXX
Mills, Helen Moore, XXX-XX-XXXX
Mitchell, Kathleen Bern, XXX-XX-XXXX
Mitchell, Theora Lois, XXX-XX-XXXX
Montoya, Irene, XXX-XX-XXXX
Moore, Barbara Sommers, XXX-XX-XXXX
Mooy, Bruce Wendell, XXX-XX-XXXX
Mullen, Donna Hoagland, XXX-XX-XXXX
Neiman, Ellen Marie, XXX-XX-XXXX
Nelson, Iva Kay, XXX-XX-XXXX
Nett, Kathleen Marie, XXX-XX-XXXX
Olszanowski, Patricia L., XXX-XX-XXXX
Parker, Cyril Conrad, XXX-XX-XXXX
Parkinson, Nancy K., XXX-XX-XXXX
Peacock, Benjamin Asmon, XXX-XX-XXXX
Peck, Teri Friedman, XXX-XX-XXXX
Perez, Amelia S., XXX-XX-XXXX
Perkins, Mary Jane, XXX-XX-XXXX
Petorak, Peter Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
Phillips, Jolynn Sorren, XXX-XX-XXXX
Probst, Cynthia Baker J., XXX-XX-XXXX
Quinn, Farris Jean C., XXX-XX-XXXX
Rakiewicz Caroline J., XXX-XX-XXXX
Resko, Carolyn Bernadet, XXX-XX-XXXX
Roberts, Jerry Ronald, XXX-XX-XXXX
Robinson, Sylvia Parker, XXX-XX-XXXX
Russo, Joan Diana F., XXX-XX-XXXX
Sarnecky, Mary Theresa, XXX-XX-XXXX
Sautter, Dawn P., XXX-XX-XXXX
Scally, Helen Marie, XXX-XX-XXXX
Schade, Etsie Regina, XXX-XX-XXXX
Schotz, Helen Coralia, XXX-XX-XXXX
Schwaler, Sandra Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
Schwark, Shelby Jean C., XXX-XX-XXXX
Shapiro, Allan Edwin, XXX-XX-XXXX
Shelton, Lanette Marie, XXX-XX-XXXX
Shepard, Rosamond Robin, XXX-XX-XXXX
Sikes, Patricia Ann H., XXX-XX-XXXX
Skowronski, Eileen F., XXX-XX-XXXX
Smith, Brenda Dunakin, XXX-XX-XXXX
Smith, Mary Jean C., XXX-XX-XXXX
Srembo, Dorothy Jane, XXX-XX-XXXX
Stone, Mary Anita, XXX-XX-XXXX
Strope, Donley Wilbur, XXX-XX-XXXX
Sullivan, Elizabeth A., XXX-XX-XXXX
Swenson, Mary Ann, XXX-XX-XXXX
Toblasson, Michael E., XXX-XX-XXXX
Urbanski, Joan M., XXX-XX-XXXX
Wacks, Gloria Jean Snow, XXX-XX-XXXX
Wall, Anne Carol Swavel, XXX-XX-XXXX
Watkins, Betty Lou S., XXX-XX-XXXX
Wells, Susan Elizabeth, XXX-XX-XXXX
Whidby, Barbara Lynn, XXX-XX-XXXX
White, Brenda Lee J., XXX-XX-XXXX
White, Orrin Monroe, XXX-XX-XXXX
Wiemers, Darlene Mae, XXX-XX-XXXX
Williams, Bertha Lou, XXX-XX-XXXX
Williams, Marilyn Jon W., XXX-XX-XXXX
Wilson, Delores Esther, XXX-XX-XXXX
Wyatt, Patricia Louise, XXX-XX-XXXX
Yaryan, Barbara Ellen, XXX-XX-XXXX
Yip, Gar, XXX-XX-XXXX
Zunino, Jeannette McAle, XXX-XX-XXXX
Zwerner, Darlene Anne, XXX-XX-XXXX

Captains

Beale, Pamela Pumperly, XXX-XX-XXXX
Belew, Beverly Ann, XXX-XX-XXXX
Brown, Jimmie Ruth W., XXX-XX-XXXX
Fitzgerald, Donna Kay M., XXX-XX-XXXX
Grieshaber, Nona Ann, XXX-XX-XXXX
Harris, Barbara Lynn K., XXX-XX-XXXX
Jacobs, Mary Ellen O., XXX-XX-XXXX
Kading, Deborah M., XXX-XX-XXXX
Keller, Susan Mildred, XXX-XX-XXXX
King, David Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
Laurita, Daniel Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
Maynard, Georgia Gay H., XXX-XX-XXXX
Morrison, Anne Brita, XXX-XX-XXXX
Musteller, Christine Jo, XXX-XX-XXXX
Oldridge, Janice Mazur, XXX-XX-XXXX
Pickeringcott, Gwendoline, XXX-XX-XXXX
Ross, Susan Walsh, XXX-XX-XXXX
Shillato, Joann Headley, XXX-XX-XXXX
Slimowicz, Carolyn M., XXX-XX-XXXX
Smail, Dorothea Louise, XXX-XX-XXXX
Smeitzer, Lola Kay Fast, XXX-XX-XXXX
Smith, Patricia Kay, XXX-XX-XXXX
Smith, Sheila Mae Cash, XXX-XX-XXXX

DENTAL CORPS
Colonels

Frost, John Marshall, XXX-XXXXX
 Guess, Kenneth Dean, XXX-XXXXX
 Hagerman, Jerry Thomas, XXX-XXXXX
 Krier, Paul William, XXX-XXXXX
 Lohse, Walter George, XXX-XXXXX
 O'connell, Wallace James, XXX-XXXXX
 Whitbeck, Peter, XXX-XXXXX
 Lieutenant colonels
 Antonini, Charles J., XXX-XXXXX
 Baer, Charles Harrison, XXX-XXXXX
 Bell, Peter Anthony, XXX-XXXXX
 Bergstrom, Thomas Neal, XXX-XXXXX
 Blahuta, George J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Boyd, Douglas Bruce, XXX-XXXXX
 Bulken, James Daymont, XXX-XXXXX
 Campbell, Donald Johnson, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Campolio, Gerald Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Carter, William James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Chupkowski, Richard M., XXX-XXXXX
 Clampit, William Terrance, XXX-XXXXX
 Daniels, Patrick E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Delzer, Delano Dean, XXX-XXXXX
 Doherty, Richard Donald, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Donahoe, Joseph William, XXX-XX...
 Dorsey, Joe K., XXX-XXXXX
 Emerson, Matthew S., XXX-XX...
 Facius, Peter Hans, XXX-XXXXX
 Falenski, Richard Edward, XXX-XX...
 Farmer, John Bartow, Jr., XXX-XX...
 Fernald, William Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Foerster, Ulrich, XXX-XXXXX
 Gary, John Jerome, XXX...
 Gifford, Gerald Ray, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Glasgow, Thomas J., XXX...
 Gluhm, David Peter, XX...
 Gross, Paul Dwayne, XX...
 Grower, Marvin Franklin, XXX...
 Haynes, David Allan, XXX-XX...
 Hecht, Robert Craig, XX...
 Herman, Wayne William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hondrum, Steven Olaf, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hutchins, Harry Stuart, XXX...
 Kaelke, Kerry Joe, XXX-XX...
 Kessler, Joel Robert, XXX-XX...
 Larson, Randall Root, XXX-XX...
 Lewis, David Michael, XXX-XX...
 Loers, Wayne William, XX...
 Machian, George Rudolph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Machuacapadín, Carlos A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 McArthur, David L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 McDowall, John W., XXX-XX...
 Miklik, David Keith, XXX-XXXXX
 Mollere, Rodney David, XXX-XX...
 Moody, Edward Lee, XXX-XXXXX
 Newhouse, Rickey F., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nishimura, Roger S., XXX-XX...
 Noe, Paul Edward, XX...
 Noone, Robert Vincent, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Paul, George Frank, XX...
 Philipsen, Ronald F., XXX-XXXXX
 Powers, William Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ritchie, Gary Max, XXX-XX...
 Rossmann, Jeffrey Allan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Saddoris, Reginald S., XXX...
 Schnell, Frederick John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schwab, Joel Ira, XXX-XX...
 Sheehe, John Paul, XXX-XX...
 Shulman, Jay David, XX...
 Sias, Barbara, XXX...
 Smith, William, Jr., XX...
 Spahn, Robert Gary, XX...
 Stephens, James Leavy, Jr., XXX-XX...
 Stevenson, Michael E., XXX...
 Taylor, Steven Edwin, XXX-X...
 Terhune, William F., XXX...
 Torres, Nadal Jorge R., XXX-XX...
 Turner, George Wayne, XXX...
 Utschig, Leonard David, XX...
 Wenger, James Scott, XXX-XX...
 Whanz, Raymond Soo, XXX...
 Woehrle, Richard Ralph, XXX...
 Wong, Marston Kin Sun, XXX-XX...
 Woodruff, Frederic D., XXX-XX...
 Zwolensky, John Richard, XXX-XX...
 Majors
 Adams, Anthony Joe, XXX...
 Adamson, Dennis Newell, XXX-XX...
 Albritton, James Edmund, XXX-XX...

Allen, Andrew Jarvis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Allen, Gary Wayne, XXX-XXXXX
 Angelo, Anthony Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bagley, Dwight English, XXX-XXXXX
 Bandy, Rufus Young, III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bandy, Thomas Elwood, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Barrett, Thomas Norman, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Barrowes, Kendall James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Baughn, Brent Leslie, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Beitler, Claude Theodor, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Berman, Fredric Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Biggs, Stephen Glen, XXX-XXXXX
 Billman, Michael Alan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Blocker, Sloan Walter, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bodenham, Mark Bridge, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bond, John Leasley, XXX-XXXXX
 Bondra, Daniel Lee, XXX-XXXXX
 Boswell, Cramer Lee, XXX-XXXXX
 Brown, Carolyn Martha, XXX-XXXXX
 Bruegger, Robert Raymond, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bryant, Arthur William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Burleigh, John David, XXX-XXXXX
 Bussell, Norman Eugene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Calabria, Robert Dennis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Campagna, Gary David, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Campbell, David Frederi, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cannava, Paul Anthony, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Caponigro, Thomas J., XXX-XX...
 Case, James Gilbert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cecic, Peter Anthony, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Chilton, Craig Andrew, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Christensen, Loren Cliff, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Civjan, Ralph Haime, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Clem, David Bruce, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cliney, Terrance Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Coloncamacho, Antollino, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Connor, Jcoseph Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cosnahan, Robert Franci, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Craemer, Timothy David, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Crandall, Edwin Malin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Crino, Samuel Joseph, Jr., XXX-XX...
 Crowther, Bruce Quintin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Guenlin, Paul Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dargon, Paul Kevin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Davis, Richard Culberts, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Deleon, Eladio, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Donathan, Grady David, I., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Domley, Dennis Leo, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Donovan, Michael George, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dorsey, Howard Dale, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Eguchi, Dennis Sho, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ekvall, William M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 English, Peter Carew, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Erley, Clyde James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Estey, Allan White, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fairchild, William A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Farabee, Ernest, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fearon, Christopher G., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ferguson, Lucian Maxwell, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fox, Michael Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Galan, Michael Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Galloway, Robert Henry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gaston, Max Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gerace, William Laston, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Giesler, Terry William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Giles, William Bruce, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Glickman, Ronald Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gordon, Mark Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hackman, Steven Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Halbert, William David, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hanover, Robert Burns, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Harper, Bradford W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Harre, John Woodrow, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Harris, Albert James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Harvey, Gerald Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hayes, Ronald James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Henderson, Lester R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hillebrand, Henry A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hinger, Alvin Howard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hirata, Ronald Haruto, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hixson, Mark Eugene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hnarakis, Emanuel James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hobbs, Timothy John, XXX-XX...
 Hogan, Donald William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hollinger, Louis R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Holt, Craig Weston, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hoots, James Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hopkins, Truman A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Horsley, John Phillip, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ingram, Timothy A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Johnston, Lawrence J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jones, Leonard Albert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kainins, Guntis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kataglara, Rodney H., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Keasier, Walter Ewing, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Keller, Dean Bailey, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kern, Stephen Bonney, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kessler, Harvey Philip, XXX-XX-XXXX
 King, Edwin Dorsey, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kinney, Don Allison, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kittle, Paul Edwin, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Klos, Chester Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Koonce, James Daniel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kordulak, John Leon, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lake, George Joseph, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lalumandier, James A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lambert, Joel Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lawson, Theodore Jan, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Leavitt, James Boyd, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Leeds, Robert Cornelius, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Leonard, John Reichmann, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lewis, Harland Guliford, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lindemann, Robert W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Livesay, Thomas G., XXX-XX...
 Loeb, Andrew Hale, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Loveridge, Larry W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Luebke, Robert John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lui, Chiu Lun, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lynch, Thomas James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 MacPherson, Michael Gay, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mariscal, Roque, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Markham, John Winford I., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mathieu, Gregory Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McDonnell, Carbra J., III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McDougle, Michael R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 McFarland, Robert John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Merkel, Stephen Arthur, XXX-XX...
 Miller, John Randall, XXX-XX...
 Miller, Loman Earl, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mills, William Palmer J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Minjarez, Pete II, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mintz, Alan Herbert, XXX-XX-XX...
 Moeller, Donald Richard, XXX...
 Mulrean, Joseph Charles, XXX-XX...
 Nedderman, Theodore A., XXX-XX...
 O'Brien, Robert Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Obrock, Ernest Fred, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Olson, Arvid Keith, XXX-XX...
 O'Neal, John Russell, XXX...
 Osmond, Joseph Roger, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pardoe, James Dick II, XXX...
 Parkman, Terry Evans, XXX-XX...
 Parks, Ralph Devon, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pawlusia, Joseph John, XXX-XX...
 Peterson, Dennis Wayne, XXX...
 Pilgrim, James Junious, XX...
 Plina, Randall Blaine, XX...
 Pohjola, Randall Martin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Primack, Patrice Diane, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Prior, Robert Francis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Putnam, James Merrithew, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ray, Vincent Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Releford, Richard Dale, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Reside, Glenn James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rethman, Michael P., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rich, Jerry, XXX-XX-XX...
 Richardson, Douglas D., XXX-XX...
 Robinson, David Stevens, XXX-XX...
 Ross, Remo Joseph, XX...
 Rouse, Leo Erskine, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rupell, Orville Lovell, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Russell, Kendall F., XXX-XX...
 Saffell, Alberta Harris, XXX...
 Saldana, Carlos Francis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Salomone, John Louis, XXX-XX...
 Schultz, Gary Michael, XX...
 Shipley, Richard Dean, XXX-XX...
 Short, Sinclair G., XXX-XX...
 Shufford, Earl Lewis, XXX...
 Shurtliff, Joseph Lynn, XXX...
 Sigler, Ernest Woodrow, XXX...
 Singer, Michael Todd, XXX...
 Skirvin, Dennis Ray, XXX...
 Smith, Charles Timothy, XXX...
 Smith, Franklin Leonard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Lloyd Nelson, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stone, Stephen Douglas, XXX-XX...
 Suchko, George Duncan, XXX...
 Sutley, Stephen Hall, XX...
 Swistak, Gary Peter, X...
 Swords, Robert Lee, XX...
 Thaler, Melvin Neil, XXX-XX...

Thompson, Bruce Howard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Thompson, James Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tidwell, Otto Frederick, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Todd, Stephen James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Trammell, Gerald Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Vogel, Stephen James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Walters, Jay Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Washington, Charles H., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Weils, Donald Wesley, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wheeler, William Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Whitsitt, John Allison, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Williams, Russell Alan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wooller, Phillip Alan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Woodard, Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Worley, Timothy John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wright, John Ben, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Yanovich, Peter Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX

Captains

Appelbaum, Fred Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bice, Ronald Winfield, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Blair, Robert Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Britton, Joseph Alonzo, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Brody, Steven Mark, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cameron, Stephen M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Carroll, Bernard Leon, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Casey, Glenn Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Clarke, Michael E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dufresne, Joseph Victor, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jones, Ronnie Kent, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Karren, Gary Roger, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lewis, John Franklin, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nelson, Craig Livezey, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Parker, Merle Harry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Raulin, Leslie Ann, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Richter, Norman Wesley, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stricklin, Stephen Robe, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Thoren, James Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tupa, James Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Witwer, David Alan, XXX-XX-XXXX

*MEDICAL CORPS**Colonels*

Alabanza, Florentino, VI, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Alvarez, Johnny Dixon, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Anglin, Walter McAdoo, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Angritt, Peter, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Austin, Ernest, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Baddour, George Alfred, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bancroft, William Hobart, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Barja, Roberto Hassente, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bart, Gerald Norman, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Beatrice, Edwin Staton, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bell, Exter Frank, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bellamy, Ronald Frank, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Benson, William Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Berner, William Hal, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Boccuti, Anthony Russel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Calkins, Richard Allan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Camp, Thomas Felton, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ching, Wilson Vui Soon, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Chipman, Martin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cohen, Howard Barry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Collin, Daniel Bernard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Collins, George James Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cook, Edgar Lewis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cucinelli, Samuel Anthan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cuettier, Albert Cayetan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Daily, Charles Dennis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dambrosio, Umberto, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Danganan, Sergio Sangil, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Daubek, Joseph Larry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Davis, Harry Earl, II, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dimond, Richard Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dobbs, Robert Mays, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ergas, Ralph Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ettore, Albert Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Favila, Marcial Quinone, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Freihofer, Erick Jean, XXX-XX-XXXX
 George, Eugene Donald, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Glancy, Gerard Lloyd, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Golosow, Nikolas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Griffith, Donna Gale, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Griffith, Jesse Samuel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Grobe, Macy John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gushwa, Richard Lew, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hastings, Constance Pat, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hastings, James Eastman, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hegstrom, George Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hennessy, William Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hick, Joe Bolton, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Holtzman, Saul Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX

Jackson, Stephen Macall, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jarotsky, Vladimir, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jeffer, Edward Kenneth, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Johnson, Edward Marion, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jones, Franklin D., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Karney, David Henry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kennell, Charles Byron, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kissack, Alfred S., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Klein, Thomas Alexander, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kolmer, John Wilson, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kovacic, Joseph Harry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Landes, Richard Dale, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McCarty, James Earl, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McManus, William F., XXX-XX-XXXX
 McNamara, Norbert J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Miller, Richard N., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Moorhead, Frank Albert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Moynihan, Francis W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nolen, Harold Wilson, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nortontarpey, Jay, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Odom, Richard Blount, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ossorioolvencia, Jose, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pakusch, Rainer S., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pauling, Fred William, I., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pawlak, Wallace Wlodzim, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pezua, Carlos David, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pierozynski, George J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ream, Norman Wendell, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rosenthal, Daniel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Saglio, Jack William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Saintromain, Ray A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sattgast, John Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Scott, Robert McNair, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Scully, Thomas Jarvis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Semenoff, Daniel John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sim, Joel Clamor, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sobol, Samuel Malbin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Soderdahl, Douglas W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stafford, Harry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sube, Janis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Thomas, John Price, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tippens, Jack Kelvin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Todd, Warren Allen, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tolson, James Monroe, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wartofsky, Leonard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Welch, Richard Douglas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wong, William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wray, Harvey Linton, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Yamaoka, Ronald Mitsuhi, XXX-XX-XXXX

Lieutenant colonels

Agodoa, Lawrence Yawo Cy, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Allen, William Randall, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Alving, Carl Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Andersen, Charles Abe, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Andrade, William Pierre, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Andreasen, Arthur Cory, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Andronaco, Joseph T., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Angladeleffanoy, Andres, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Aronson, Charles Erwin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Auerbach, Julian, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Awan, Mushtaq Ahmad, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Babcock, Terence Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Baker, John Adelbert, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Banks, Richard Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bascom, James Flaver, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Belenky, Gregory Lucas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Benenson, Michael W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bischoff, Marshall B., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Blaedel, Mark Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bleck, Robert George, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Block, Dale Kenneth, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Boedeker, Edgar Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Boehm, Timothy Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bornemann, Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bradley, Martin Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Brahman, Sherry Lee V., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Branlygomez, Rolando, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Brenz, Ronald Wesley, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Brewster, Frank Albert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Broadnax, Gary Burks, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Brown, George Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Burkhalter, Edward L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Butler, Donald, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cabelion, Silverio, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Camp, Norman Marshall, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cannady, Preston B., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cannon, Benjamin Hollis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Carter, Jimmy Maxwell, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Carter, Preston Leroy, XXX-XX-XXXX

Cecere, Fred Anthony, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Chan, Philip, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Chloupek, Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Chulay, Jeffrey David, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cline, William Reynolds, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Collins, Delano Malcolm, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Condon, Brian Francis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cook, John Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cosas, Crisale Cango, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cosgriff, Thomas M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cotterill, Robert W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Courtney, Anthony Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cristobal, Aurora L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cross, Alan Stephen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cunningham, Billy Elvis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Deshon, George Ellis, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dingeman, Robert Denis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dixon, Kenneth Eugene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Doberstyn, Edward Brian, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dowdy, James Randolph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Driver, Doyle, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dufield, John Richard, X
 Eddieleman, William Loy, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Edmund, Robert Harvey, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ellis, Charles Meyer, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Erdtmann, Frederick J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fagan, Joe Garrell, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Faggett, Walter Lee, II, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Farley, Patrick Clare, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Febo, Manuel Angel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fellini, Robert William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Figelman, Alan Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fischer, Gerald Walter, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Foley, John Donald, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Franceschi, Porfirio, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Frattaroli, Nicholas F., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Frias, Antonio, Emmanuel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fuentes, Canales Manuel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fulk, Charles Samuel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Galvin, Eugene Gerard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 George, Lynn Darcy, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Glendening, David Logan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gray, William James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gregory, Quinones Gerard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Grinnell, Garfield M., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Groh, Lawrence Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Grossling, Sergio Freud, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gunby, Edwin Neal, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Guyden, Thomas Earl, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hamlin, Nonie Vilches, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hannam, Bernard Ray, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Harden, Lewis Brown, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Harmon, John Watson, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Harpster, William Henry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Harris, Stanley Craig, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hawley, Richard Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hayes, Charles Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Head, David Richmond, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Healey, Edwin Mack, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Heller, Paul Bernard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hershey, Stephen Charlie, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hodder, Richard Anthony, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hollison, Robert Victor, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Holstenbeck, Linton S., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Homann, Joseph Francis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hood, Charles Hardin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hurst, Charles Gary, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hymarsh, Marilyn Kaye, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jenkins, Elray, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Johnson, John Frentiss, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jones, Charles Cabell, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jones, John Kipling, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jones, Preston Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Joyce, Roby Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jung, Chung Ja, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jurney, Thomas Harlan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kale, Milton Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kashgarian, Mark, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kehoe, John Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kennon, William Gilliam, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ketchum, Robert Van A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kidd, Gerald Steele, II, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kim, Michael Hwan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kirchdoerfer, Richard G., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kirk, John William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kirkpatrick, James W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Klein, Arthur Deo III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Knowles, Clarence R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kraft, Barry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Krober, Marvin Smith, XXX-XX-XXXX

Lampe, Richard Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lapins, Nikolajs Armand, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lawrence Sidney Zachar, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lee, Robert Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lepore, Michael Leo, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lisanti, Michael Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lister, Robert Carl, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Logan, William Ernest, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lopiccoco, Philip Frank, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lowell, George Henry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lowman, Isom, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lucas, Phillip Roney, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lundblad, Edward Gorman, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lundy, Ray Olva, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Madden, William Anthony, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mansfield, Lyndon Edwin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Marsh, Verelyn Howard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Matthews, Joseph Ignati, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McAuley, Robert Addison, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McGuire, Arthur Merrett, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mellette, Julian Ramsey, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mendez, Joaquin Ralmund, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Merves, Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Miller, Charles Francis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Miller, Robert Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mitchell, Charles Henry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mitchell, Michael Hewitt, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Moore, Hylian Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Moreira Allan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Morgan, Andrew Marlin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Morrison, Robert Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mosjczuk, Askold Dmytr, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Musetti, Robert William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mutter, Mitchell Luke, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Myers, Larry Stewart, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Myers, Robert Lynn, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nadalo, Lennard Albert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nash, Daniel Alphonzo J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 O'Donnell, Francis L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Onufer, Charles Nicholas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ortiz, Ana Alicia, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Osman, Mark Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Oster, Charles Nelson, XX-XXXX
 Ozaki, Joe Kuniaki, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ozer, Kerry Jae, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pamplin, Charles Lewis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Parks, Samuel Dale, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Peck, Carl Curtis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Peirsol, John Mark, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Perry, Michael Eric, XX-XXXX
 Peterson, Richard B., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pettett, Philip Gary, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Petura, David Allan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pick, Terry Eugene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pierce, John Randall, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Plymate, Stephen Rex, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pollard, William Wood, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Posner, Michael Harris, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Price, John Clyde, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Price, Peter Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pulaski, Edwin Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Puskas, Thomas John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Raife, Michael James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Raine, Dudley Allen, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Reed, Larry Douglas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Reid, Robert Harry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Richardson, George G., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rimm, William Raymond, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Roberts, David William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Robinson, Bernard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rubinow, Sidney David, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sadoff, Jerald Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Salasche, Stuart Joel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Salazar, Andres Mario, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sandberg, Maynard Craig, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sausker, William F., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schlatter, Egon K. E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schneider, Richard L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schultheis, William F., XX-XXXX
 Schultheiss, John F., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schuster, Brian George, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schwab, James Anthony, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schydlower, Manuel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Seab, James Augustus, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Shearer, Robert Dale, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sheridan, John Lessage, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Shim, Poong Sup., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sidenberg, Barry Stuart, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sjogren, Robert William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smallridge, Robert C., XXX-XX-XXXX

Smith, Dick Roswell, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Franklin Ryder, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Thomas Larry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Snyder, Robert Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sorensen, Gregory W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Spebar, Michael John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Spencer, Roger Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stoddard, Frederick R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stokes, James William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Summers, Richard James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Takafuji, Ernest Tomoyu, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tellis, Claude Jenkins, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Thompson, Clarence R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Thomsen, Russell John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Todd, Robert Clifford, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Treese, Gary Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Trivette, Parks Dewitt, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tuer, William Frederick, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tyner, Carl Frederick, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Underwood, George Heard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Vanhook, David Madison, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Velasco, Maximo Marcaro, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Vonk, Harold, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Waldman, Lionel Elliot, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Walsh, Matthew James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Weber, Richard Wolfgang, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Weidenfeld, Irwin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Weir, Michael Ross, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wells, David Woodburne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wertz, Fleming Denton, XXX-XX-XXXX
 White, Stephen William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wiener, Michael Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wittich, Arthur C., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wong, Roy Kwock Hung, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Yelland, Graham, XXX-XX-XXXX
 York, William Byrne, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Young, Michael Bernard, XXX-XX-XXXX

Majors

Adnot, John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Africano, Enrique Amin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Albaugh, Jeffrey Smith, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Alexander, Mark Vincent, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Alexander, Milton D., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Amster, Steven Mark, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Anderton, Barry J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Andres, Dale Frederick, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ansineilli, Richard A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Arney, Gerald Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Arterberry, Joe F., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Atkinson, Alva Winston, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Auer, Thomas Harper, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bacon, David Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bailey, Bruce Olin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Baker, John Adelbert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bank, Robert Louis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Baker, Frank John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Banner, James Daniel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Barr, Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Barrett, John Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bassett, Martin L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Batson, Pascal Gayle, II, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bean, Gary Owen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Behnke, Ernest Edmund, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Benton, Frank Ridgley, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Berger, Timothy George, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bergfelder, Paul Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bergquist, Roy Jeffrey, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bernier, Ralph Dell, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Betts, Stephen Claude, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bird, Julio J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Black, James Franklin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Blanchett, Leo Mose, III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Board, Robert Jeffrey, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bohman, Verle Duane, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bollerup, Edwin John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bomberger, James John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Booth, John Price, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bork, David Burton, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bourg, Wilson Charles, I, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bowen, James Norman, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bowland, Warren Frank, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bowman, William Edmund, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Boyd, Bruce Huntington, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Boyd, John Arthur Kip, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Boyer, Richard Alan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bragg, Larry Mark, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Brammer, Robert Eric, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Brearley, William Dubois, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Breedon, Richard Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Brennan, Michael West, XXX-XX-XXXX

Brewer, Thomas George, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Brock, Kenneth James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Broughton, Robert Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Brown, Carl Douglas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Brown, James Edward, XX-XXXX
 Brown, James Howard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Brown, James Stuart, XX-XXXX
 Brown, Jerry Mark, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Brown, John Harold, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Brown, Ronald Lauchlin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Brown, Sam, Jr., XX-XXXX
 Brown, Sharon Patrice, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Broyles, Richard Lee, XX-XXXX
 Brunsvold, Robert Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bryan, George Edward, II, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Buckler, Robert Earl, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bullen, Reed, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bulley, William Arthur, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bundy, Ralph Lawson, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bunker, Stephen Raymond, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bunkersoler, Antonio Lu, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Burgess, Russell Earle, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Burns, Billy Ray, XX-XXXX
 Burns, Ronald Gibson, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Burran, William Patrick, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Burroughs, Wallace Fren, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Burton, Bernard Allison, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Burton, Cary Layne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bussa, John Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Byars, William Pershing, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Byrne, William Russell, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Callahan, Michael Earl, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Candage, Raymond Lester, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Carpenter, Gary Bailey, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Carpenter, Mark Merritt, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Carr, Walter Guy, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cartagena, Miguel Angel, XX-XXXX
 Carter, Richard Alan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cates, Michael Aubrey, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cathcart, Cornelius Fit, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Chadband, Robert B., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Chaffin, Jack C., Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cheatham, Wayman Wendel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Chismire, Kevin Joseph, XX-XXXX
 Chung, Raymond Craig, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Churchill, Frank Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Clary, Richard Moncure, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Classen, Paul Lewis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Clayton, James Ernest, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Coger, William Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Collier, Nathan Bernard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Collins, Raymond Craig, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Colman, Lauren Kenneth, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Colpitts, John Frederic, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Coludro, Enid America, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Condos, William R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Conn, Francis William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cooke, James Harbin, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cooper, Ronald Heywood, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Copeland, Randolph L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cordova, Edmond Silfred, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cowan, John David, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cragun, William Hal, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Craig, Daniel Baxter, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Craig, William Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Craighead, Michael Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cricco, Carl Francis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cronk, Roger Leroy, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Damore, Stuart, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Daniels, Jewell Lee, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Davila, Ricardo, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Davis, James Scott, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Davis, Jon Steven, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Davis, Leon Douglas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Davis, Roy Kim, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Deal, Terry Duane, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Deal, Virgil Thomas, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dempsey, Glenn Bryant, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Desonier, Keith Francis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Deutsch, Anthony John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Diehl, Louis Frederic, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dodson, Leonard Edwin J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dorn, Ronald Vancort, II, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dorsett, Roswell Branson, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Douglas, Benjamin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Duncan, Ian Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Dunn, Bruce Cullom, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Duplantis, Allen Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Durant, William Preston, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Duster, Mark C., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Eberhard, Todd, XXX-XX-XXXX

Eggli, Douglas Fred, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Eggli, Kathleen Dunne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Eisemann, Daniel Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ellenberg, John Frank J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ellington, David Alan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Elteto, Aron, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ely, Thomas Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Evans, John Willis, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Evenson, Eric Todd, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fallon, William Francis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Farmer, Kenneth Lloyd J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Faucher, Paul Gregory, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ferguson, Clifford Lest, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ferraris, Victor A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fields, Larry Stephens, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fill, William Louis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Finnerty, Robert Urban, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fitz, James Dudley, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fitzpatrick, James E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fleming, Curtis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Flynn, Frederick George, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Flynn, Michael Laverne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Foret, Lynn Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fortner, Bryant Reeves, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Freeman, Cornelius Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Freeman, Sharon Diane, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Frerkes, Joseph Leon, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fulkerson, Alvin Ray, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Fuselier, Francis Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gaines, Leila Teressa, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gant, David Scott, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Garber, Eugene Bradley, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gardner, Richard Dennis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Garrett, Wayne Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Garvey, Scott Pearson, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gearhart, John Rathmann, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Geer, Michael Reynaud, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gentry, Richard Harold, XXX-XX-XXXX
 George, Christopher B., XXX-XX-XXXX
 George, Robert John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gilbert, Jimmy Goodwin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gold, Lewis Feldman, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Golden, Barbara Jean, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Goldman, Richard Alan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Graeber, Geoffrey Marc, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Graff, Gene Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Greene, Thomas Conley, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Greer, Michael Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Griffith, James Carter, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Grimwood, Ronald Eugene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Grist, James Donald, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Grizzard, Lo Kathleen M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Groves, Sheridan Hale, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Guidera, Kenneth John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gutknecht, Michael G., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hamilton, John William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hanley, James Francis I., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hanson, John Vernon, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hanson, Rae Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hardy, Michael Rob, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Harriman, George Howard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Harris, Albin Warner, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Harris, John Malcom, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Harrison, Randolph B., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Harrison, Shannon M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Haskett, Joseph Ray, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hayne, Steven Timothy, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hayslip, Clifford C., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hector, Richard Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Heinecke, Carl David, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hemmer, Thomas Melville, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hempling, Leonard Jack, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hendrix, Maecenas Bento, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Herrera, Guillermo Anto, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hickey, Deborah Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hicks, Henry Carlton, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hill, Frank Costigan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hill, Harry Haydon, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hill, Kenneth Forbes, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hiller, Durell Alpheus, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hochreiter, George Carl, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hodge, Gerald Mack, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hodges, Ronald Howard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hoffer, Richard Scott, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Holcomb, John Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hope, John Malcolm, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Horn, Robert Traill, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hostetter, Robin Eino, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hotchkiss, George John, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Howard, Fred Marion, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hudson, Larry David, XXX-XX-XXXX

Humm, Gayle Ann, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hunter, James Gregory, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hunt, Harry Andrew, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Icochea, Rosendo Segund, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Imai, Walter Kenji, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Insalaco, Samuel Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jackson, John Howard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jackson, Michael Howard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jacobson, Neil Arvid, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jamison, Rodney Keith, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jenkins, Terry Ray, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jennings, Jeffory Glenn, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jirka, John Harry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Johnson, Carl Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Johnson, David Edgar, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Johnson, Eric Alan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Johnson, Robert Milton, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Johnson, Sheldon Ashley, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jones, Ronald Jay, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jucas, John Juanutis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kacenga, Kenneth Stephen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Karcher, Donald Steven, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kaye, James Howard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Keegan, Michael Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Keiser, John Francis, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Keisler, David Simpson, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kelley, Kevin Christopher, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kellogg, Eugene Lloyd, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kelly, Robert William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kenney, Robert Luther, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kiley, Kevin Christopher, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kimbrell, Fred Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kirchner, Donald Bruce, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kirkwood, Alfred John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Klepatz, Robert Stephen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Knight, James Arthur, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Knudsen, Dennis Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Koerper, Conrad Epping, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kolb, Melvin Max, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kraus, Eric Werner, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kray, Kenneth Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kunath, Arthur Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kyser, Perry Leroy, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Laccheo, Michael Lewis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lammie, John James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lane, Richard James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Larson, John Leonard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Law, Eleanor Smith, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lawler, Gerry Norman, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lawsin, Rosen Jamandire, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lee, Kenneth Amos, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Leeburg, William Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lehrner, Lawrence Marsh, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Leonard, Tommy Junior, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lesueur, Leo Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Leverton, Robert S. II, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Levin, Marc William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lewis, Sterling Francis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Li, Lillian Yuan Yuan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Long, William Hanover, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lord, Jonathan Grant, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Luetzow, Thomas John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lukas, Garron Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lum, Wayland Tuck Chinn, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lundy, Michael Mahoney, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mabee, Lee Maitland, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Madden, Steven Allan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Maddox, John Lindsey, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mader, Thomas Henry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Malloy, Tyrone Cecil, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Marinelli, Philip Vince, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Maroldo, Thomas Vincent, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Marsden, Richard James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Marshall, William, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Martin, George Randolph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Martin, J. Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Martin, Norman Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Martin, Rafael Antonio, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Martinez, Colon Manuel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Massenburg, Jerome D., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Matthews, George Eric, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Maughan, Delray, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McBride, Dana Carlos, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McCabe, Michael Oren, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McCarthy, Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McCauley, Ronald Keith, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McClain, John Bruce Lun, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McHone, James Samon, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McKinney, Harry Don, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 McKoy, James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McLeod, Samuel Luther I., XXX-XX-XXXX
 McNeill, Daniel Hugh, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 McNeill, Karen Millis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 McNlesh, Lawrence M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mead, Jay Harvey, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Meadows, Daniel Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mendenhall, Milton Tosh, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mendoza, Adalberto, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mesrobian, Robert B., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Micka, Thomas Frederick, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Middlebrooks, Tracy W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Miles, Brian John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Miller, Jerry Winkler, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mills, Glenn Morris, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Moffett, Paul Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Moffitt, Donald Ray, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Moore, Raymond Parnell, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Moraczewski, Thomas H., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Morgan, Barbara Nylund, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Morton, Berry Ezell, II, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Morton, Gregory Keith, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Moseley, Preston Wooten, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Moses, Charles Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mowbray, Alan Gene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mueller, Lawrence Peter, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Muensch, Alan Guyot, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Murray, William Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mygatt, George Garner, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nash, William Craig, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Natalino, Michael Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nefflen, Paul Eugene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nelson, Mark William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Newman, Forest Pike, III, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Nickell, Michael David, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Noce, Michael Anthony, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ochiai, Rowland Echete, XXX-XX-XXXX
 O'Connor, Dennis Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ogilvie, Orin Howard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Olazabel, Raul Phillip, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Old, Christopher Wingate, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Olson, David Warren, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Olson, Leroy Curtis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Omdahl, Nicholas Samuel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Opal, Steven Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Orcutt, Jeremy, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Orecchia, Paul Mario, XXX-XX-XXXX
 O'Rourke, Timothy John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Orrick, Larry Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Osborne, Mary Louise, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Owens, Brian David, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ownbey, James Linus, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Palermo, James Vincent, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Palmer, Corley Mark, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pan, Paul Paolung, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Panosian, Jeffrey Brent, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Park, Gordon Sherman, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Parker, Allan Law, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Parker, Edson Oliver, II, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Parsons, William Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Patton, Gary Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Payne, John Bruce, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pelegrina, Miguel Angel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Perry, David John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Peterson, David Arthur, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Petrie, Jonathan Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Petty, Robert Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Petzold, Robert Warren, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Phillips, Yancy Y., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Phurrough, Steve Eric, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Piskun, Mary Ann Dunn, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pomerance, Glenn Noel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Poole, James Morrison, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Portman, Ronald Jay, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Potter, Allen Roger, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Powers, David Longfellow, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Pruitt, Chester Eugene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ramirez, Manuel Fernand, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ranlett, Robert Darrel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ratner, Paul Howard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Reddick, Eddie Joe, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Reed, Kendall, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Reed, Robert Lawrence, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Renard, Ronald Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Reuben, Leedell, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rigo, Mark Steven, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Riston, Dennis Dekoven, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Roberts, David Alan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Roth, Rob Roy, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Russell, Don Ross, XXX-XX-XXXX

Russell, John Ronald, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Russell, Robert Blaine, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Rutledge, Kenneth Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ryan, Paul Harold, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Safford, Kathryn Lynne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Salminen, Eric Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 SanAntonio, Pamela Jo P., XXX-XX-XXXX
 SanAntonio, Richard Pat, XXX-XX-XXXX
 SanMartin, Antonio Alej., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Saunders, Charles Glenn, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Scannon, Patrick Jerome, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schick, Martin Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schnicker, Steven Craig, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schoenfeld, Roger H., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sedwick, Richard Elmer, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sepulvedaserra, Rene A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Serine, Enrico Anthony, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Shanahan, Dennis F., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sheehan, Timothy Daniel, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Shehi, Lyle Edward, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Shelton, Artie Lindy, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sherman, John Leonard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sherville, Robert E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Shropshire, Lowry C., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Siletchnik, Mark David, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sinar, Dennis Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Skarin, Robert Mark, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Slade, Clement Lawrence, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Slatten, William Crosby, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Slover, Robert Henry, II, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smerz, Richard William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Clifford Baxter, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Heather Sue, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Kathleen Jeanne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Leroy Carter, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Michael Gene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Wallace Dean, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, William Roy, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Snowdy, Harry Addison J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Snyder, Karl Stuart, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Snyder, Paul John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Soden, Cyburn Earl, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Spottswood, Paul Gregor, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sprague, Thomas Harold, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Spratling, Larry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Squire, Edward Noonan J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stallings, Roosevelt J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stanton, Robert Page, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Steiner, Richard Albert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stith, Rosa Bell, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stoddard, Donald Duane, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stoecker, Willeford J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stone, Irvin Keith, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Strampel, William Derke, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Strange, Gary Rondell, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stuart, Robert Elmer, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sweet, Brian Richard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Sydnor, Robert W., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Taylor, Neill Oliver, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Taylor, Shaun Ahern, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Terebolo, Howard R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tewis, Huey Duane, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tezak, Richard William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Theodore, Henri Claude, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Thompson, Albert Marion, XX-XXXX
 Thompson, Andrew Mark, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Thompson, Paul Benhart, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Towe, Benjamin Franklin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Townsend, Donald Cross, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Townsend, Donald Gaye, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Trant, Collie Michael, XX-XXXX
 Traylor, Michael Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tretta, Joseph Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tyler, David Lendon, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tyson, Duncan Wright, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Urban, Edward Stevens, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Vancura, Stephen Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Vandewalle, Michael B., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Via, Charles Sanford, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Vierra, Lawrence A., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Vikelidou, Iphigenia, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Voorhees, Elwood Gerald, XX-XXXX
 Vovakes, Michael Jon, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Walcott, William Oliver, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wallace, Roger Lewis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Walter, Michael Harry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wappett, Nigel George, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ward, Michael George, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Watson, Thomas Downes, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Way, Bill Vaughn, XXX-XX-XXXX

Weatherwax, Robert John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Weaver, Michael Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Webster, Joseph Carlton, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Weddel, Stephen Jay, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wehrle, Paul Allen, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wehrly, David James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wells, Larry Joe, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Welton, Richard Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wendt, Randall James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 West, Walter Clinton, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Weyant, Timothy Boyd, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Whitson, Michael Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wickham, Lawrence K., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wicklund, Dale Gordon, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wikert, Gary Allan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wilcox, Carver Gregory, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Willey, Godon Denis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wilson, Bruce Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wilson, Ronald Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Winton, George Beverly, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wolf, Charles Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wolf, Charles Redmond L., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Worley, Bob Stanton, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wortham, Dale Cralle, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wright, Alvin James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wright, Daniel Godwin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wright, Homer Jacob, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wright, John Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wright, Lucius Feathers, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wu, Phillip, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wulfsberg, Bruce Warren, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Wymer, David Cole, XX-XXXX
 Xenakis, Stephen N., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Young, Thomas Oliver, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Yurt, Roger William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Zaloznik, Arlene Joyce, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Zielinski, Henry John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Zimmerman, Donald M., XXX-XX-XXXX

Captains

Coppie, Hal Eubert, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Frumkin, Kenneth, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kirzinger, Stephen S., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mansour, Esber Hani, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Michael, Rodney Allan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Mosby, John Anthony, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Reece, Richard Randolph, XX-XXXX
 Russell, Henry Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Whatmore, Douglas Neri, XX-XXXX

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Colonels

Harder, Richard Charles, XX-XXXX
 Moussa, Moufied Abdelaz, XXX-XX-XXXX

Lieutenant colonels

Alexander, James R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Attack, Rodney Merrill, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Banner, Louis Eugene, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Batalsky, Joel William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bivens, Rolland Nile, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Blatnicki, Joseph Robert, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bleich, Roland, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Brown, Jerry Milford, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Chermol, Brian Hamilton, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Ciliax, Donald Ralph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Clement, Stephen David, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Czachowski, Robert Jose, XXX-XX-XXXX
 D'Oronzo, Paul Anthony, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Freilheit, Gene Arthur, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Garrett, Leonard F., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gill, Alfred William, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gillooly, David Hugh, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Gmelin, Robert Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Goldstein, Jerod Louis, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hampton, Jon Franklin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Jones, Malachi Brown, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kamenar, John Michael, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Knight, Horace, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kozuki, Robert Junji, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Kreiner, John Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lelesch, John Herman, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lewis, Charles Henry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Lindahl, James Henry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Livermore, Phillip E., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Marshall, Stanley B., XX-XXXX
 McGinley, Michael P., XXX-XX-XXXX
 McLaurin, Benjamin Fran., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Muul, Illar, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Olander, Leroy Hush, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Porta, Ronny Edwin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Richardson, William O., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Russell, Gerald Edward, XXX-XX-XXXX

Schopper, Aaron Walter, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Schumaker, Richard L., XX-XXXX
 Shannon, Michael Alfred, XX-XXXX
 Simon, Vern Joseph, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smart, William Franklin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, George Theodore, XX-XXXX
 Sparks, Frederick Donal, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Stotler, Richard Elmo, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Taylor, Phillip Larry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Thill, Fred Arch, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Thomas, Charles Edgar, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Tibbets, Karl Alfred, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Watson, Robert Timothy, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Young, Jimmy Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX

Majors

Abercrombie, Jay, XX-XXXX
 Aitkin, James Maurice, XX-XXXX
 Alexander, Jimmy Don, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Allen, James Donald, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Amos, Paul David, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Andre, Richard Graham, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Andrews, Kenneth Gerald, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Andron, Leo Alexander, I, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Anschutz, James Harold, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Arnot, Dave, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Arnott, John James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Askew, Eldon Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Aspinall, Kenneth Bru, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Baderschneider, Roger D., XX-XXXX
 Ball, James Everette, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Banks, William Foster, J, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Baugher, Jerry Isom, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Baumann, Roger Carl, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Beach, Johnston, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Beauchemin, Richard R., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Becco, Lawrence Andrew, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Beene, Jerry Don, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Beirne, Douglas Ronald, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bell, John Wesley, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bender, Donald Raymond, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bennett, Charles Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bentley, Gerard Anthony, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bevett, David Leon, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Biddle, Michael James, XX-XXXX
 Bjornson, Darrel Curtis, XX-XXXX
 Blake, Herbert Alden, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Block, Harold Gordon, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Blum, Barry Nathan, I, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Blythe, Raymond Ellsworth, XX-XXXX
 Boecker, Frederick Will, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Borders, William Steve, XX-XXXX
 Borkowski, Thomas Vern, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Brewster, James Leroy, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Brian, Rex Jenson, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bridger, Larry Ervin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Brisbois, Charles Perry, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Broach, John Cedric, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Broadway, Peter John, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Brooks, Franklin Ramon, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bull, John Michael, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Burns, James Walker, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Butke, Kenneth Paul, XX-XXXX
 Caldwell, Jerry Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Callaghan, John Ayers, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Caputo, Frank Vincent, XX-XXXX
 Carbonell, Arthur J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Carp, Matthew Barr, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cattan, Joseph Ellis, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Channing, Eugene S., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Chastain, Roger Vernon, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Childs, George Edward J., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cho, Gordon Winter, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Churchman, James M., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Clark, Richard Lee, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Clayton, Robert Alan, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Clouse, Stephen Paul, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cloutier, Marc Gerard, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Clyde, William David, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Collins, Clarence Ray, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Collins, Dean Alfred, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cook, Timothy Ross, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Coolbaugh, Gerald Allen, XX-XXXX
 Cooley, William Leslie, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cooney, William Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cordy, Michael Dean, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Corley, James Hale, XX-XXXX
 Coulter, Kenneth Christ, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Cripe, Lloyd Irvin, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Crumrine, Martin Hilmer, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Culley, James Robert, XX-XXXX

Cummings, John William, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Cunningham, Samuel Lee, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Custer, Norman Jerome J., XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Danby, James Clayton, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Davis, Timothy Andrew, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Day, James Francis, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Deblasio, William A., XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Derr, John Robert, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Dicks, Louise Augustus, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Dilly, Breckenridge CHA., XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Dingeay, Martha Jane, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Dorland, Peter Grant, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Drost, Leonard Stefan, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Dunlap, Melvin Eddie, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Dunn, John David, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Dunphy, Donald Edward, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Eads, James Robert, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 East, Virgil Ralph, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Edwards, Horace F., XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Emery, Homer Cecil, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Farnsworth, Donald M., XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Fedorov, Alex, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Fellows, Samuel Barton, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Fields, Boyce, Jr., XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Fosen, Lloyd Bruce, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Fox, Alan Irving, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Frommer, Robert Lee, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Frost, Charles Francis, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Fulifer, Jesse Kenneth, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Furbish, Bruce Gordon, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Furlow, Bruce Michael, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Futterer, James William, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Gage, Arlon Bernard, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Gallant, Lewis Edward, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Galloway, Robert Dean, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Gemmill, Robert Holt, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Gingrich, John Bruce, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Gisin, George Joseph, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Graeber, Raymond Curtis, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Graven, Johannes Theodo, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Greene, Jeffrey Francis, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Greenfield, Gary Ray, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Greer, Terry Arlin, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Gregg, Charles Stanley, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Griswold, Richard Harry, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Guiang, Mark Figuerres, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Guibert, Terry Vaughn, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Gunn, Bruce Alan, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Halsler, Robert Lee, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Hamilton, David Edward, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Hamilton, Emma Davis, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Hamlin, Elywood Roderick, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Hampton, Lawrence Dale, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Hancock, Roy Ellerbe, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Harlan, Harold Jonathan, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Harris, Melvin Louis, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Harrison, Thomas Gwynn, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Hatcher, Robert Wilburn, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Hawks, Thomas Reid, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Heffer, Robert Allen, II, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Helm, Franklin Charles, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Higbee, James, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Hillberg, Owen Eugene, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Hockmeyer, Wayne Thomas, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Hogan, Kenneth Roger, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Holgate, Stanley Hrd, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Holly, Franklin Freder, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Hoopes, Thomas Robert, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Hoover, Michael Eugene, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Howard, Alfred Norman, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Howell, Hardy Marc, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Huether, Ronald Austin, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Hulsebus, Robert Clary, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Hursh, Steven Rawlings, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Iverson, Donn Allan, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Jackson, David Clark, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Jackson, Edward Lawrence, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Jackson, Jon Dexter, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Jacobs, James Randolph, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Johns, Merlin Curtis, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Kardatzke, James Thomas, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Keller, Lucien Fairfax, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Kelley, William Ronald, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Kelly, Stanley David, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Kershner, Ronald Charles, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Killgore, Ernest Shephn, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Kimbell, David Lee, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Kirschbaum, George Albe, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Kittinger, Paul Francis, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Klundt, David Leroy, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Knodel, Stewart Eugene, XXXX-XX-XXXX

Koehler, Harold Charles, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Kosman, James Michael, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Kowal, Dennis Melton, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Krueger, Gerald Peter, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Labaugh, William James, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Lacey, Thomas Arthur, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Lamy, Joel Robert, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Landry, Alfred Joseph Jr., XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Lanway, Merle Stanley, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Laschkewitsch, John Mau, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Laskow, Gregory Blaise, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Leahy, Dennis James, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Leibrecht, Bruce Carl, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Lester, Michael Barry, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Linkous, Otis Everette, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Lippert, Lloyd Edward, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Liter, Melvin Earl, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Lovois, Carl Francis, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Lott, Charles Melbert, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Love, Alan Lance, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Lowe, John Raymond, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Lozada, Jacob, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Luckey, Thomas Samuel, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Magee, William, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Mann, Edward Russell, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Manning, Frederick Jose, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Mantia, William Michael, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Marrs, David Onis, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Marslander, Robert Gay, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Martin, Brian Paul, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Mathewson, Nathan Sanbo, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Maury, James Ludlow, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Mays, Robert Allen, Jr., XXXX-XX-XXXX
 McAdams, Charles Orien, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 McAuley, Robert James Jr., XXXX-XX-XXXX
 McCarty, Gary Patrick, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 McClelland, Howard Aust, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 McCrary, Thomas Michael, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 McDonough, John Henry Jr., XXXX-XX-XXXX
 McGrath, James Patrick, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 McMenamin, John Joseph, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 McNeil, Thomas Joseph, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Minkley, Thomas Eugene, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Mitchell, Robert Allen, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Molitor, Robert Bruce, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Morin, Randall Steven, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Mueller, Herman Gustav, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Myers, Peter Hall, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Nikolich, Francis Mario, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Nilsen, David Ivar, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Nowakowski, Robert James, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 O'Brien, Donald Edward, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Ognibene, John Howard, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Olson, Glenn Edwin, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 O'Mara, Peter Augustine, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Opland, Ronald Lewis, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Ouzts, James William, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Palmer, Darwin Bayne, Jr., XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Parker, William Rex, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Parmer, David Lee, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Pelosi, John Jay, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Popek, Daniel Joseph, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Potter, Eugene Wayne, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Powanda, Michael C., XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Puttock, Robert Edward, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Rachfal, John Robert, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Rath, Frank Henry, Jr., XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Rawlings, Donald Charles, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Reid, Michael John, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Rhodes, Allen Edward, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Richardson, James Clair, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Rippe, Robert Alan, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Robinson, Ronald Barry, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Rogers, Michael James, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Rosenheim, Harold David, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Rumbaugh, Paul Carleton, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Salzman, Robert David, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Sanderlin, Larry Robert, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Sawa, Joseph Sherman, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Schneider, Robert Jacob, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Seidel, Frederick John, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Sellards, Robert R., XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Sessions, George Rufus, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Shoberg, John David, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Skeistaitis, Walter J., XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Slaton, Irving Carroll, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Byron Neiley, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Donald Billy, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Michael James, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, Ray Virgil, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Smith, William Rodney, XXXX-XX-XXXX

Smullen, Melvin George, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Soma, David Joseph, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Southworth, George C., XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Stahl, William Theodore, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Starcher, Bobby Lee, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Starrett, Patrick Dee, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Stephens, Elwood Larry, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Sternal, Thomas Michael, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Straker, Richard Michael, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Sutton, Stanley Paul, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Swingier, Ralph Scott, Jr., XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Szurek, John Leonard, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Tannahill, Chris Len, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Tessler, Paul Leo, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Thomas, Robert Eugene, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Thompson, Garold Keith, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Todd, Michael Hugh, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Treece, Thomas Robert, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Turnbull, John David, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Turner, George Henry, II, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Underwood, Cone Smith, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Urbancik, Gerald Walter, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Vallery, James Floyd, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Velker, Timothy James, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Venezia, Daniel Joseph, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Verzywelt, Lynn Joseph, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Vombredow, Jurgen Klaus, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Vonszilassy, Peter J., XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Waddell, Thomas Robert, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Wallace, John Riley, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Wannarka, Gerald Lee, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Warner, Kenneth David, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Watson, Douglas Lee, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Webb, Arthur Boyce, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Wetherill, Samuel Roger, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Whiddon, Robert Gray, Jr., XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Whisenant, Allen Dale, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Whitaker, Stephen D., XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Whiting, Robert Edward, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Willard, David Lee, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 William, John Allen, II, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Williams, Rogers F., XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Williamson, Donna Carey, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Wilson, James Paul, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Wilson, Mary Althea, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Wilson, Saunders Edward, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Wingate, James Carlisle, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Woolridge, Wesley C., XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Wooten, Wilford Dean, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Yaryan, Robert Alan, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Young, Charles, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Young, James Howard, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Zabrycki, Andrew Gary, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Zold, Anthony C., XXXX-XX-XXXX

Captains

Allen, Timothy Pete, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Bartosh, Edward Thomas, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Berezuk, Gregory Phillip, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Browning, William C., XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Cheatham, Ronald R., XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Clarke, Milton Alonzo, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Clement, Dennis Lynn, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Day, Rodney Gene, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Deppensmith, Donald L., XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Duvall, Garry David, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Gilpin, James, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Grill, Dennis Joseph, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Honi, James Arnold, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Lacy, Danny Elwood, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Magill, Samuel Wallace, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 McQueen, Samuel Garland, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Nelson, William Roy, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Newborn, Jesse Paul, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Pierce, Phillip Ervin, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Piotrowski, Stanley L., XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Rakickas, Ronald Jude, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Rembold, John Maynard, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Rickett, Daniel Lowe, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Roberts, Chester Ronald, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Robins, Michael Craig, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Siefert, Ernest George, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Sorensen, Elin Crnkovic, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Thies, Paul Ray, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Thornton, William H., XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Turcotte, Hugh Joseph, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Zolock, David Thomas, XXXX-XX-XXXX

*VETERINARY CORPS**Lieutenant colonels*

Ervin, John Travis, XXXX-XX-XXXX
 Maul, Lawrence Phillip, XXXX-XX-XXXX

Majors

Agnew, Eugene Welch, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Bell, Jerry Don, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Callis, Robert Thomas, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Garrett, Joe Carroll, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Goodwin, Bradford Shaw, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hanna, Gary Dale, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Hixson, Clifford James, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Johnson, John Bruce, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Morrill, John Charles, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Taylor, Robert Vernon, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 Torrence, William Harold, XXX-XX-XXXX
 Yarbrough, Leslie Wayne, XXX-XX-XXXX

Captains

Frey, Robert Maclay, XXX-XX-...
 Hoyt, Robert Franklin, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX
 McNamee, George Allen, Jr., XXX-XX-XXXX

IN THE NAVY

The following-named temporary captain of the U.S. Naval Reserve for permanent promotion to the grade of captain in the line, pursuant to section 611(a) of the Defense Officer Personnel Management Act (Public Law 96-513) and title 10, United States Code, section 624 as added by the same

act, as applicable, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Jones, Wilbur D., Jr.

The following-named temporary commanders of the U.S. Navy and Naval Reserve for permanent promotion to the grade of commander in the line, pursuant to section 611(a) of the Defense Officer Personnel Management Act (Public Law 96-513) and title 10, United States Code, section 624 as added by the same act, as applicable, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Anderson, Richard G. Blanco, James V.
 Fantin, Jonnie R. Foster, William I.
 Friel, David J. Gallagher, Michael T.
 Hohlstein, Richard A. Johnson, John D.
 Kennelly, Robert J. Nesbitt, Donald L.
 Jr. Parks, John L.
 Ostrander, Peter H. Simmonds, James L.
 Robbins, Albert H. Wheeler, Gerard C.
 Stone, John F.

The following-named temporary lieutenant commanders of the U.S. Naval Reserve for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant commander in the line and vari-

ous staff corps, as indicated, pursuant to section 611(a) of the Defense Officer Personnel Management Act (Public Law 96-513) and title 10, United States Code, section 624 as added by the same act, as applicable, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Pryor, Hershel W., Jr.
 Sine, Don T.

MEDICAL CORPS

Mayers, Douglas L.

DENTAL CORPS

Kiselica, Lawrence D.

The following-named officer of the line of the U.S. Navy, for appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps, as permanent lieutenant (junior grade), pursuant to section 611(a) of the Defense Officer Personnel Management Act (Public Law 96-513) and title 10, United States Code, section 532 as added by the same act, as applicable, subject to qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Aalbue, Frederick A.