United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 93d CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE—*Wednesday, September 4, 1974*

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JAMES ABOUREZK, a Senator from the State of South Dakota.

PRAYER

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

Almighty God, who has watched over us in times past and brought us to a new day of fresh opportunity and new hope, grant us a clear sense of Thy presence and power in our daily work. May we work together for the coming kingdom when men everywhere shall live and walk together in peace and good will as the children of God.

Grant, O Lord, to the President, to the Members of Congress, and all workers in Government a rich endowment of that wisdom which comes from Thee, so that as we are strong in statecraft we may also be powerful in the things of the spirit. May each of us yield to the leading of Thy spirit, confident that where Thou dost guide, Thou wilt also provide.

We pray in the name of the Great Redeemer. Amen.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

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

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., Sept. 4, 1974.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate on official duties, I appoint Hon. JAMES ABOUREZK, a Senator from the State of South Dakota, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

JAMES O. EASTLAND,
President pro tempore.

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

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of August 22, 1974, the following messages from the House of Representatives were received:

On August 27, a message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills:

S. 821. An act to provide a comprehensive, coordinated approach to the problems of juvenile delinquency, and for other purposes;

H.R. 13871. An act to amend chapter 81 of subpart G of title 5, United States Code, relating to compensation for work injuries, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 15572. An act making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development; for space, science, veterans, and certain other independent executive agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, and for other purposes.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of August 22, 1974, the enrolled bills were signed by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF) on August 27, 1974.

On August 28, 1974, a message announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H.R. 2), an act to provide for pension reform.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of August 22, 1974, the enrolled bill was signed August 28, 1974, by the President pro tempore.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of August 22, 1974, the enrolled bill (H.R. 13999) to authorize appropriations for activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes, was signed by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF) on August 23, 1974.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that he presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills of the Senate:

On August 22, 1974:

S. 1871. An act to amend the Youth Conservation Corps Act of 1972 (Public Law 92-597, 86 Stat. 1319) to expand and make permanent the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes;

S. 3703. An act to authorize in the District of Columbia a plan providing for the representation of defendants who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

S. 3919. An act to authorize the establishment of a Council on Wage and Price Stability.

On August 27, 1974:

S. 821. An act to provide a comprehensive, coordinated approach to the problems of juvenile delinquency, and for other purposes.

DEFERRAL OF PAY ADJUSTMENT FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of August 22, 1974, the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. ABOUREZK) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was received on August 31, 1974, and referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

To the Congress of the United States:

At a time when inflation is the main concern of every American, the Federal Government has a special obligation to take those actions which begin to stop inflation.

In this spirit and with the knowledge that the action I am taking will help to hold down the cost of living for all Americans, I now recommend a ninety-day deferral in the pending pay adjustment for Federal employees. At the same time, I am also ordering the Director of the Office of Management and Budget to proceed with a reduction of 40,000 Federal civilian positions from those planned for the current fiscal year.

Therefore, as required by law, I am transmitting to the Congress a plan to defer Federal pay raises for ninety days. This is intended to meet both the needs of those who serve the Government and the common interest of the general public, all of whom must bear the burden of increased inflation.

Under this plan, a pay increase for all Federal employees based upon an appropriate comparability adjustment would become effective on the first pay period beginning on or after January 1, 1975. The level of the comparability adjustment will be determined during the next few weeks.

I regret asking for this postponement of a Federal pay increase, but I am convinced of its necessity. Federal employees who I am asking to make a sacrifice are the foundation of sound, effective government. I am more conscious than ever of their contributions to our country.

Nevertheless, at this critical time in the economic health of our Nation, I must call on all Americans without exception to make sacrifices in order to hold down wages and prices. Federal employees, as one of the largest groups of workers in the country, have a special role to play in the fight against inflation because we in Government set the example. As we seek a noninflationary

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

budget, it is especially important this year that Federal spending be held to a minimum.

I urge the Congress to support this action, because it is in the best interest of all Americans.

The plan to defer Federal pay raises by ninety days is attached. As required by law, the plan represents an alternative to the October effective date which would otherwise occur.

In addition, the Office of Management and Budget has now determined the specific reductions in civilian positions from those budgeted for the current fiscal year. The agencies will shortly be informed of these reductions by letters from OMB. Wherever possible, these reductions will be accomplished through normal attrition.

It is extremely important that the Federal establishment hold employment to the absolute minimum needed to get the job done. Effective use of human talents is a wise use of the tax dollar.

The pay raise deferral and the reduction in civilian positions together will reduce the 1975 budget by about $1 billion. Thus, the Federal Government is taking an essential first step in holding down the Federal budget and showing the way for restraint by all Americans.

GERALD R. FORD.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *August 31, 1974.*

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of August 22, 1974, messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations were received on August 23 and August 29, 1974, which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(The nominations received during the adjournment are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings today.)

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the Senate of August 22, 1974, the following reports of committees were submitted:

On August 29, by Mr. ALLEN, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

H. Con. Res. 564. A concurrent resolution to declare the sense of Congress that Smokey Bear shall be returned on his death to his place of birth, Capitan, N. Mex. (Rept. No. 93-1129).

On August 29, 1974, by Mr. EASTLAND, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, without amendment:

H.R. 13267. An act to authorize Federal agricultural assistance to Guam for certain purposes (Rept. No. 93-1130).

On August 29, 1974, by Mr. TALMADGE, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment:

H.R. 13113. An act to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to strengthen the regulation of futures trading, to bring all agricultural and other commodities traded on exchanges under regulation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93-1131).

On September 3, 1974, by Mr. NUNN, from the Committee on Armed Services, without amendment:

H.R. 15406. An act to amend title 37, United States Code, to refine the procedures for adjustments in military compensation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93-1132).

On September 3, 1974, by Mr. KENNEDY, from the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, with an amendment:

S. 3585. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend the programs of assistance under title VII for training in the health and allied health professions, to revise the National Health Service Corps program and the National Health Service Corps scholarship training program, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93-1133) (together with additional, minority, and supplemental views).

On September 3, 1974, by Mr. SPARKMAN, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment:

S. 3394. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 93-1134).

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, August 22, 1974, be dispensed with.

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

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

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

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

EXECUTION FEES FOR PASSPORTS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1076.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 15172) to authorize the Secretary of State to prescribe the fee for execution of an application for a passport and to continue to transfer to the U.S. Postal Service the execution fee for each application accepted by that Service.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GISCARD'S HOPE FOR FRANCE; THE WORLDWIDE PROBLEM OF INFLATION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in Sunday's New York Times appeared a news story by James Reston entitled "Giscard's Hope for France: A New Age of Reform."

I noted with interest that the President of France, Mr. Valery Giscard d'Estaing, made a reference to what he considered to be a fact—that the President of the United States had neglected to mention Europe in his first one or two speeches and that the White House, in reply, pointed out that reference had been made to Europe during the course of the President's remarks.

I would hope that there would be a better understanding and less sensitivity on both sides so far as relations between the United States and France are concerned.

I look upon President Giscard d'Estaing as one of the new type of chiefs of state who have much to contribute to the welfare of the world. From personal knowledge, I know that he is an excellent friend of the United States; and I know, on the basis of conversations with President Ford, that that feeling is reciprocated in his feelings toward France.

I would hope that it would be possible in the weeks and months ahead for the President of the United States to work closely with the President of France; the Chancellor of the Federal Republic of West Germany, Helmut Schmidt; and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Harold Wilson; and Prime Minister Tanaka of Japan. I make this suggestion because of the growing interdependence of the world and the fact that the problems of one part can no longer be considered separate and apart from the rest of the globe.

We are now in a very serious inflationary period. In my opinion, we are in a recession. But the answer to that recession will not be found by just pursuing practices which, on the surface, might appear to be beneficial to the United States alone. It will have to be done. I believe, in addition, in concert with the chief nations of Western Europe, the leaders of which I have already enumerated, and on the other side of the globe with Prime Minister Tanaka of Japan and, in a larger sense, with all nations.

What I am endeavoring to say is that inflation is not a factor affecting just one country. It is affecting all the countries—notably those without rigidly controlled economies. It reminds me of the situation which developed in the 1930's, at which time we had a worldwide depression and at which time we scarcely perceived of the need to cooperate and confer with others at that time.

Now the world is smaller; it is shrinking daily; communication is faster; problems are more and more universal.

It would be my hope that in addition to what President Ford is attempting to do in this country with regard to the economy—and I honor him for it—he and his advisers would not lose sight of the fact that what is happening economically today is something which could be considered in its worldwide context.

Therefore, Mr. President, in asking unanimous consent that this very worthwhile article on the new President of France, by James Reston, be incorporated in the RECORD, I express the hope that a closer relationship will develop between the Presidents of the two countries. I have no doubt at all that President Ford and President Giscard d'Estaing will come to an understanding of each other, that they will work cooperatively, and that the west and the world, will be the better off as a result.

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

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

GISCARD'S HOPE FOR FRANCE: A NEW AGE OF REFORM

(By James Reston)

PARIS, August 25.—President Valery Giscard d'Estaing describes himself as an optimist. He thinks the world is a little mixed up these days but believes its problems are manageable, its people tough and adaptable and its future not too bleak.

In an interview with The New York Times here three days ago, he sat on a green velvet couch in the Elysée Palace and spoke with measured confidence about the coming age, as if the contemporary preplexities were sort of a passing nuisance that could be handled, if not resolved, once people learned to live with perpetual change and reform.

GILT AND SCARLET OFFICE

He was friendly toward the United States. He spoke about a member of his family, Admiral Conte d'Estaing, who led French naval forces in an attack on Savannah, Ga., during the American War of Independence and was beheaded during the French Revolution.

Mr. Giscard d'Estaing supported the concept of a united Europe, eloquently but vaguely, and talked mainly about France—with the utmost pride—as a model for the future, and about the role of women, youth and leadership in bringing about an age of reform.

As a former Finance Minister, he began by criticizing the economic and financial condition of the world. De Gaulle was condemned for trying to create trouble, he said, but now it is obvious that the general was right in believing that the world simply could not absorb more than $100-billion of American deficits.

Since that time, President Giscard d'Estaing continued, the world has done away with the international monetary system and has just a moving floating, situation now. Maybe this is all right technically, he asserted, but psychologically and politically it is very unsettling. People did not know where they were or where they were going, and this could be cured only by the establishment of a new international monetary system.

While on this subject, he said that in the past four or five years of widespread inflation, people of all classes had gotten in the habit of desiring a constantly higher standard of living without any consideration for where the money was coming from. He hoped this attitude was approaching its end.

The President placed considerable emphasis on the importance of equality between France and West Germany in economic and industrial power. It was for this reason, he said, that he had insisted on a faster rate of growth for France, since she was lagging.

PERMANENT STATE OF CHANGE

The problem of political leadership, he said, is to help people adjust to a permanent state of change. France is a very conservative country, he observed, and the people do not like change; they are torn between two attitudes: an intellectual desire for change and a fear of change.

In the past, he explained, France went for long periods without much change until things became intolerable, and then there were upheavals of various types: revolutions in the 19th century, serious political crises in the 20th century such as the emergence of the Popular Front in 1936 and the fall of the Fourth Republic in 1968.

His intent, he said, is to try to have a steady, reformist policy, continuous change, with a speed that could be increased or decreased according to the needs of the situation.

It is a mistake, Mr. Giscard d'Estaing said, to be afraid to contest those who fight against change. For example, a large majority of the French people were against his law facilitating abortion and contraception, but once the policy had been decided, the people accepted it quite naturally.

The President, who has been in office for just over 100 days, was asked what he hoped to achieve as a result of his spectacular victory over Francois Mitterrand, the Socialist leader, in a runoff in May. Two things, he said: to create a feeling that France is again a little ahead of her time, politically and socially, and to be a member of some European community.

EVENTS, NOT CONCEPTS

Pressed to define his concept of a European community, he replied that he had always believed it rather futile to discuss concepts. We are not living in a world of constitutions now, but in a world of events, he added, so what will matter is what happens, not what is written.

The question of federation or confederation did not seem to him to be the key to the problem, though perhaps what he envisaged was what might be called a confederation. As soon as governments are really working closely together, really making decisions together, he explained, the question of structure is not important.

Still, he insisted that he meant to move toward common action in Western Europe and had talked with the West German Chancellor, Helmut Schmidt, about developing an attitude so that Europe will be perceived as a whole by Europeans and by others. But not, he noted, as an additional structure like the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

He was asked how it was possible to reconcile all the different political and economic problems in each country with common international policies—how to reconcile all this diversity with European unity.

He replied that he did not think it was all that difficult. Nations had the right to diversity. We must not try to force them into a single mold. There were differences of language, behavior, education and standards of living. The main thing to know was whether people, despite their national differences, thought of themselves as belonging to the same unity.

MATTER OF LEADERSHIP

It is a question of leadership, he insisted: If the leaders are forceful enough and imaginative enough and bring a certain lyricism to the task of leadership, the people will begin to think in a more unified way.

What the President seems to be aiming at is a peaceful revolution, a policy of perpetual change at home and a loose confederation in Western Europe. His Cabinet is drafting a charter on the quality of life. Social security is to be extended to everyone. The Government is discussing a plan for reforming the structure of French companies. Parliament will be asked this fall to pass more liberal laws on divorce, abortion and contraception.

In a way President Giscard d'Estaing, like President Nixon in his first term, seems to be trying to cut across the rigid lines of ideology and party loyalty and create a progressive coalition. To break up the old groupings of French politics, he is appealing particularly to women and to youth.

Take the situation of women in France, he said: They have limited possibilities of choice in contraception, divorce, opportunities in business. Yes, he went on, he is serious about the problems of women. The cultural change of our time, he emphasized, will probably come through women.

On relations with the United States, Mr. Giscard d'Estaing stressed the importance of consultation but showed little enthusiasm for ceremonial summit meetings or formal institutions to harmonize trans-Atlantic policies.

SPOTS ON THE SPHERE

The best technique is direct consultation between leaders, he said. In fact, there is good consultation between French and American leaders now, he added, but he was canny about discussing associations.

The world should be seen as a sphere with large spots on it, he said—the American spot, the European spot, the Soviet spot, the Chinese spot, etc. You could not have the same spot for Europe and the United States; their natures were different, their problems of defense were different, so they could have good relationships, but they could not be related in the sense of a common structure of decision.

Of course, he continued, Europe and America belong to the same political philosophy, the same economic way of life, and this creates a lot of similarities, but it does not mean association against some other part of the world.

He agreed that there were common problems of population, food, oil and other raw materials, and no doubt these required common thinking. Except for a few nations, colonialism and borders were no longer problems. These other questions were the real problems, but unfortunately they were not always seen in the same way.

The United States, he observed, believes in a world market without too many rules and the West Germans have much the same approach, but the tradition of the French, the British and the Dutch favors an organized world economy for raw materials, and for population and other major problems.

DEEP BUT INFORMAL

Accordingly, he thought there was need for a deep and complete discussion of all this, but it was important to avoid having it in a rigid international forum, where officials tend to maneuver against one another and fail to reach any real analysis.

On a more personal level, President Giscard d'Estaing said he was interested in the 200th anniversary of the American Declaration of Independence in 1976 and thought that perhaps that would provide an opportunity for him to visit the United States. He spoke of the admiral, a career officer in the Ancien Régime who was appointed head of the French Fleet when the American Revolution started and fought at the siege of Rhode Island as well as at Savannah.

Asked about his interest in Flaubert and about his own reading and writing, he replied that he had read everything written by and about Flaubert and De Maupassant. Some people like to read for the subject matter and consider language merely a supporting vehicle, he said, but he read and studied them because he liked literature. Also he was fascinated by the question whether De Maupassant was not only Flaubert's pupil but also his son.

He said he always had a book under way. Last winter he was working on three novels, but now there is the matter of how they would be received in his present position. When he has trouble falling asleep, he said, he composes stories in his head—slow, low-key stories, sufficiently articulate to keep his mind busy.

NOT STYLE, BUT SUBSTANCE

Mr. Giscard d'Estaing has sometimes been criticized for paying more attention to the style of his presidency than to the substance of his policies. To a question about this he replied that he was absolutely decided on the reforms he had proposed for the prisons, for control of wiretapping and for freedom of the press. It was unprecedented for a French President to visit prisons and shake hands with prisoners, but he had done so because he wanted to know conditions first hand.

Except in exceptional circumstances of spying or when there is court approval, he said, wiretaps are to be eliminated. The press will not be troubled for denouncing him or his administration. Pornography is another matter, he said: not the publication of it so much as exposing it to children.

Looking to the longer future, Mr. Giscard d'Estaing foresaw a different world, which,

he said, was why he was striving for something different in his thinking and his political actions. He does not foresee major conflicts between the nuclear states in this century, but he does expect authoritarian, oppressive regimes in large parts of the world and probably considerable tension and localized conflicts as a result of them.

Referring to the late French philosopher Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, he recalled that Teilhad said that the real question is not what you are looking at but where you are looking from.

In the past we looked at the world from only one point of view, with the light coming only from us and everything else in shadow, Mr. Giscard d'Estaing said, but in the future there will be many more lights, coming from many different places—Brazil, Malaysia, the Philippines, Indonesia—so we will see things in a different way, in a different light.

He is an optimist about this coming world, he said, for the history of mankind is a history of progress, and optimism is in order.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself generally with the remarks just delivered by the distinguished majority leader. Once again, the statesmanship of the majority leader is reflected by his statement, in which he has recognized the determined effort being made by President Ford in the fight against inflation which, indeed, is a worldwide problem.

To win the battle against inflation, it is important to be aware of the importance of restoring and building public confidence in the ability and determination of the Government to cope with the problem. It is unfortunate, in my opinion, that several economic spokesmen for the administration have apparently left an impression with the media that major moves to combat inflation will not be made until sometime next year.

I want to indicate my strong view that President Ford has already made major moves. He has made it clear that inflation, which he describes as "Public Enemy No. 1," has replaced Watergate as the major concern of the Nation.

Day in and day out, he has moved vigorously to deal with the problem of inflation. He had been meeting daily with economic experts in and out of the administration. He has called for legislation, to which the Congress has already responded, to reactivate the Cost of Living Council, which will monitor wages and prices. He has called upon the Congress to cooperate in reducing the level of Federal spending by at least $5 billion in this fiscal year. He has announced an economic summit meeting in response to a proposal made by the majority leader and other Senators.

And he has called for cooperation from the Congress in deferring from October 1 to January 1 a pay raise for some 3.5 million classified Federal workers.

On that point, Mr. President, I hope I shall not put the majority leader on the spot—because that is not my purpose—but I did notice that, when he was asked about it on yesterday, he did not jump to a position in opposition to the President's request for a deferral of that pay raise. I know that when the majority leader does take his position on the issue, it will be one that is well reasoned and will reflect his best judgment.

I urge other Senators to follow the example of the majority leader—to take a little time before taking a position on this issue. The vote on this question can be crucial because it can figure importantly in the psychology of the battle against inflation.

To win the battle against inflation, cooperation is needed from all segments of society. Certainly, we cannot expect that only a housewife who goes to the grocery store will sacrifice in this battle. Others will have to tighten their belts and sacrifice as well.

Whether General Motors sacrificed enough when they responded to President Ford's request and rolled back their announced price hike may be debatable. I have no doubt that some sacrifice was involved, because General Motors was prepared to demonstrate that every penny of the price increase first announced was based on increased costs.

The point is that everyone at all levels should expect to sacrifice, to some extent. And, it seems to me, that the Federal Government should expect to set the example.

I know it is difficult politically to ask Federal workers to defer a pay raise. But the request is not that they forgo it.

They will get the pay raise on January 1. The request is only that they tighten their belts for 90 days and defer the raise. If Congress would cooperate with the President to that limited extent—that move, along with the reduction of some 40,000 Federal positions, which the President intends to achieve through the process of attrition, will save $1 billion in this fiscal year. That is a big step toward the goal of saving $5 billion in this fiscal year.

I think it would be somewhat tragic if, in the first major test that Congress faces in the battle against inflation, the Congress were not to support the President. This is an important test, not only symbolically and psychologically, but substantively as well.

It should be pointed out, just for purposes of clarification, that the pay raise scheduled to take effect on October 1 would not apply to upper echelon Federal employees—Federal judges, Cabinet officials, Members of Congress, and others. In fact, personnel in those categories have not had a pay raise since 1969. So, certainly, there has been, and continues to be, sacrifice by personnel in those categories.

So far as the 3.5 million employees who would be affected, they have received pay raises during the last 5 years which total 30.1 percent. During that same period the cost of living has gone up approximately 30 percent. So, while some others have not kept pace with the cost of living, the Congress has seen to it, and I think rightly so, that those who do work in the Federal classified service have been keeping abreast of the cost of living.

Mr. President, I have taken the floor and made these remarks in the hope that I might encourage my colleagues in the Senate, where I suspect the crucial vote on the issue will be taken, to at least take some time to read carefully the President's message, to weigh the consequences of an adverse vote, in terms of what it would mean as the signal to the rest of the country and the rest of the world concerning our intentions in this all-important battle against inflation.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senator from Oregon (Mr. HATFIELD) is recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

IN MEMORY OF WAYNE MORSE

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, when our former colleague, Senator Wayne Morse, died on July 22, it was my responsibility to announce this to the Senate. At the time, I said I planned a more extensive eulogy at a later date. I have delayed making these remarks until today so a complete transcript could be prepared from the memorial service to Senator Morse here in Washington. Now that it has been completed, I wanted to share some comments with my colleagues this morning about this remarkable gentleman.

Wayne Morse and I worked in concert on a number of matters; we were political foes on many other occasions. Throughout my years of public service, beginning as a young State legislator in 1950, Senator Morse was always a political force in our State. As has been said by some editorialists, our State will not see another Wayne Morse again. A strong voice has been stilled. He remained a fighter until the day he died.

Throughout the full and rich life of Senator Morse, he felt a commitment to the truth. His early life was highlighted by brilliant scholarship and inspirational teaching. His middle career was one of mediating differences between management and labor. In yet another career within the Senate of the United States, Wayne Morse called forth all of these skillful characteristics and meshed them by alternating the roles of the scholar and the teacher. He demonstrated an oratorical prowess seldom equaled in the history of this body. Using these skills, he helped shape much of the education and libertarian legislation that was passed during his years in the Senate.

But we would do his memory an injustice if we did not recognize the dogged determination of a fighter for principle who would take on the mightiest of the world at the drop of a scruple and who would chase the money changers from the temple, the marketplace, or the White House with a fury of fierce ferocity.

Often called a prophet without honor, we honor him now because he was proven right in so many instances. That is not to say he was never wrong. But even in those instances the fire and brimstone were brought forth with a style that evoked fear and trembling—a Morsequake, if you will—and he delighted in watching his colleagues, friends and foes, as the Morse barrage of facts, legal precedents, and constitutional quotes poured forth. Also, he never shrank from an issue when it appeared the skies were falling. He stood toe to toe with the best debators this body ever has seen.

Mr. President, I would like to share with my colleagues some thoughts on the life of Wayne Morse I gave at a memorial service in Salem, on July 26, 1974, in memory of Senator Morse.

Undaunted.

Steadfast.

Unyielding.

Indefatigable.

All these come to mind with the memory of Wayne Morse.

We, of course, had been political adversaries, but not out of willful choice or desire; rather, out of inevitable political circumstances.

But also, we were often colleagues in causes, striving together with mutual convictions that naturally wrought bonds of respect; bonds which transcend those more ephemeral differences.

At times like this, we remember what is most lasting about the imprint of a life; we remember what will endure beyond those 73 years given by God to Wayne Morse; we remember what is transcendent of mere politics, and reaches forward to our common destiny and future.

Wayne Morse cherished his convictions.

He clung to them, fought for them, and yielded to them.

One cannot say this about many men today.

Politics can breed a callousness to truth, and an enslavement to expediency and compromise. One is enticed into the worship of popular opinion, and loses his sense of conscience, of inner integrity, of accountability to conviction.

But not so with Wayne Morse.

Certainly he fought as hard or harder as any in political combat, for he was a relentless pursuer of his causes. But there was a difference. It was not just his political survival which thrust him into his battles. Rather, in larger ways it was the unquenchable strength of what he believed.

Wayne Morse never thought the point of politics, or of life, was "to get along, you go along." He was freer than most from that perpetual concern with popularity. It was more important for Wayne Morse to stand for his convictions, and struggle or truth.

Wayne Morse loved the law.

He always remained a tutor of the Constitution to all who would listen.

And it was that love which produced such bristling indignation whenever he felt others were jeopardizing the sanctity of constitutional law. Would that such a jealous love were shared by all given the responsibility of political power.

All these qualities equipped Wayne Morse for the most valued contribution he made to our country: His unceasing drive to bring the Nation from war to peace.

That is how Americans will remember him best. For he warned America; he pleaded with her; he tried to alarm her; he wanted to tell America how she was endangering her deepest ideals, and spilling innocent blood.

You could say that he spoke then like a prophet, heralding the truth to ears that rarely were open.

But he remained undaunted. Steadfast. Unyielding. Indefatigable. The Gulf of Tonkin vote was the natural outgrowth of his character and commitment. Inexorably, the truth he proclaimed was embraced by more and more others, as the Nation began to listen.

Wayne Morse always kept on fighting for peace, and for his inner beliefs, and for the Constitution.

Words by Dag Hammarskjold bring Wayne Morse back to our minds:

> He broke fresh ground—because, and only because, he had the courage to go ahead without asking whether others were following or even understood. He had no need for the divided responsibility in which others seek to be safe from ridicule, because he had been granted a faith which required no confirmation.

His zeal was infectious, both nurtured and shared by wife and family, who marched with him on his crusades, and were all bound together with unflinching devotion.

He refused to let even age defeat him. Wayne Morse would no more yield to it than to any other foe. So he died fully alive, still in political combat, with his incisive mind and penetrating voice still advocating his cause, still preaching constitutional sermons about the law he knew and loved so fervently, and still telling us what he felt in his mind and heart.

Tennyson's words best capture for me the life of Wayne Lyman Morse:

> To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield.

Mr. President, at that same Salem service, tributes were given by Oregon Gov. Tom McCall and Oregon State President Jayson Boe. Mr. Boe, incidently, was the primary opponent this past spring challenging Senator Morse for the Democratic Senate nomination.

I ask unanimous consent that these two eulogies appear at this point in the RECORD.

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

REMARKS BY GOV. TOM MCCALL

My relationship with Wayne Morse—often friendly but sometimes tenuous—has roots nearly 40 years old.

The first contact I can remember was in the mid-1930's, after I had won a write-in campaign for president of the senior class at the University of Oregon. Law School Dean Wayne Morse—then head of the faculty-student Executive Committee—ruled that since there was no space on the ballot for write-ins, my election was a nullity.

I think it was the only bad decision he ever made. It was the only contrary thing he ever did to me; there was much he did for me.

As a political writer, government servant and progressive Republican, I was privileged to have some unusual insights into Senator Morse's reaction to key situations, and so I feel a kinship approaching that of a family member.

We have laughed, argued, nodded agreement, and given each other advice, some taken and some not.

I saw him strident, audacious, challenging, and penitent. To those progressive Republicans he left behind to suffer the scorn of more conventional Republicans when he left the party, he was contrite. And he told me he was grateful that they had stood up for him and with him for a more realistic political party.

At the Republican National Convention in 1952—which I attended as a news reporter—I was sitting next to him with the Oregon delegation when the name of Richard Nixon was put forth as the vice presidential nominee. He clutched my knee in his distress and asked: "Why him? Why not a progressive Republican like Leverett Saltonstall?"

It was a myth that he wanted the nomination himself. But he wanted it for a progressive—particularly one who would be even-handed toward labor. But as he saw it, his party had fallen into the clutches of the conservatives, and there was no longer any room for him among the Republican faithful.

His decision came not out of spite. It was simply an intellectual conclusion, another victory for his conscience.

When A. Robert Smith's book "The Tiger in the Senate" came out in 1962, I was the first newsman to get this reaction. He loathed the book. He told me: "There never was a monster as bad as the one portrayed by that book."

He could make high drama in a sentence or two. Often he ran beyond that because he had such an inquisitive, acquisitive mind and understood things so well that he was always prepared, and wanted to tell the story in depth. He wanted us to know everything he did so that we would understand the issues as well as he. He didn't talk to be talking; he was applying his considerable oral skills to winning an appreciation and an understanding of his point of view.

What some people only think, Wayne Morse would often say. He could be inexplicably harsh in his assessment of those he believed were ignoring their conscience, or had none. But it was pointless to be angry with him. We came to find we'd rather have him that way than in the cozy clubhouse of the politics-as-usual association.

In the two years that my career as Governor and his as Senator overlapped, I turned to him many times for help, and got it. He had an office finely tuned to service to the citizens of Oregon, and he became the scourge of the bureaucrats.

One of the last times I saw him was more than a year ago when we crossed paths in Portland. He said: "You know what I've been doing today? I was in Columbia County campaigning for your school tax plan."

I asked him once if he knew the political risks of getting into that campaign, and of course he did. But he said he believed it offered justice to the kids and equity to the taxpayers, and he couldn't stand mute to that opportunity.

Except for his union with his beloved "Midge" and their family, and his leadership of his cattle club, Wayne Morse loosened the ties or beat his way out of about every organization he got into. His appeal was to our reason as individuals.

The closest he came in recent years to gathering an identifiable flock was the attachment of millions of young people to his banners.

Was it opposition to the Vietnam War? Most young people knew very little more about him than that. But I detect that it was not only his opposition to the war, but a feeling flowing from it that here was an honest man, that when he spoke you knew there was no hidden motive.

The young and many of their elders view most politicians with immense cynicism—a cynicism fostered outrageously by political leaders who defend Watergate with the canard that "everybody does it."

So the young have the notion that almost everybody is on the take from the oil companies, and ITT, and the milk trust, and that everybody with any influence at all can dodge taxes, and steam open other people's mail.

But they do not believe it of Wayne Morse, and oh, what his past has taught us! His life reminds us that there are other lands of the free and the brave, and that patriotism isn't an exclusively American property. He told us that personal and national principles cannot be changed to accommodate your

bank account, or your political party, or your friends or even your enemies. In his uncompromising way, he encouraged us to stiffen our backs against compromise of principle.

In the name of presidential privilege, national honor, military power or economic interest, we see gross violations of the letter and spirit of the United States Constitution. And Wayne Morse—more like an author of the Constitution than a politician—reveled in running against the tide that has created a uniquely American system of government by men.

In these days we tend to honor men and women in public life for the buildings they constructed, the highways they built, the laws they passed, the institutions they endowed, or the power they obtained to manipulate the lives of others.

It is rare that we have the opportunity to honor someone whose great achievement was to have and to hold devotion to conscience, and integrity of the most immense proportions. But that is why we honor this rare man, Wayne Morse.

The United States Constitution guarantees the right of the people "to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

Our most eloquent petitioner lies dead. Let us now take up his burden as our memorial to his name.

EULOGY FOR SENATOR WAYNE L. MORSE

(By Jason Boe, President, Oregon State Senate)

Inscribed in the marble of the rotunda of our state capital are these words:

"In the souls of its citizens will be found the likeness of the state which if they be unjust and tyrannical then will it reflect their vices, but if they be lovers of righteousness, confident in their liberties, so will it be clean in justice—bold in freedom."

These words, which touched Mrs. Morse so tenderly yesterday, serve well to describe the life, work and the philosophy of Senator Wayne Morse.

We assemble here today to honor the memory of Senator Morse, who was stricken on July 17th and passed away on July 22, 1974.

A national symbol of courage is dead.

Wayne Morse's leadership in causes he believed to be just transcended party lines. It arose above narrow political ideologies. In his long career in the Senate that he loved, he was extraordinary effective for the people of Oregon. Constituents who needed him came away knowing he cared—he cared for his people as all good legislators must; and knowing that he cared, people were satisfied that he would seek to solve their problems if the solution were just.

Wayne Morse's Senate performance was spectacular. He was a senator's senator. He knew the joys and inner rewards of public service. He knew the thrill of victory, he knew full well the agony of defeat.

Wayne Morse worked hard, drove hard. He made hard decisions not always popular. He never avoided the rough waters if they had to be negotiated for a goal in which he believed.

And through it all, he had the loving companionship and support of his marvelous wife Midge and their lovely family.

I had the honor to be Senator Morse's last competitor in the political process he loved; the ageless electoral struggle to reach the minds of men and women; to articulate their aspirations for a better government—a better life. Through it all, our relationship didn't change. The issues that united us were far stronger, far more powerful, far more important than any other consideration.

In the fifth verse of Chapter 74 in the book of Psalms it says: "A man was famous according as he had lifted up the axe upon thick trees." Wayne Morse never hesitated to lift up the axe when it was in defense of our individual liberties or for equal protection under the law or for the cause of world peace.

"In the souls of its citizens will be found the likeness of the State . . ."

Senator Morse was a lover of righteousness, confident in the liberties of the people. He was clean in justice, bold in freedom, and gracious in victory. His spirit was never—nor now will it ever—be defeated.

Morse of Oregon. We shall not soon see his like again.

Mr. HATFIELD. In addition, at the memorial service in Salem, Speaker of the Oregon House of Representatives Richard Eymann, former Senator Eugene McCarthy, and Morris Novick, a personal representative of George Meany from the AFL–CIO, also spoke.

Later in the day, another service was held in Eugene, Oreg., Senator Morse's home town. Unfortunately, no written comments were retained by the speakers, Dr. Wesley Nicholson, Dean Orlando Hollis, Dr. Charles Grossman, Merton Bernstein, and Justice William O. Douglas. I ask unanimous consent, however, that an article by Henny Willis, from the Eugene Register Guard, describing the service, and containing excerpts from the eulogies, appear at this point in the RECORD.

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

WAYNE MORSE AT FINAL REST

(By Henny Willis)

Wayne Lyman Morse was laid to rest Friday on a hilltop knoll not far from his beloved Eugene ranch.

The private burial service, in Rest-Haven Memorial Park attended only by the Morse family and a few close friends, brought a political era in Oregon history to a close as praise for the 40-year public career of the old "Tiger in the Senate" echoed across the nation.

Morse, 73, died Monday after being stricken last week with a severe urinary tract infection.

Appropriately, his close associates say, Morse—perhaps this century's most renowned political maverick—was campaigning for his old Senate seat when he was stricken.

At a mid-afternoon funeral service at the First Congregational Church in Eugene, the church's (and Morse's) pastor, the Rev. Wesley Nicholson, revealed the ex-senator's last words.

Nicholson said he had visited Morse in the hospital shortly before he died and that the family had relayed to him that Morse, in what Nicholson described as a "semi-coma," had believed himself to be at a "political gathering." His last words, Nicholson said, were:

"I want to thank you all for coming. Thank you for such a beautiful day. Thank you, everybody. Thank you."

At the two-hour funeral service, eulogies came from four men who had known Morse intimately over the years.

Orlando Hollis, who taught at the University of Oregon Law School when Morse was dean and who succeeded Morse as dean, relayed anecdotes and impressions of Morse from those early years (both men came to the UO in 1929).

Hollis said Morse loved his ranch and his horses as a release from his hectic—and often controversial—public life. He said throughout his life, Morse would try as often as possible to go out at sunrise and ride his horses.

Another facet of the Morse character, Hollis said, was that he had an "ability to communicate with and understand young people, without being condescending them."

From his earliest days at the UO, Hollis said he perceived that "Wayne Morse stood in awe of no one, absolutely no one. He was a man of complete self-confidence."

Dr. Charles Grossman, Morse's personal physician and long-time friend from Portland, said one of the ex-senator's greatest strengths "was that he was always on the side of the people—the working man, the farmer, the blacks and Chicanos, the Indians."

Grossman said on July 4 this year, Morse had run a three-legged race with a young girl at a holiday fete.

"It was symbolic that he should end his life running and tied to the younger generation," Grossman said.

Merton Bernstein, a law professor at Ohio State College of Law and a one-time Morse aide during the Senate years, described his old boss as a "warm, vital person . . . a man of great compassion and tolerance—we worked not for him, but with him."

The principal eulogizer was U.S. Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas, a long-time Morse friend.

Douglas said he last visited with Morse at the recent funeral of ex-Sen. Ernest Gruening, D-Alaska, who was only one of two U.S. senators—the other was Morse—to vote against the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution in 1964.

"In the past few weeks," Douglas said, "we've seen the death of three outstanding public servants—Earl Warren, Ernest Gruening and Wayne Morse. Each of these men respected public office as a trusteeship."

Douglas called Morse "a giant" of constitutional principles and "as good a constitutional lawyer as ever sat in the United States Senate."

The justice said Morse's vote against the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution—the passage of which triggered American escalation in Vietname—was his proudest vote.

"In his view," Douglas said, "a presidential war was the most dangerous of all."

Douglas called Morse "outspoken and blunt, but he was not filled with rancor and bitterness—he was a man of integrity fearlessness and daring will."

Douglas said government today "seems to act as though corporations have a bill of rights. It's more like a government of corporations, by corporations and for corporations. But Wayne Morse followed steadfastly the tradition of Abraham Lincoln and fought for a government of the people, by the people and for the people."

From the church filled with high-ranking political figures and average citizens, Wayne Morse was taken to his final resting place.

An era had ended. The Tiger was still.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I also participated in a memorial service here in Washington at National Cathedral paying tribute to Wayne Morse. It was a most moving occasion, and many of Senator Morse's friends from this area gathered to pay him final tribute. As I indicated, I waited to offer this eulogy until a transcript could be prepared of the service. Even the songs seemed perfect to comment on his rich life. I ask unanimous consent that the full text of this service appear at this point in the RECORD.

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

MEMORIAL SERVICE FOR SENATOR WAYNE LYMAN MORSE OF OREGON, 1900–1974, TUESDAY, JULY 30TH AT 10:30, WASHINGTON CATHEDRAL

ORGAN PRELUDE

Music of Johann Sebastian Bach

Sonatina from the Cantata "God's Time Is Best"

Sinfonia from Cantata "I Stand with one foot in the Grave"

Choral Preludes: "When we are in greatest need"

"Deck thyself, O my Soul"

PROCESSION OF THE PARTICIPANTS

(In silence)

OPENING SENTENCES AND PRAYER

(All standing)

Canon Jeffrey Cave

Lord, make us instruments of your peace;
Where there is hatred, let us sow love;
Where there is injury, pardon;
Where there is discord, union;
Where there is doubt, faith;
Where there is dispair, hope;
Where there is darkness, light;
Where there is sadness, joy;
Grant that we may not so much seek to be consoled, as to console;
To be understood, as to understand;
To be loved, as to love:
For it is in giving that we receive,
It is in pardoning, that we are pardoned,
And it is in dying that we are born to eternal life.

Oh, God of righteousness, we thank you for the faith
we inherit. It gives us the vision
of a world where children of God are not ground down in oppression,
but lifted up freedom.

We thank you for the gift of your love.
It demands that the human person
must not be bound in misery,
but liberated in joy.

We thank you for the abundance of the earth.
It makes possible a society of persons,
not equal in poverty, but diverse in wealth.

We thank you for the pricking of conscience.
It makes us lay the foundations
for such world, not tomorrow, but today.

And, we thank you for Wayne Morse,
a faithful and good man. Amen.

Senator MARK HATFIELD. Let us remain standing and join together in responsive reading taken from Psalm 119:

R. Thy word is a lantern unto my feet, and a light unto my paths.

C. I have sworn, and am steadfastly purposed, to keep thy righteous judgments.

R. I am troubled above measure: quicken me, O Lord, according to Thy word.

C. Let the free-will offerings of my mouth please Thee, O Lord; and teach me Thy judgments.

R. My soul is always in my hand; yet do I not forget Thy law.

C. The ungodly have laid a snare for me; but yet I swerved not from Thy commandments.

R. Thy testimonies have I claimed as mine heritage forever; and why? they are the very joy of my heart.

C. I have applied my heart to fulfil Thy status always, even unto the end.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE MARK HATFIELD

Undaunted. Steadfast. Unyielding. Indefatigable.

All these come to mind with the memory of Wayne Morse.

At times like this, we remember what is most lasting about the imprint of a life; we remember what will endure beyond those 73 years given by God to Wayne Morse; we remember what is transcendent of mere politics, and reaches forward to our common destiny and future.

Wayne Morse was a man of the earth.

With his ranch and cattle, he always maintained his roots with the soil.

He treasured Oregon's forests and ranges, battling to preserve their bounty and beauty.

At the bedrock of his career was his commitment to Oregon's land and people. Wayne Morse cherished his convictions. He clung to them, fought for them, and yielded to them.

Certainly he fought as hard or harder as any in political combat, for he was a relentless pursuer of his causes. But there was a difference. It was not just his political survival which thrust him into his battles. Rather, in a larger way, it was the unquenchable strength of what he believed.

Wayne Morse never thought the point of politics, or for life, was "to get along, you go along." He was freer than most from that perpetual concern with popularity. It was more important for Wayne Morse to stand for his convictions, and to struggle for truth.

Wayne Morse loved the law. He always remained a tutor of the Constitution to all who would listen.

And it was that love which produced such bristling indignation whenever he felt others were jeopardizing the sanctity of constitutional law. Would that such a jealous love were shared by all given the responsibility of political power.

All these qualities equipped Wayne Morse for the most valued contribution he made to our country: his unceasing drive to bring the nation from war to peace.

That is how Americans will remember him best. For he warned America; he pleaded with her; he tried to alarm her; he wanted to tell America how she was endangering her deepest ideals, and spilling innocent blood.

You could say that he spoke then like a prophet, heralding the truth to ears that rarely were open.

Inexorably, the truth he proclaimed was embraced by more and more others, as the nation began to listen. His zeal was infectious, both nurtured and shared by Mrs. Morse and family.

He refused to even let age defeat him. Wayne Morse would no more yield to it than to any other foe. So he died fully alive, still in political combat, with his incisive mind and penetrating voice advocating his cause, still preaching constitutional sermons about the law he knew and loved so fervently, and still telling us what he felt in his mind and heart.

It is Tennyson's words which to me would capture the life of Wayne Lyman Morse:

"To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield."

HYMN 471—"ROCK OF AGES," (TOPLADY)

(All joining)

Rock of Ages, cleft for me
Let me hide myself in Thee
Let the water and the blood
From Thy side, a healing flood
Be of sin the double cure
Cleanse me from its guilt and power.
Should my tears forever flow,
Should my zeal no languor know,
All for sin could not atone:
Thou must save, and Thou alone;
In my hand no price I bring
Simply to Thy cross I cling
While I draw this fleeting breath
When mine eyelids close in death
When I rise to worlds unknown
And behold Thee on Thy throne
Rock of Ages, cleft for me,
Let me hide myself in Thee. Amen.

Mr. PEPPER. Canon Cave, members of the family of Senator Morse, and friends: A reading from the 39th Chapter of the Book of Ecclesiasticus:

"He who devotes himself to the study of the law of the
Most High will seek out the wisdom of all the ancients, and will be concerned with prophecies;
He will preserve the discourse of notable men and penetrate the subleties of parables;
He will seek out the hidden meanings of Proverbs and be at home with the obscurities of parables.
He will serve among great men and appear before rulers;
He will travel through the lands of foreign nations, for he tests the good and evil among men.
He will set his heart to rise early to seek the Lord who made him, and will make supplication before the Most High;
He will open his mouth in prayer and make supplication for his sins.
If the great Lord is willing, he will be filled with the spirit of understanding;
He will pour forth words of wisdom and give thanks to the Lord in prayer.
He will direct his counsel and his knowledge aright, and meditate on his secrets.
He will reveal instruction in his teaching, and will glory in the law of the Lord's covenant.
Many will praise his understanding, and it will never be blotted out;
His memory will not disappear, and his name will live through all generations.
Nations will declare his wisdom, and the congregation will proclaim his praise.
If he lives long, he will leave a name greater than a thousand.
If he goes to rest, it is enough for him.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE CLAUDE DENSON PEPPER

On the first day of this month, many of us who have gathered here today in this noble edifice, assembled to pay our honor and respect to the late Senator Ernest Greuning.

Among those who came all the way across the continent from his home state of Oregon to join in that appreciation was him whose name we honor today—Senator Wayne Morse.

I shall never forget how we stood and talked together in the robing room, of his great past, of our service together in the Senate, of his hopes for the future, should he be endowed with the opportunity to resume that great career previously cut short. And, now, too soon it is his name, and his memory which we honor today.

Senator Wayne Morse was a rare man! Rare in so many respects: Rare in keen intelligence, rare in the dynamism of his spirit, rare in his peculiar capacity to be dedicated to a purpose, rare in his courage, rare in his persistence in pursuit of a dream that he entertained.

Wayne Morse, as a Senator, ranged all over the realm of public issues like a knight of the round table jousting with every defender of wrong he could reach, raising his fearful lance in support of every worthy cause that came within the scope of his restless energy.

And, what a record he made! In two respects, I should like to mention that record:

One having to do with his participation in the formulation and in the development of the policy of our country in respect to Latin America:

In nineteen hundred and fifty-five, he became Chairman of the Subcommittee on Latin American Affairs of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

In 1958, he began a study of the relations of our country with our neighbors to the South, and out of that study came the principles of what was later the noble declaration of the Alliance for Progress. A great member of that subcommittee was Senator John F. Kennedy. When Castro was coming to power in Cuba, it was the voice of Wayne Morse, raised in warning against our country embracing one of his character and the disposition that he was beginning to display. Thereafter, visiting with the President, with the Secretary of State—representing the President, he had a large part in the relations between our country and Latin America, always striving to make the hemisphere stronger, and to make

closer the attachments of friendship between our country and theirs.

And, then in the field of education, Wayne Morse had signal distinction. During the time he was Chairman of the Education Subcommittee of the Senate Education and Labor Committee, more legislation affecting education in this country, giving federal assistance to the program of education in our nation was enacted, than ever before in the nation's history, and Wayne Morse was the one who led the passage of that legislation in the United States Senate.

His colleagues have borne eloquent testimony to the contribution that he made in this field. I quote from the remarks of Senator Abe Ribicoff, former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare in the administration of President Kennedy:

"When the name 'Morse' appears on an educational bill, the present generation of children and children yet unborn will be assured that the bill stands for one man who in my opinion more than any other single individual in the whole history of our nation, has helped further the cause of education in the United States."

And Senator Javits:

"The work of the Senior Senator from Oregon in bringing this bill to the floor with the unanimous support of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare is of such an extraordinary quality that I feel that that alone, whatever else ensues, deserves the highest encomium of which I am capable, but also the entire world of education."

And majority leader, Senator Mansfield, said:

"The title, 'Mr. Education', is a title well-earned by Senator Morse. I thank him from the bottom of my heart, and I congratulate him for his tremendous understanding, knowledge and ability on all matters, but especially on questions involving education."

Every aspect of education: Elementary and secondary, Higher education, Assistance to students needing financial aid in obtaining an education, All this great panorama of education passed under the careful guidance and great leadership of Wayne Morse.

Perhaps, one of the qualities of Wayne Morse that all will remember best is his steadfastness of purpose. Indeed, once he committed himself to a course, he was unshakeable in that position.

It might be said, as was said in an ode from Horace, "were the vault of Heaven to break and fall upon him, its ruins might smite him, undismayed."

He was actuated by the motivation of concern for people, and pursuit of what he thought was his just duty. And he was moved by what might be the words of Babcock, who said,

"We have hard work to do,
loads to lift;
Shun not the struggle;
Face it.
It is God's gift."

We may truly say, as was said by Shakespeare,

"He has borne himself beyond the measure of his own times, doing in the figure of a lamb the feats of a lion."

And we can say, May God long preserve the memory and the spirit of Wayne Morse; For, as his friend said to Hamlet, "We know we shall not see his like again."

A REMINISCENCE BY BISHOP SMALLWOOD WILLIAMS

Canon Cave, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, and members of the family:

In my considered judgment, the late Senator Wayne Morris was one of the greatest Senators to have sat in the United States Senate.

He was not only interested in the citizens of the State of Oregon, which sent him to the U.S. Senate for twenty-four years, but his profound humanitarianism gave him a great consideration for the poor, the disenfranchised, the disinherited, and the underpriviledged everywhere.

The hungry children of our nation's capitol loved him for his great concern which led him through legislative action to secure a lunch and milk program for public school children, liberal welfare, public assistance, and family aid legislation.

He was an intrepid, determined fighter for civil rights, civil liberties, and integration for all citizens of the United States of America.

He was a fierce fighter against all forms of discrimination and second class citizenship in our nation. His powerful voice, and wise counsel, and impressive presence, and liberalism in the Fifties helped to make possible the civil rights legislation for the Sixties.

Senator Morse was a very friendly person. He would invite me to have breakfast with him, in the U.S. Senate dining room, back in the Fifties, before the days of integration. The Senate dining room at that time was a lily-white situation. The usual only visible blacks were waiters and servants.

The presence of a black guest would always attract undue attention. The Senator, while conversing and eating unhurriedly, would look up and notice some of his distinguished colleagues from various parts of the country who did not share his views on racial integration. He would politely rise, as the Southern Senator from Louisiana passed, and he would warmly address his colleague and say:

"Senator, I want you to meet my good friend, Bishop Smallwood Williams."

The Senator would blush red, and shake my hand, acknowledge the introduction, and later the Senator from Georgia would pass. He would repeat the introduction with similar results; so, finally, one of the Southern Senators gave Senator Morse what I considered at that time a left-handed compliment. The Senator with the different racial philosophy from Senator Morse said:

"I differ with his racial views. However, one thing I would say about Wayne Morse—he practices what he preaches."

And may I profoundly add, not only did he practice what he preached, but we honor him today because he preached what he practiced.

For his strenuous effort and others like him; America is the bastion of the free world, And it is a better place to live; a more pragmatic example of human freedom and dignity, which our Declaration of Independence and Constitution proclaims.

Senator Wayne Morse leaves this nation a great legacy of liberalism and determinism, which his contemporaries cannot ignore, and history should not omit.

In spite of the political turbulence of our times, this nation is better because a man named Wayne Morse lived and worked here tirelessly, throughout his life, for the causes in which he believed.

May God ever bless his memory, family, and friends. Amen.

ADDRESS BY GEORGE MEANY

I came to know Wayne Morse early in his years of public service on the War Labor Board, during World War Two. That Board was a solid example of the ability of free men to govern themselves, uncoerced, in the service of their country in the time of searching trial. As a public member, the character, wisdom and diligence of Wayne Morse helped to make it possible for labor and management to measure up to that test. Yet, he never demanded or expected that either would yield, for a moment, their duty to advance most vigorously the rights and interests of those they were there to represent.

Our respect for Wayne Morse grew with familiarity over the years, as he involved himself deeply in the processes of collective bargaining, as one of the nation's leading arbitrators and mediators of labor-management disputes. His fairness, integrity and dedication to free and voluntary paths to industrial peace were above question by either side of the many controversies he helped to solve.

His contribution to human rights in industrial life, as well as political life, will endure far beyond his time.

That respect and regard continued to grow in the course of his political career, and it survived frequent differences on issues and approaches to issues. A powerful advocate and a formidable adversary, he was one whom we always wanted to have on our side. His force always exceeded his solitary vote in the Senate, for he was willing to step forward from the pack, to lead and to fight, and he fought from conviction, not from any awe of persons or institutions.

He was a friend of labor, not because he was beholden to labor, but because his largeness of heart and mind made him a champion of the plain people, the advocate of the little man surrounded by forces and aspirations beyond his reach.

He played the game on the top of the table, without guile or petty artifice. But, he brought to that great game of politics and legislation, a spirit of steel and a will of iron. He knew full well that when the battle of the common man is to be fought, any weakness of will or slackness of mind must succumb before the interest and odds against it.

He gave as much of himself to the people of the District of Columbia, who lacked the political voice or power to reward him in any way for his fidelity, as he gave the nation, when larger issues called him forth.

Wayne Morse perceived and understood the vital link between education and human progress. That great series of acts of Congress, which vastly enlarged the federal role in support of the expansion of educational opportunity during the years of Lyndon Johnson's Presidency bear the strong marks of his concern.

How often since he left the Senate, and issues and causes languished for lack of a courageous and stalwart champion, have we said among ourselves, "If we only had a Wayne Morse to lead this fight for us on the Hill?" But the only Wayne Morse was Wayne Morse himself!

We had hoped that in the fall we would be able to help return Wayne Morse in full voice to the Senate where he belonged, and where he is needed; but it was not to be. Now, we shall not see his like again. The Senate, the nation and the people have lost a great champion of justice, and we are all the poorer for that irreplacable loss.

ADDRESS BY JOSEPH L. RAUH, JR.

Canon Cave, friends, family of Wayne Morse:

I think I speak this morning not for myself, but for all those in the civil rights movement who worked with Wayne Morse: For those of us who had the privilege of working closely with him; for Clarence Mitchell, Roy Wilkens; but, really, above all, for the millions of people whose rights exist today because of Wayne Morse, and who probably do not even know his name:

Justice Brandeis once wrote, "If we would guide by the light of reason, we must let our minds be bold."

More than any other public leader of our lifetime, Wayne Morse lived by this Brandeis injunction. There is no time within memory when he failed to let his mind be bold. Over and over again in the thirty years of our friendship and collaboration, it was Wayne Morse who raised the banners toward new goals of equality and civil freedom.

Once the goals were set, no force on earth could move him from his appointed course.

It was Wayne Morse in the late Forties and Fifties, who outlined the constitutional bases, for the broad civil rights laws of the Sixties. Only too often in that period he knocked

unsuccessfully at the Senate clubhouse door with its ever-present sign, "No Civil Rights legislation wanted."

It was Wayne Morse who helped keep the civil rights goals alive in Nineteen Fifty-Seven, by voting against the watered down civil rights bill of that year, and eloquently reaffirming the true needs of minority Americans. And, I suppose I may say, like so many others would say, I was one of those who advised him to vote for the bill.

It was Wayne Morse who helped stop the 1958 Congressional onslaught on the civil liberties decisions of the Warren Supreme Court. Indeed, my favorite mind's-eye picture of Wayne is at four a.m. on an August Sunday morning in 1958, with books piled high on his desk, and a "they shall not pass" look on his face. The drive for the last of the anti-court bills lapsed in the face of that threatened end of the session filibuster.

It was Wayne Morse who kept the goal of true Home Rule for the District of Columbia alive in the Fifties and Sixties, while others berated him for not accepting unworkable substitutes. Every Washingtonian should thank God for Wayne Morse, as they cast their first Home Rule vote this fall.

Often, Wayne Morse stood alone. Where others sought refuge in the crowd, he had the courage to take the stand, undaunted by the absence of colleagues or other supporters. For those who knew him, Tonkin Gulf was not a surprise, but an inevitability.

As so many have said this morning before me, we shall not see the likes of this fierce warrior for justice soon again. Almost alone among public figures, his courage never once left him faltering or hesitant. Wrong he may, on occasion, no doubt, have been. But lacking in boldness he never was.

At a time when too many would hide in the changeless center, Wayne Morse is our reminder, forever, that one man with unlimited courage can move mountains of apathy and despair.

We shall miss him more and more.

HYMN 519—"EBENEZER"

(All joining)

Once to ev'ry man and nation
Comes the moment to decide,
In the strife of truth with falsehood,
For the good or evil side;
Some great cause, God's new Messiah,
Off'ring each the bloom or blight,
And the choice goes by forever
Twixt that darkness and that light.

Then to side with truth is noble,
When we share her wretched crust,
Ere her cause bring fame and profit
And 'tis prosp'rous to be just;
Then it is the brave man chooses,
While the coward stands aside,
Till the multitude make virtue
Of the faith they had denied.

By the light of burning martyrs
Jesus' bleeding feet I track,
Toiling up new Calveries ever
With the cross that turns not back;
New occasions teach new duties,
Time makes ancient good uncouth;
They must upward still and onward
Who would keep abreast of truth.
Though the cause of evil prosper
Yet 'tis truth alone is strong;

Though her portion be the scaffold,
And upon the throne be wrong.
Yet that scaffold sways the future,
And, behind the dim unknown,
Standeth God within the shadow
Keeping watch above his own.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE JAMES WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

Canon Cave and friends:

To Wayne Morse our country is deeply indebted.

The circumstances presently confronting our nation serve to emphasize the importance to the preservation of our democratic system of government of men with the personal integrity, the dedication and the courage of Wayne Morse.

Although he enjoyed personal friendships as others do, he always gave one the impression that the welfare of all the people he represented so ably was his primary concern and he was relentless in his pursuit of that objective.

He was willing, as few men are, to be aggressive and abrasive to his colleagues, or to Presidents, when he believed the peoples' interest required it. Few men have equalled his devotion to the Senate and to the country!

Some Senators distinguished themselves as great advocates; others, as far-sighted critics of national policy. Wayne Morse was both:

A remarkably knowledgeable and skillful legislative manager, especially in the fields of labor and education, and an equally distinguished critic of mistaken policies, especially in our foreign relations.

As a legislator, he was brilliant and indefatigable. As one who usually agreed with Wayne Morse in debate, but occasionally did not, I can state, unequivocally, that I greatly preferred having him on my side. He was in the classic sense of the term a great debator, a gifted practitioner of an art form now in decline. While Senators increasingly have taken to the media, and to the techniques of public relations, Wayne Morse retained an old-fashioned faith in government by discussion, and the place for that discussion, in his view, was the Senate floor. It was pre-eminently his forum, where he brought to bear his extraordinary gifts of knowledge, logic, and tenacity.

Wayne Morse and I served together on the Foreign Relations Committee for fourteen years, from 1955 until 1969. There, especially, I appreciated his remarkable energy and foresight. Whereas, many Senators made it a practice to appear only occasionally in the committee, to make a point or advance a particular cause, Senator Morse was there most of the time, listening, questioning, probing, and, in so doing, educating—educating his colleagues, and educating the American people.

Above all, in foreign relations, he was far-sighted. He was ahead of most of us in appreciating the defects of our bi-lateral foreign aid programs. He was one of the architects of the Alliance for Progress, and, under his chairmanship, the Foreign Relations Committee on Inter-American Affairs was uniquely creative and influential.

To his enduring fame and credit, Senator Morse perceived the tragic folly of the Vietnam War before virtually anyone else. His vote against the Tonkin Resolution in 1964, one of only two in the Senate, along with his then unheeded efforts to apprise the Senate of the facts of that episode, stand as a landmark of courage and prescience in the Senate.

We have heard a great deal in recent years about the need to strengthen the Senate by means of new rules of procedure and reorganized committees. For my part, I can think of a much more effective means of strengthening and rejuvenating the Senate: Elect more Senators like Wayne Morse of Oregon.

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE ARTHUR J. GOLDBERG

There was a man—He was a zealot! He railed against injustice, immorality and abuse of power.

He had the courage to be alone and apart, In defense of principles. Just like the tree planted by the water, where principles were involved, he could not be moved.

He alienated and challenged the establishment on occasion. He even chided his most intimate friends for lapses from what he regarded to be the true faith.

Critics were prone to say that he was too self-righteous, that he wore a hair-shirt, that he was intolerant of human failings, and that his deep-felt convictions were too strongly expressed, too single-mindedly held, and too passionately argued.

Yet, his heart was filled with love, notwithstanding, notwithstanding that he often felt that he had to speak in words of condemnation.

He was a maverick, a mugwump. The man I have described is Jeremiah, Ezekial, Isaiah, or Micah, prophets in Israel.

Is it not remarkable how many of the qualities of the Hebrew prophets Senator Wayne Morse possessed? I would not presume to characterize Wayne Morse as a prophet in the biblical sense. The prophets of the Old Testament were divinely inspired.

Yet, it cannot be gainsayed that Senator Morse, like the prophets of old, was a zealot—for integrity, morality, justice, the rule of law, peace, and steadfast adherence to basic principles.

There is an old Jewish tradition, tracing back to the prophet Isaiah, that in every age there are 36 just men, which in Hebrew is called—they're called the "Lamitvov". According to this tradition, if just one of them were lacking, the suffering of man would multiply.

Lamitvov, the legend says, are the hearts of the world multiplied; and into them, as into one receptacle, pour all of our grievances against injustice and inequity. The teaching of this legend is that one man is indispensable, and Wayne Morse was!

For Wayne Morse's career and good works proves the essential truth of this legend: Absent Wayne Morse and his great contributions to the cause of the poor, the oppressed, the wage-earner and those discriminated against, the suffering of mankind would, indeed, have multiplied!

The Lamitvov tradition is a legend. But, to paraphrase the poet, more things are wrought by legends than men dream of.

If Wayne Morse dissented from public policies contrary to the public interest, as he frequently did, if he championed social and economic justice, as he frequently did, if he fought for the elimination of illiteracy, of prejudice and racial bigotry, as he did, if he loved peace—hated war—abjured violence and discord at home and abroad, as he did, Senator Morse was giving expression to the highest patriotism, best defined by Adlai Stevenson in these words:

"What do we mean by patriotism in the context of our times? A patriotism that puts country ahead of self; A patriotism which is the steady dedication of a lifetime. These are words that are easy to utter, But this a mighty assignment. For it is often easier to fight for principles, Than to live up to them."

"When an American says he loves his country, He means not only that he loves the New England hills, The prairies glistening in the sun, The wide and rising plains, The great mountains and ranges and virgin forests of the far west, He means that he loves an inner air, An inner light in which freedom lives And in which a man can draw a breath of self-respect."

I don't know whether Adlai Stevenson was conscious of this, but he was paraphrasing the words of the first Chief Justice of the United States, John Jay, who spoke of the "Free Air of American Life."

If I were to have a capsule of Wayne Morse, I would say he took one gain from the founding fathers. His slogan was theirs: "Do not tread on me and our liberties." That to me is the essence of Wayne Morse.

Like another great American, he conceived that those who won our independence believed liberty to be the secret of happiness, and courage to be the secret of liberty.

They believed, as he did, that the greatest menace of freedom is an inert people; that public discussion is a political duty;

that this should be a fundamental principle of all American government.

They recognized the risk to which all human institutions are subject; But they knew, as he did, that order cannot be secured merely through fear of punishment for its infraction; that it is hazardous to discourage thought, hope and imagination; and that fear breeds repression, that repression breeds hate, that hate menaces stable government; that the path of safety lies in the opportunity to discuss freely supposed grievances and proposed remedies, and that the fitting remedy for evil counsels is good ones. These convictions held by the founding fathers—and Wayne Morse, perhaps represent a lesson to us, and a teaching for our present travails.

In mourning Wayne Morse's passing, we, his friends and distinguished colleagues who are gathered here today salute this indomitable combat soldier for *liberty, freedom, justice* and *peace*.

To these great ends he dedicated his life and, in so doing, left an enduring profile in courage.

PRAYERS—for the departed and those who mourn for Oregon, for our country—the Lord's prayer.

Canon Cave: As the service draws to a close, shall we stand for the prayers:

"Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, in whose hands are the living and the dead, we give Thee thanks for all Thy servants who have spent their lives in the service of our country, especially Thy servant, Wayne. Grant to him Thy mercy, and the light of Thy presence, and give to us such a lively sense of Thy righteous will that the work Thou hast begun in him may be perfected through us." Amen.

Let us pray for Oregon:

"O, God, author of all majesty, how bright is Thy glory, upon the land of Oregon! Blessed be the trees upon their hills, the valleys in their verdure, and the dry places waiting their turn of fertility. Praised be to Thee for the precious gift of rain, drawn in to Heaven from the sea, caught again upon the snowy peaks, returning fruitfully down the strong rivers, giving life to Thy people in their orchards and city places. May their lives likewise be lifted to Thee and blessed, and sent again to do Thy service upon earth; so may the land be renewed, and the souls of Thy servants, through Jesus Christ, our Lord." Amen.

Let us pray for our country:

"Almighty God, who has given us this good land for our heritage; we humbly beseech Thee that we may always prove ourselves a people mindful of Thy favor and glad to do Thy will. Bless this land with honorable industry, sound learning, and pure manners. Save us from violence, discord, and confusion; from pride and arrogance, and from every evil way. Defend our liberties, and fashion into one united people the multitudes brought hither out of many kindreds and tongues. Fill with the spirit of wisdom those to whom we entrust the authority of government, that there may be justice and peace at home, and that, through obedience to Thy law, we may show forth Thy praise among the nations of the earth. In the time of prosperity, fill our hearts with thankfulness; and in the day of trouble, suffer not our trust in Thee to fail; all of which we ask through Jesus Christ, our Lord." Amen.

All pray:

"Our Father, who are in Heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done. On earth as it is in Heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil, for Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever and ever." Amen.

BENEDICTION BY CANON CAVE

"The peace of God which passeth all understanding, Keep your hearts and minds in the knowledge and love of God, And of His Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, and the blessing of God almighty, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, be amongst you and remain with you always." Amen.

POSTLUDE

Choral Prelude "We Believe in One God"—Johann Sebastian Bach.

Mr. HATFIELD. In addition, Mr. President, I call to the attention of my colleagues a project begun by State Senator Edward Fadeley, a long-time friend of Senator Morse. He is collecting memories and ancedotes of Senator Morse from people across the country, and compiling them into a book for distribution to young people as another tribute to Wayne Morse. Any of you, or any of the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, should feel free to send your comments to Mr. Fadeley. I ask unanimous consent that two letters describing this work appear at this point in the RECORD.

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

OREGON STATE SENATE,
Salem, Oreg., Aug. 19, 1974.

Hon. MARK O. HATFIELD,
U.S. Senator From Oregon, Senate Office Building Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HATFIELD: Enclosed is a letter to the editor which explains the purpose of this letter. Could you have an appropriately edited version of this letter entered in the Congressional Record?

Whether that is possible or useful, I would appreciate it if you would personally respond to the letter with a memory of Wayne. I do not plan to charge for the booklet, but will pay the cost myself. Of course, as a contributor, you would receive a copy.

It is my hope that this booklet might come into the hands of some young person who would be stimulated to enter government activities and service, by Wayne's example.

Sincerely,

EDWARD N. FADELEY.

OREGON STATE SENATE,
Salem, Oreg.

DEAR EDITOR: Wayne L. Morse was actively involved in over a quarter century of Oregon political and social history. Many, many Oregonians had interesting contacts with him. Now is the time to preserve our memories of Wayne.

Please publish this letter as a request to your readers to share with others high points of their experiences with Senator Morse. I am asking that Oregonians write letters describing their interesting experiences with Senator Morse and send the letter to me. In return I will mail each contributor a copy of all the letters which I receive, edited in booklet form, as a keepsake or memento.

As a state political party chairman during 1966–68 and a Lane County Legislator for thirteen years I had many contacts with Wayne. My own recollections of things important, entertaining and characteristic of Wayne will be added to the booklet which those of your readers who mail me their own contributions will receive.

It would be wrong to limit the letters of recollection to those of political pros or to the political arena only. The booklet will be most fitting if it includes remembrances of human interest, or humorous events or of help sought and received. His love of horses, livestock and county and state fairs should also produce recollections worth sharing and preserving.

Please mail your letters of recollections of Wayne Morse to me at 801 East Park Street, Eugene, Oregon, 97401.

Sincerely,

EDWARD N. FADELEY,
State Senator.

Mr. HATFIELD. Also, Mr. President, I have been asked what the many friends of Senator Morse could do to honor his memory. I am pleased to pass on the fact that the University of Oregon has established a Wayne Morse Chair of Law and Public Affairs. Contributions to endow this chair are welcome, and can be sent to this chair, in care of the University of Oregon Development Fund, Carl Fisher, director, Box 3346, University of Oregon, Eugene, Oreg. 97403.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I contacted Oregon journalists and asked that they send me copies of any editorials or commentaries they addressed to the memory of Wayne Morse. I ask unanimous consent that this material appear at this point in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

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

[From The Corvallis (Oreg.) Gazette-Times, July 23, 1974]

DEATH RETIRES MORSE

Death came to Wayne Morse suddenly, in the middle of a hard-fought political campaign. It was timing he might have chosen for himself.

Like no other, Morse leaves his imprint on Oregon's political history. He brought the La Follette progressive heritage with him in 1929 from Wisconsin as a young law professor at the University of Oregon, bred in his bones and peculiarly attuned to Oregon voter sentiments.

Morse was a fighter, a scrapper, the maverick and "Tiger in the Senate." He was tough with a jugular instinct in politics. His own personal integrity was scrupulous.

His fiery oratory, his distinctive gravelly voice raised in a litany of uncompromising blacks and whites, served opposition best. But from the beginning it was a two-edged sword. Sharp disagreement with Interior Secretary Harold Ickes over a War Labor Board coal wage decision was instrumental in the rejection of Morse for a federal judgeship in 1943. By then, established as U of O law school dean, Morse switched tacks and ran for the Senate.

He broke with Republicans over President Eisenhower, spent a stretch in comparative limbo as an Independent and then moved across the aisle as a Democrat. Through it all, for nearly a quarter of a century, Oregon voters remained loyal; the dynamism of Morse's spell-binding speechmaking could not be resisted.

It was dissent, too, that cast Morse as hero for the youth of this area. His was one of the only two votes cast against the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution that plunged the U.S. disastrously into Vietnam. Later-day idols came along but Morse had a special niche, one of the exceedingly rare veteran politicians who turned-off youth turned to, trusted and revered.

After his defeat for re-election by Bob Packwood in 1968, it was they and other liberals who spurred his entry into the unsuccessful race against Sen. Mark Hatfield in 1972. He was back again this year, victor in the primary, pushing for another six years on

the Potomac. The bloody bruises he left along his comeback trail fractured the Democratic party but his base among a segment was solid.

Brilliant, courageous, vital. Committed to a government of laws and, particularly after his appointment by Eisenhower as United Nations delegate in 1960, to a world government of laws.

A man of bitter feuds and strong passions for the causes in which he believed, he cherished his independence. He prided himself on voting his convictions and many Oregonians took somewhat perverse satisfaction in his fireband tactics and forthright acknowledgement that he would vote as he thought best, not how he thought voters wanted him to. Yet few were better at servicing the multitude of constituent requests that arrive at a Senator's office. They constituted a reservoir of good will and political support.

The U.S. constitution was the Rosette Stone against which he weighed all actions. He ruled on constitutionality with the ferocity of a founding father. His verbosity was legendary, his speeches soaring to climax after climax, but even his record-breaking Senate filibusters were filled with substance. He had a vast accumulation of wide-ranging knowledge.

Although his monument must be built primarily of driving dissent rather than innovative programs of his own, in his final Senate years Morse became a leader in education legislation. He also was a tireless and highly effective negotiator in labor disputes.

Wayne Morse had as many foes as friends but all are saddened by the death of this complex, dedicated and controversial public servant.

[From the Cottage Grove (Oreg.) Sentinel, July 25, 1974]

THE TIGER

The death of former Senator Wayne Morse on Monday ended the career of one of the most dynamic and controversial politicians in Oregon's history.

Mr. Morse, who had been a member of the United States Senate for 24 years before Bob Packwood beat him in 1968, blazed a trail in the history books of tomorrow with his outspoken method of operation in what has been called the political jungle—Washington, D.C.

We were often critical of stands taken by Mr. Morse, but as with any individual, we would defend his right to speak his piece. We were concerned when he decided to make this one last try to return to the Senate which he dearly loved. Many people told us he was strong enough to make the long hard campaign, but when he visited us in May prior to the primary election we wondered if the arduous campaign was not beginning to take its toll.

Whether the campaigning really caused the former Senator's death, only the good Lord knows that. However, Mr. Morse went down fighting in the battlefield he knew best and that is the political arena. We suspect he would have wanted it that way.

Whether you were an admirer of him or not, Wayne Morse made and left his mark on Oregon. He fought hard for what he thought was good for his state and nation and that is what he was doing at the time of his death because he felt his services were needed again back in Washington. That is all that can be asked of any man—dedication to his work and the political arena had certainly been Wayne Morse's work area for many, many years.

[From the Eastern Oregon Review, July 25, 1974]

WAYNE MORSE: POLITICAL ARTIST

(By Gary Eisler)

There was the venerable gray head, arrayed among all those young political comers who hoped to impress Oregon's Publisher's Association. One newsman elbowed another and made a joking reference to the length of speech we could expect from him. But the tone of voice expressed nothing but respect for speaker Wayne Morse.

If I'd ever thought the man could be senile, the thought vanished as he answered questions. He first made a general sketch of what he would say. Then came broad, general brush strokes of background, colored by his experience. The composition could have fallen apart into unrelated, meaningless disharmony. But then Morse laid in the final details and the whole thing came together, came to life. Every level and layer of his answer was necessary for me to understand the picture he painted.

"Yes" or "No" satisfies the question but not the questioner. He began his answers quietly enough. The ideas came lightly, easily. He flowed through several historic precedents that he personally had lived through. But soon the tempo increased and the points were stronger as he assessed the moral issues. At last he reached the climax, in which the frightening implications of what he was saying rumbled like tympany drums, in which the challenge to us to respond and do our part clashed like cymbals, until the rightness and truth of the man and what he was saying glowed inside.

That wasn't the first time I'd experienced Morse. We sat side by side at a pre-primary luncheon here. A hopeful young contender for the Oregon Legislature like myself couldn't have had a better partner for the event. Morse listened to my ideas before I spoke, helped me develop them, encouraged me with them. After he finished speaking himself he threw the spotlight onto my positions, lent his grandeur and authority to me.

He answered the main question before anyone could ask it: "Am I too old for the job? No!" Morse showed us that his age group represented millions of people who deserved representation. He explained that age meant experience for him, the kind of experience America needs in the next six years. He told us he still had his connections in Washington and that he could sit in on any committee he wanted to and participate, so he wouldn't be a "freshman" senator. And finally, he proved that he had control of his faculties and that age limitations were arbitrary and meaningless. Before I knew it, he had convinced me that his age was the best thing he had going for him.

Wayne Morse, now dead. I'm thankful I got to know Wayne Morse, the political artist.

[From the Brownsville (Oreg.) Times, July 25, 1974]

A LIVING LEGEND . . .

Legends usually develop years—even decades or longer—"after the fact"; but "Oregon's Senator," Wayne Morse, was a "Living Legend" long before he passed away, Monday.

There were no "gray areas" for "The Senator" . . . something was either "right", or . . . "wrong". As has been said (and written) time and again since he "passed the border" Monday morning:

People either loved and/or unreservedly admired him; or . . . they literally, (with few exceptions) hated or detested him.

During the 4 decades we have been connected with the news scene, we have met no person who could come close to his brilliance, perceptiveness and eloquence (this latter, despite his gravelly voice).

It has been said—we believe truly—that there was no foe too formidable to daunt him; nor was there any person, community or cause too small not to merit his attention.

Many have charged, through the years, that "Morse deserted the Republican Party". But no one who closely followed the 1950 Oregon Primary election can deny that this was the start, on the part of the "Grand" Old Party to push him out.

As a measure of the man, we remember that it was Senator Morse who was responsible for getting the Holley Dam project back on the active list, after an effort had been made to quietly bury the project. When he left the senate in January, 1969, the project was "still active" . . . Has anyone heard anything about it recently?

While others were "playing to the big, adult gatherings, Senator Morse took time out, during his busy 1972 Primary campaign to visit Central Linn's 5th-Graders (from all 3 schools) at the Halsey school. He was talking to "future voters" who—he obviously knew—could never vote for him. He discussed such matters as water pollution . . . and stayed to answer questions posed by the youngsters, despite a jam-packed schedule.

It is significant that—though the "Tiger of the Senate" clawed virtually every President during the 24 years he was a U.S. Senator . . . these same men turned to him to solve the really knotty labor problems. He always responded . . . giving the problem full attention.

When this area needed some flood-control revetment and channel work, 10 or 12 years ago; and the Corps of Engineers was dragging its feet . . . "The Senator" came here and devoted a full day looking over the situation—action soon followed.

We could go on-and-on along this line of thought; but—with millions of words (so it seems, anyway) having already been eulogized in his memory—what more is there to say?

Yes, we could go-on, commiserating, too, about the integrity (a quality which is in short-supply, in public life today) and the attitude of Oregon's "Senator for All Time" with the challenge he hurled at us (and many others, undoubtedly) during his prime years:

"I will do what I believe to be right. If the people of Oregon do not agree with me, it is their duty to elect someone else to take my place. Even if I were certain that a given stand would result in my defeat in the next election . . . if I believe I am right, I would stick with it."

That was almost prophetic . . . because we heard such a statement from the lips of Senator Morse (the 1st time) before Vietnam was an issue.

Senator Morse's last speech in Central Linn—at the LinnCo Democratic Picnic in Pioneer Park just 2 years ago—also was virtually prophetic. ("Watergate" was not yet even a whisper.) His keynote address included the following (as quoted in the Aug. 3, 1972, edition of "The Times"):

"This is a critical, vital election . . . Nixon is the issue . . . We cannot have another 4 years (of Nixon) without losing 1 procedural right after another. We are losing constitutional checks-and-balances right down to the local level."

As reported by the "covering media" this spring . . .

Yes, the "Tiger of the Senate"—Oregon's All-time Senator—is gone; but his influence continues . . . effectively.

[From the Oregon Daily Emerald, July 23, 1974]

THE TIGER WOULD STILL BE ROARING

A man with strength, courage and an unchallenged sense of moral rightousness died Monday.

Wayne Morse was for years known as "the tiger" of the United States Senate. Some said it with affection, admiration and respect. Others said it only with respect. They all said it. As a former Democratic senator from Illinois said when Morse arrived in Washington, he "mounted his horse and rode off in all directions."

In the early 1950s Morse saw the dangers of a power-hungry executive branch of government. He saw the now-too-clear faults of

Richard Nixon while Nixon was still a member of the Senate and fought bitterly against Eisenhower's choice of him as a running mate. In 1952, disgusted with Eisenhower, Wayne Morse left the GOP. After a short time as an independent, Morse joined the Democratic party in 1955.

In the 1960s Wayne Morse vehemently opposed the Vietnam War, knowing fully that a conservative state such as Oregon might not look kindly upon his stand. He was one of two senators to vote against the 1964 Gulf of Tonkin Resolution. Because of this and other unpopular stands, in 1968 Wayne Morse lost his seat in the Senate.

But instead of modifying his position to appease those in power, instead of retiring to sulk over his defeat, instead of losing faith in the American form of government, Wayne Morse quickened his pace of writing and speaking. His message was clear—we've got a good system of government here, let's not throw it away to an over-zealous, powerseeking executive. Let's get Congress out of the corner and to the center of the ring, where it can do some good.

As the years passed, Oregonians began to see just how right Wayne Morse had been. The Vietnam War was a terrible and tragic mistake. The executive branch of government possessed dangerous power and was not acting in this country's best interests.

Last March Wayne Morse decided once again to do something about the plight of this country. He once again wanted to represent the people.

In his endorsement interview with us in May, Wayne Morse talked about the next six years as being critical to the future of this country. Either we put Congress back on its feet and have this nation's representatives running this nation, or we slip into a fascist-elitist form of government, he said.

Following his primary election victory, one of Wayne Morse's campaign workers said that all the long hours already put in and all the hours ahead would be worthwhile if only to see the looks on the faces of U.S. senators when the chamber's doors opened and "the tiger" came back to the Senate.

Wayne Morse isn't going back. And impeachment is still a big IF, and the economy isn't improving and our government is saturated with unrepresentative, owned and owing politicians.

But were Wayne Morse alive today, he'd be fighting to improve the problems of this country, not sitting in a corner stewing over them. He'd be taking an active role in government, not simply denouncing it and copping out. He'd be preaching optimism, not pessimism.

We should follow his lead.

[From the Oregon Labor Press, July 26, 1974]

WAYNE MORSE: SO OFTEN RIGHT, A MAN FOR AGES

"I had rather be right than be President," said Henry Clay, one of the historic giants of the U.S. Senate, in 1839.

Another giant of that great deliberative body, Wayne Lyman Morse, never became President either, although he aspired to it in 1960. But he had the satisfaction of knowing that he was so often right on the great issues of his time.

Now, Wayne Morse, sometimes referred to as "the conscience of the Senate," belongs to the ages—like Clay, Webster, LaFollette, Borah, Norris, Vandenberg and other lions of the United States Senate.

One of the issues on which his was a lonely, minority voice of rightness was his opposition to U.S. involvement in Vietnam. It sparked a divisiveness among Oregon Democrats that ultimately resulted in his narrow defeat in 1968. This year, the wounds healed, the party united, Morse at 73 was stumping for a comeback against the upstart who unseated him.

Death denied him that opportunity. It sounded its roll call for him on the morning of July 22 in a Portland hospital. A kidney, then his heart, failed. His hospitalization last week came as a shock. Only a few weeks ago, vibrant, vigorous, ramrod straight, he thundered denunciations against the scandalous excesses of the Nixon Administration as he told the state AFL–CIO convention that the nation needs a vetoproof Congress.

Morse had served in the Senate 24 years. He was first elected as a Republican in 1944. Disenchantment with the party of Eisenhower and Nixon in 1952 caused him to become an independent; in 1955 he became a Democrat.

His trademarks were his bushy eyebrows, raspy voice, integrity, irascibility, cantankerousness, a mind of dazzling brilliance, an enormous ego, a credo of "principle above politics," the boundless energy to filibuster for nearly 24 hours, rugged devotion to old-fashioned principles, and the guts to stand up and fight for his beliefs.

The title of a book about him summed it up: "The Tiger in the Senate."

Morse talked a lot—he could take 45 minutes to answer a 30-second question. But what he said made sense. Lesser minds often required the wisdom afforded by hindsight to recognize his rightness.

In his 24 years as a senator, organized labor's scorecard showed him with 81 "right" votes, only 5 "wrong" votes on issues of concern to wage-earners as union members, citizens, taxpayers, parents, consumers.

Some of the "wrong" votes evoked the wrath of unions, but when he came up for re-election in 1968, when he challenged Mark Hatfield in 1972, and this year, he received the unanimous endorsement of the state AFL–CIO conventions.

A national labor publication said of Morse in 1968: "If ever a senator belonged to the whole country it is Oregon's Wayne Morse, whose work for labor and education has nationwide impact."

Another national labor paper said of him: "Wayne Morse has truly proved himself a giant in the Senate. He is a man of the utmost integrity, both personal and political. He wears no man's yoke. He takes no man's orders. He follows his own conscience."

Although Morse was the most vocal opponent of President Lyndon Johnson's Vietnam policies, Johnson once said of him: "No senator has done more for the average citizen than has the senator from Oregon. He has fought the money-lenders. He has fought high interest rates. He has fought for the people in his state who produce and who earn their living by the sweat of their brows."

His legislative concerns and achievements were broadgauged. His imprint was stamped on legislation concerning civil rights, senior citizens, timber and water conservation, education, public health, veteran's benefits, crime prevention, pollution control, fair taxation, transportation, public works, foreign policy.

Morse became recognized as such an authority on constitutional law that President Johnson often called him "my constitutional lawyer."

The senator once referred to himself as a "lawyer, farmer and educator."

Born in Wisconsin Oct. 20, 1900, he was educated at Wisconsin, Minnesota and Columbia universities; became dean of the University of Oregon Law School at age 30, a job he held until elected to the Senate.

In the 1930s and '40s he carved out a reputation as a consummately skilled, effective arbitrator of labor-management disputes. President Franklin D. Roosevelt appointed him chairman of the President's Railway Emergency Board in 1941, later named him to the National War Labor Board. While in the Senate, Presidents called on his talents to settle major labor-management disputes.

One of the early pieces of legislation sponsored by Morse led to creation of the Federal Mediation Service to provide professional mediation, when needed, at the bargaining table.

He was a firm believer in collective bargaining.

"American living standards are the highest in the world largely because working people have gained a fairer share of the wealth their work creates. Collective bargaining is the way that was accomplished."

Morse was as much an Oregon landmark as Mt. Hood. He had greatness, majesty, was awe-inspiring. Now, Mt. Hood remains, but Senator Wayne Morse is gone.

[From KXL Radio, July 23, 1974]

NOTES AND COMMENTS

(By John Salisbury)

Wayne Morse was two men. He was the often irascible Tiger of the Senate—a rough and ready campaigner who could be depended upon to slice his opposition to bits. He was a maverick who could begin his political career as a Republican, switch to Independent and finally to Democrat and continue to win elections because he convinced people he was his own man. He was a man who received plenty of the brickbats of his chosen profession, but he was a man who could dish them out in kind.

Wayne Morse was a fighter—and if some people were not really sure where he stood, Morse himself had no doubt. He stood for what he believed in—and while he may have believed in changing his mind and his party affiliation, he always called the shots as he currently saw them. He was a brilliant constitutional lawyer and teacher, and this was his field of battle in the Senate. That was one man. The other was a gentle man—and a gentleman. And those who knew Wayne Morse well—who were his friends—knew that very human side of him, too.

Sometimes his friends and co-workers were highly critical of him. In recent years, some called him a spoiler because he campaigned where his party felt younger men should be given the chance. But they loved and respected him for his statesmanship, too. Perhaps never in his career was Wayne Morse more revered or more effective among his young and old partisans as at the last Democratic National Convention to which he was a delegate. He was particularly gentle and self-effacing, yet when called upon to give counsel he gave it readily and warmly.

None of the old tiger was about him at that time, and I got to know him then about as well as I ever did. And I enjoyed him more than I ever had. He was really a hero to the Oregon delegation and there were those who said, not unkindly, that the old tiger's claws had been clipped—by the tiger himself. But not quite. He was challenging a man whose candidacy he had once supported—Sen. Mark Hatfield. He lost that one in '72, and returned home as people speculated about other campaigns Morse might yet elect to enter. There was to be one more—the last campaign against the man who had defeated him in 1968, Sen. Bob Packwood. The Tiger's claws were by no means clipped.

At 73 years of age, the seemingly ageless Morse was fighting to regain the seat Packwood had taken from him and there were those who cried, perhaps with reason, vendetta. Was it really vendetta—or was it a deep concern for the nation living in the shadow of Watergate—or was it a love affair with the Senate itself which prompted the Tiger into his last battle? Perhaps those closest to him could answer that question. As for me, my recollections of Wayne Morse are pleasant ones. I did not agree with his viewpoint, but I liked and respected him.

Morse of Oregon—a man unique in politics, a fierce yet gentle man. Ruthless yet compassionate—honest, forthright, decent. And a prophet not without honor—even in Ore-

gon. He is a quarter century of our most turbulent history.

[From the Rainier Review, Aug. 1, 1974]

REVIEW AND COMMENT

(By Albert R. McCall)

It was with a feeling of personal sadness and not merely one of public loss that we heard of the death of Oregon Senator Wayne Morse.

Mr. Morse was an individual of scintillating intellect. As a college instructor, as an attorney, and as a member of the august United States Senate he ranked as exceptional.

Senator Morse was respected and admired as well for his espousal of causes in which he believed. He was a lover of peace, and opposed the Vietnam war when it was not popular to do so.

But this columnist, still recalling the noted characteristics of Senator Morse, likes to think most of his kindness and courtesy to a then younger reporter-newspaperman. And that gentility and kindness to the end, we hear, marked his reception of visitors are the senatorial offices in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Morse, the aggressive politician, the sometimes hardnosed statesman—but always the kind and courteous gentleman underneath. That is how we remember him with appreciation along with our sadness.

[From the Roseburg (Oreg.) News-Review, July 26, 1974]

THE ROAR IS STILLED

(By Dick Kerruish)

During the 24 years that Wayne Morse served as a U.S. senator, it was sometimes difficult to find Oregonians who admitted to agreeing with or supporting him.

Yet Morse, who died Monday at age 73, kept getting re-elected.

It was part of the Morse mystique. He proved in the Democratic Primary Election that some of that mystique still remained when he defeated the much younger State Sen. Jason Boe, Reedsport, in a comeback attempt. He could not step down from political life, even after two consecutive defeats by incumbent senators Mark Hatfield and Bob Packwood. It was not his nature to quit.

The "Tiger of the Senate" will go down as one of the most controversial figures in Oregon's political history. A party switcher (he served in the Senate alternately as a Republican, an Independent and finally as a Democrat), he was either hated or loved. In many ways, he suited the role of senator perfectly. He looked like one; he possessed great oratorical eloquence; he was a tough, articulate compaigner. But few men during their political lifetimes have experienced the extremes of criticism and praise that were heaped on Morse.

Despite his famed cantankerousness, Oregon voters returned him to the Senate four times.

It's probably right to state that Morse gave his life in a determination to win back a Senate seat and return to the national limelight, which he loved. In truth, Morse envisioned himself as more of a national personality. Many criticized his concept of the Senate office. He seemed forever preoccupied with the big hassle—cutting down presidents, opposing the Vietnam War, going against the mainstream—while political observers question whether he ever did much of note for Oregon.

His critics will concede, however, that he never lacked the courage to declare his position on issues despite determined opposition. And he refused to budge from that position, even in the face of hopeless opposition.

But even while his accomplishments are questioned, he never-the-less demonstrated genuine, deep concern for individual Oregonians who sought his help while he was in office. Few members of Congress have been more diligent in providing aid for or communication with constituents. Requests to his office for information or assistance received immediate attention and if there were any way at all to remedy a constituent's problem, the senator would do it—or try to.

A maverick, yes. But there was something unique and spellbinding about this irascible politico. With all his contentiousness, he won the admiration of Oregonians. Perhaps he appealed to the basic stubborn independence that has traditionally characterized the people of the state of Oregon.

Say what you will about the Tiger—his roar will be missed.

[From the Daily Astorian, Astoria, Oreg., July 24, 1974]

WAYNE LYMAN MORSE

He said, "We're going to win this. We'll see you in the fall. We'll have a lot to talk about then."

Wayne Morse was on the campaign trail. There was fire in his eye. He was enjoying every minute of it.

He expected to beat Jason Boe in the Democratic primary. He did and by a much wider margin that anyone but he expected. The experts who said that Oregonians wouldn't send a 73-year old man back to the United States Senate were having second thoughts.

He is gone now and we'll never know how this race against Bob Packwood in the general election would have gone, how it would have turned out. But we can be sure that this most unusual man would have put on a campaign to remember.

He had been in the Senate 24 years when young Bob Packwood beat him six years ago. He said the voters would regret what they'd done. He said they would be asking for the opportunity to say that they were sorry, that they'd been mistaken. He must have decided almost immediately after that humiliating loss to Packwood that the voters would be given that opportunity.

He was back on the campaign trail in 1972 against the advice of his closest friends. They told him that he couldn't beat Mark Hatfield. He disregarded that advice. He brushed aside the evidence that many Democrats had not forgotten nor forgiven him for supporting Hatfield six years earlier against Bob Duncan and that they had been waiting to get even.

He couldn't be expected to believe that. The voters had forgiven him over and over again for errors and indiscretions that another politician could not have survived.

He was the Republican Party's candidate in his first election to the Senate. He turned against the party and its presidential candidate, Dwight Eisenhower, in 1952, after coming out of a national convention in which he put all his energy into getting the nomination for Eisenhower in a bitter battle against Bob Taft.

Some insiders said he deserted because the Republicans chose Dick Nixon as their vice presidential candidate, a nomination he had been encouraged to think he could have. Whether or not it was solely that or more than that, Wayne Morse heaped abuse on Dwight Eisenhower throughout that campaign.

Soon after that he registered as an Independent. It became obvious that wouldn't last. Two young Democrats, Howard Morgan and Monroe Sweetland, wooed and won him for their party. Many Republicans said that's where he should have been all along. He did seem to feel more at home with the Democrats. But it wasn't long before he was disagreeing and fighting with them. He turned on his colleague, Dick Neuberger. That separation was deep and bitter to the day of Neuberger's death.

He heaped abuse and ridicule upon Democrats as readily as upon Republicans. He was harshly critical of Harry Truman who had frequently spoken of his admiration for the senator from Oregon.

He was intolerant of anyone who disagreed with him, of anyone who was critical of his position on a public issue. He impugned their motives. Friendships with editors who strayed from consistently praising and admiring him were destroyed by his allegations that they had sold out to special interests. In his view he was the only authentic liberal in the Senate. Others who were generally thought to be liberals he described as phonies.

During his years in the Senate he attacked almost all of his colleagues. There was a notable exception. He never spoke critically of Sen. George Aiken. Perhaps the esteem others had for the senator from Vermont was too formidable to confront. But that was a rare exception. He stuck the knife into scores who could not subscribe to the proposition that Wayne Morse always was right.

In view of all of this, how did he manage to stay in the Senate for 24 years? There isn't a short, simple answer to that. It was a combination of several things. He was a masterful orator. An editor who had fallen out with him said that he wouldn't go to hear him speak "because he'll make me believe that white is black." He had an able staff led by the very able Bill Berg who meticulously handled his homework. No request from a constituent was too inconsequential or ridiculous to go unanswered. Many voters considered his courage his greatest asset. He used that to the fullest advantage, and he had the facts to back it up. His compassion for senior citizens was genuine. Organized labor would go to hell for him. Labor leaders rounded up votes for him and generously financed his campaigns.

There was all of that going for him and until Bob Packwood came along six years ago it was more than enough. But a lot of it held on after that and there was enough of it to win the Democratic senatorial nomination for him in May of this year against odds that seemed to many insurmountable. To many, sending a 73-year old man to the Senate for what he said would be only one term seemed absurd. But to many others it seemed a golden opportunity to send to Washington a man who would really shake up those no-good so and sos. One said, "Can't you see their faces when he walks in! Boy, I'd give a lot to see that!"

We will never know whether enough voters would have seen it that way to send Wayne Morse back to Washington. But we wouldn't have wagered that they would not, for this man was not an ordinary politician. Not in any way. Oregon has never had another politician like him and it is improbable that Oregon ever will. He broke all the written and unwritten rules and not only got away with it, but was praised by many for doing it.

Was he a great senator? He never was chairman of a major committee. His name was not on any important legislation as its author. But his courageous defense of unpopular thoughts and causes led people far from Oregon to say that he was "everybody's senator." Historians will prepare the balance sheet. They will not miss the point that we and many others were sure that we hadn't and never would see another person quite like him.

[From the Coos Bay (Oreg.) World, July 22, 1974]

THE "TIGER" IS DEAD

Wayne Morse is dead today, but his mark remains indelibly printed on the pages of U.S. history.

He was called the "tiger of the U.S. Senate," where he served from the state of Oregon for 24 years. The "tiger" was a mixture of idealist and pragmatist; he raised his

voice where no others would and that voice is still ringing in the ears of many Americans. Morse was a firm believer in the constitutional process of government and spoke out strongly against what he deemed an illegal and unconstitutional war in Vietnam. More recently, he was adamant over what he termed a "most serious threat to the perpetuation of our system of constitutional self-government by the people of the United States." In this he referred to "the trend toward more and more government by executive supremacy and secrecy."

He never minced his words. For all his expertise, for all his dealings with some of the greatest political leaders of our times, Morse was what could be called a "straight shooter."

He was a liberal, without any threads attached. When he first ran for the Senate he advocated the 18-year-old vote, and urged other election reforms over the years.

Morse was opposed to excessive military spending at the expense of domestic programs, most importantly perhaps in his eyes the educational programs of the nation. He supported limited presence of American soldiers on foreign soil. He also supported abolishing the draft "in peacetime or in undeclared wars."

His positions and his actions were many, too much so for this space today.

But they are, as is the man, well known to millions of Americans, not just Oregonians. Morse will be remembered as one of the last men in history, perhaps, who at the age of 73 was still an energetic idealist with a strong belief in his country and its laws.

[From the Bend (Oreg.) Bulletin, July 22, 1974]

WAYNE L. MORSE, 1900–1974

Wayne Morse died this morning, victim of an infection which put him in the hospital only a few days ago. He was approaching his 74th birthday, but only a few days ago was the envy of many in his age group. He appeared ageless as he hit the comeback trail a few months ago.

He was not, of course. Time had slowed him down. His keen mind lapsed into occasional forgetfulness. He no longer looked fresh after a few hours of sleep following an 18-hour campaign day.

Morse's death ends a part of Oregon political history, a part which lasted more than 40 years. He didn't serve in office that long; he was engaged in partisan and education politics that long.

Morse was one of the state's best-known figures during that period. Few Oregonians didn't have a strong opinion about him. He was revered by some and reviled by others. Oregonians became Morse admirers or Morse haters.

He served four terms in the U.S. Senate before he lost out six years ago in an attempt to win a fifth term. By Senatorial standards they were generally unproductive terms. Morse's name is not attached to much legislation, and to no major policies. His most enduring memory was a change in the formula by which federal lands were sold to local units of government.

But that didn't stop him from becoming one of the most widely-known members of the Senate. Morse had been a teacher of debating and argument. He knew the English language extremely well. He had a gift for polished invective.

He used all those gifts, and used them well. He often used them on fellow members of the Senate, and on every President of the United States from Franklin D. Roosevelt to Richard M. Nixon. His tactics did not endear him to either Senators or Presidents.

But those same gifts made him a darling to the American Zionist movement, which repaid his efforts in the movement's behalf by large campaign contributions. They made him a darling to the liberal movement, always delighted with a speaker who would attack anyone.

The old tiger had slowed down in recent years. He was on the campaign road once more, almost like the days of old, when he was struck down. But it was not altogether like days of old. The campaign was largely the same, but Morse was older. He moved more slowly. His voice was not as strong. His memory played tricks on him. He told one group recently he was delighted to be, once again, seeking to be the "Senator from Wisconsin" (his birthplace).

Now he's gone. His detractors are not sorry to see him go. His admirers will miss him. And for many of us, some of the flavor is gone from Oregon politics. Morse's campaigns, and those of his opponents, were not always high level. But they were always interesting.

[From the Vancouver (Wash.) Columbian, July 23, 1974]

THE TOUGHEST TIGER

One of the tragedies of politics is that a candidate who has once found favor with the voters has a tough time accepting defeat. Wayne Morse had about three times as much of that never-give-up spirit as the average politician.

So it was not without significance, and some pathos, that the former Oregon senator died Monday while trying to regain his old seat in Congress. Even though narrowly defeated for reelection by Robert Packwood in 1968 and easily beaten in 1972 when he tried to take Sen. Mark Hatfield's seat, he tried to come back again this year. He won the Democratic primary this year against a state senator whose name was not well known. Packwood supporters were reported to have regarded Morse as an easier candidate to beat than a new face. That new face now will be selected by the Oregon Democratic state central committee.

This year's Senate race was completely within character for Wayne Morse. He seemed not to care what others thought of him or his actions. He could defy a political party, as he did when he left the Republicans in 1952. He could ignore the Senate seniority system, as he did as an independent for four years. He could stand alone against the Senate, as he and Sen. Ernest Gruening, D-Alas., did in voting against the Tonkin Gulf resolution in 1964.

At home, year after year, he could withstand what seemed to be overwhelming criticism from editorial writers, politicians and voters. When election time came every six years he proved that he could get the voters needed to go back to Washington. Oregonians who cussed him between elections took pride in being represented by a maverick.

For most politicians success does not last forever. Morse had his first taste of vincibility when his self-projected candidacy for president went nowhere in 1960. Eight years later Packwood, who had entered the campaign as a little known state legislator, took his Senate seat.

In the same spirit in which he had come back to win other second engagements, or at least to prove himself right, as in the case of the Tonkin Gulf resolution, Morse refused to accept that defeat. But, for even the toughest tiger, time passes, the issues and the mood of the voters change, and defeat comes.

Yet neither defeat nor death can detract from the reputation Morse built as one of this century's great champions of law, due process and civil rights.

[From the Hermiston (Oreg.) Herald, July 25, 1974]

WAYNE MORSE

You can tell a lot about a man's character and intelligence by his style—the unique language he creates for himself—the preciseness of his language and the authenticity of his manner of speaking. Is he an accomplished actor, or a genuine human being putting forth his true thoughts and feelings?

When I remember Wayne Morse, I'll remember specific things he said about specific problems and his absolute willingness to always say exactly what he thought on any subject no matter what the political consequences might be.

Wayne Morse thought and spoke with great clarity about all of the problems facing our nation and our world. If he lost on principal at times it was never because he was misunderstood.

Many of Morse's critics were critical of Morse for not bringing home the bacon for Oregon. They were partially correct.

Wayne Morse wasn't a provincial politician. He saw himself as a citizen of the world and he did what he could to steer America toward a constructive role in world affairs. It was therefore not surprising that he was a leading authority on international affairs—especially Latin American affairs, and international law.

But it was the uncompromising integrity we will always love most about Wayne Morse. No man ever accused him of taking an illegal nickel under the table at any point during his career.

I remember some of his remarks about honesty when he spoke to a small group of students at my college in 1964. Morse said he could, if he chose, take his wife along on congressional junkets overseas and pointed out that many congressmen do this. However, the senator said whenever he traveled overseas he always paid Mrs. Morse's air fare himself rather than charging it to the government. Like everything he did—it was a matter of principle with Wayne Morse.

[From the Siuslaw (Oreg.) News, July 25, 1974]

WAYNE MORSE

Last Monday morning a great statesman and a close personal friend of this area died leaving his indelible mark on the central Oregon coast.

Wayne Morse was the "Tiger of the U.S. Senate", and at the same time he was the "Champion of the People" at the grass-roots level. Probably no clearer picture can be drawn than the one he painted in this area in fighting for our rights and freedoms during what is known locally as the "National Park Fight." His monumental insight clearly saw the problem besetting this area, and it was his astuteness and understanding of the "people at home" that brought their wishes to prevail.

Wayne Morse was truly a great man and a true politician in the finest and highest sense of the word. His moral character and fiber will live forever in the history of Oregon, and he shall be fondly and nobly remembered by all of us here on the central Oregon coast who had the privilege and opportunity to know him.

[From the Portland (Oreg.) Observer, July 25, 1974]

MORSE LEAVES LEGACY

Wayne Morse, the fighting Senator from Oregon, is dead, but his legacy will live as long as the nation survives.

Great men will honor him; even his detractors will praise his courage and his spirit. But it is we—the Black, the poor, the children, the aged—who have benefited most from this man's long and brilliant career and it is we who will cherish his memory.

Our Senator was a leader in the field of Civil Rights, and although he was the Senator from Oregon, a state with few Black voters, the achievement of equal opportunity for every individual was one of his major concerns. He began writing and introducing anti-discrimination legislation soon after his arrival in the Senate, and was an author and co-sponsor of the 1964 Civil Rights Act. This

was done out of principle, not political expediency, for the Black cause was not a popular cause in those days.

Senator Morse was assigned to the unpopular Washington, D.C. Committee when he left the Republican Party, but he remained on the committee throughout the remainder of his years in the Senate, working for self-government for this majority-Black city. In 1968, Clarence Mitchell, director of the NAACP Washington Bureau, said "The Black people of Washington, D.C. pray that the people of Oregon will return 'our' Senator to the Senate."

Wayne Morse was a sponsor of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964—the War on Poverty—which brought Headstart, the Foster Grandparents Program, manpower training, and many other essential programs to the poor of the nation. In 1958, he became the first man in the United States to introduce a medicare bill. He served on the special subcommittee that produced the Older Americans Act of 1965.

Wayne Morse's leadership produced dramatic changes in the field of education legislation. Morse became chairman of the Senate Education Subcommittee in 1961 and under his leadership the United States Senate passed more education legislation, in quantity and quality, than in the entire history of the nation. After years of indecision, the United States Congress finally endorsed the theory that the federal government has a moral obligation to the education of America's children.

The major education legislation passed under Senator Morse's guidance includes the important Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which provides special funds for the education of children of low-income families. Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Abraham Ribicoff said in 1965, *"When the name Morse appears on an education bill, the present generation of children and children yet unborn will be assured that the bill stands for the one man who, in my opinion more than any other single individual in the history of the nation, has helped further the cause of education in the United States."*

Senator Morse was widely acknowledged as a foreign policy statesman and his early and lonely opposition to the Vietnam war was praised throughout the world. His position as a labor law expert was unchallenged. His reputation was established as a constitutional expert, as a conservationist, as one of the Senate's leading liberals, and as a source of strength and inspiration in the passage of social legislation. His courage and willingness to fight long and hard, and often alone, and to oppose evil wherever he found it is well known.

But the Senator from Oregon will also be remembered for his concern for the individual. No problem was too small and no person too insignificant for his personal attention. Amid his speeches on the floor of the Senate, his masterful debates, his hours of research and study, Wayne Morse made time to attend to the personal problems of his constituents. The late Social Security checks, the denied welfare grants, the cases of discrimination on the docks and in the Post Office of Portland, were to him of major importance.

The world will long remember this great Senator, who was never afraid to stand alone on a matter of principle; who spent his career in the pursuit of individual liberty. He could have taken an easier path and avoided the wrath and the scorn of those who opposed him, but he lived his motto, "Principles Above Politics". His life will remain an inspiration and a challenge to those who also would serve.

[From the Medford (Oreg.) Mail Tribune, July 23, 1974]

THE TIGER LEAVES THE JUNGLE

The Tiger in the Senate, Wayne Lyman Morse, 73, an Oregon legend and a political mover and shaker, died as his last battle was just getting under way.

Morse had many bitter enemies and many devoted friends, and probably even more who loved him and detested him at the same time. Such a paradox is one of the measures of the man.

His superlative qualities were legion. He had a steeltrap mind, independence so strong that sometimes it seemed to be independence for its own sake, and a deep respect for the U.S. Constitution and its guarantees of liberty. He was absolutely fearless.

His less attractive qualities likewise were legion. He was a poor loser and a bad enemy, with a streak of petty vindictiveness that ill-became a man of his stature. The list of former friends who considered they had been stabbed in the back by Wayne Morse was a long one. He was verbose; one word would not suffice when a few thousand would do. Consistency—except a devotion to what Wayne Morse wanted and believed—was not one of his virtues.

And then there were the mixtures, paradoxical again. He could be compassionate and kind, or he could be viciously cruel (as when in 1958 he virtually elected Mark Hatfield to the Governorship by bringing up a youthful traffic mishap of Hatfield's that everyone else had forgotten, thus creating a revulsion that redounded to the discredit of Hatfield's hapless opponent, Bob Holmes).

He made his mark in the Senate by attention to great national concerns, but at the same time he was one of the most devoted, and effective, members of the Oregon delegation in getting things done for Oregon.

He quarreled with all the Presidents in office during his long service in the Senate, yet often was among their stoutest allies in the passage of crucial legislation in his areas of specialty. But none of those Presidents—Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson—escaped the scarifying lash of his tongue.

He was one of the most successful labor arbitrators of his time, but was never able to bring his conciliatory genius to bear in the legislative jungle of the Senate. He was too abrasive, too prickly-proud, to form lasting political alliances, as his Republican, Independent and Democratic affiliations indicated.

Whatever one thought of Wayne Morse, one could not ignore him. He was always there, a monumental fact of Oregon political life, a force majeure to be reckoned with, even after he had been defeated and left the Senate in which he served for nearly a quarter of a century.

Love him or hate him—or, as with the undersigned, a curious mixture of both—he will be missed, and his like will not soon again be seen in Oregon, or in the U.S. Senate where the Tiger once stalked.—E.A.

[From the Salem (Oreg.) Times, July 25, 1974]

SALEM TIMES EDITORIAL

Wayne Morse was a unique person, a one-of-a-kind. First, he was an honest man, rare indeed in politics these days. Second, he led rather than followed, also unusual for those in public office.

Morse always spoke his mind and he didn't mince words. On occasion some of the citizenry did not seem ready to hear what he had to say. He was an object of scorn when he first opposed the Vietnam War. Years later most Americans came to the conclusion Morse had been right on the war issue all along and they listened as he attacked the insensitivity of big government and warned of the menace of the military-industrial complex. In most of his speeches in recent months, Morse argued American leaders were ignoring our Constitutional guarantees and that our nation was in danger of becoming a police state. His arguments, as usual, are convincing.

Oregon, the nation and the world will miss Wayne Morse, who never wavered where principle was concerned. One hopes a new leader with his concerns and similar integrity emerges in this country, but the wait may be long, very long.

[From The Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, July 23, 1974]

END OF THE TIGER'S CAMPAIGN TRAIL

It was altogether appropriate that Wayne Morse should die in the middle of a campaign—with his boots on. The tough old Tiger never gave up, determined to vindicate himself and return to the Senate seat he lost by a whisker in 1968.

Now there was a man, this Morse. Oregon had never seen the likes of him before and may never again. No other political figure so dominated a generation—not McNary, not anybody. From the time he was first approached to run for Congress until the day he died, he exerted such an influence on Oregon politics that no question could be resolved without taking Morse into account.

He was many men. He was brilliant and eloquent. He was sometimes irascible. He was vain and completely sure of himself. But his principal stamp was his fierce independence. He wore no man's collar—not even the voters'. One of his favorite quotations was from Edmund Burke's 1774 speech to the Electors of Bristol:

"Your representative owes you not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays instead of serving you if he sacrifices it to your opinion."

"If you want to send a senator to Washington," he used to tell his audience, "send Morse of Oregon. If you want to send a Western Union boy to do your bidding, then find a Western Union boy and send him. Don't send Morse."

This independence got him into all sorts of trouble—not that he minded. He was one of those figures who commanded a fierce loyalty or a fierce dislike. Few could be neutral about him. He demanded absolute loyalty from his subordinates and from his friends. If he didn't get it, they became former subordinates or friends. He expected them to turn as he turned and at exactly the time he turned. He wanted his monument to be in foreign policy and that may be. But it is just as likely that he will be remembered more favorably for his role in labor and education. He was unquestionably a statesman, serving the whole nation. Yet, he never forgot that he came from Oregon. If a constituent wrote the senator about a problem, he got an answer fast, usually by return mail.

He had two things going for him. First, he was twice as smart as most of the people around him. His memory was almost beyond belief. He could reach back 30 years and remember exactly what he said to Taft or what Vandenberg said to him. The other advantage he had over most mortals is that he worked twice as hard as they did, and thrived on it. At an age when most men would have retired on a generous pension, he preferred the battle. His campaign schedule last spring looked like a man-killer and maybe it was, literally.

Republicans expressed a distaste for him because he "quit" their party. They did not concede that they really kicked him out in a series of insults and slurs against the only Republican senator who was welcome in a union hall to campaign for Dewey and Warren in 1948. He was a loyal Republican for as long as he could stand it and for as long as the Republicans could stand him.

Although he was a formidable figure in the U.S. Senate, in the United Nations or on the campaign trail, he could also be a delightfully warm human being. Sitting under a tree on his College Crest farm, he was everybody's good neighbor. Talking about his cattle or his horses, he was a different man,

a man in love with nature. He knew how to relax and could be an easy companion.

They called him the "Tiger of the Senate," and a tiger he was—smart, strong, skillful, determined, bent upon survival and command, fearless and his own boss. Oregon and the nation are not likely to see his kind for a long time. Maybe never.

[From the Klamath Falls (Oreg.) Herald and News, July 24, 1974]

WAYNE MORSE: HE CALLED HIS OWN SHOTS

Wayne Morse was always his own man. He could be overbearing, and frequently was. He lectured presidents just as he lectured his students when he was at the University of Oregon law school.

He started as a Republican, turned Independent (a change which probably characterized his attitude and philosophy best) and then became a Democrat. Even when a member of the two regular parties in the Senate, however, he didn't automatically hew to the party line.

His most memorable battle with the establishment of his party—and just one of many—was his refusal to support the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution in 1964 which led to the deep involvement of the United States in Vietnam. He was joined in that refusal by the late Ernest Gruening, then Senator from Alaska. Morse continued his vehement criticism of the United State's Southeast Asia policy and was joined by a continually growing number of disenchanted congressmen.

His nickname, "Tiger of the Senate," followed naturally. His commitment to a course of action was total. He rarely wavered. It's ironic that Morse also won fame as a skillful arbitrator of labor problems, because compromise wasn't the Morse style in the Senate.

After 24 years in the Senate, Morse lost to Bob Packwood in the general election after Morse's narrow win over Bob Duncan in the Democratic primary gave clear indication Morse was in serious trouble at home.

Morse, an old warhorse who had gone to many battles in Congress and didn't hesitate long to attack a colleague or a president if he felt they warranted it, tried to regain a senate seat in 1972 when he ran against Sen. Mark Hatfield. He lost it and it appeared that, at 72, his long and often controversial political career was over.

Morse, however, thought otherwise. He surprised many by filing for the Democratic nomination for the Senate. Not the least of the surprised was Jason Boe, president of the State Senate, who had been the early favorite for the nomination. Morse beat Boe, setting up a return match with Packwood this November.

The "Tiger" was a person about whom there were few uncommitted people. His personality, forcefulness and sometimes haughty manner usually forced people immediately into a pro- or anti-Morse stance. There was little middle ground.

Morse was never reluctant to borrow from his Congressional experience in his campaigns. The first names of high government officials were liberally sprinkled in his interviews.

"And I told Lyndon . . ." he would say in his characteristic rasp, softly pounding his fist on a handy desk. One question was usually sufficient to get Morse going for the length of an interview as he poured out a torrent of legislative history along with legal and Constitutional background on an issue. If the questioner wanted to ask a second question, he usually had to bluntly cut into Morse's discourse on the first. Morse understood. He was enough of a politician to do that.

Morse lived by a set of high ideals and his abrasive pursuant of those made enemies. Morse earned some of that enmity, but it's unlikely it bothered him much.

We were not among Morse's fans, and we're not going to lavish praise on him now.

Regardless of what we thought of his personality and our appraisal of what he accomplished for Oregon during his tenure, however, we have to say this: Wayne Morse charted his own course. He left his mark on Oregon. Very few will be able to say the same when their time comes.

[From the Review, July 24, 1974]

THE PASSING OF GREATNESS

There was a certain something about the man Wayne Morse. He commanded your attention when he spoke because there was so much of America's history behind his words.

The man who had been on Capitol Hill representing his Oregon people for so long was as much a part of that history as any great statesman. Maybe more. We are sorry he was unable to achieve his last goal—to regain his seat in the Senate against the odds of age and infirmity.

He spoke of the Kennedys, Johnson, Nixon and Eisenhower as if they were old acquaintances and told you in no uncertain terms what he thought about them all. His early place in the legislative battle against a war that eventually became unpopular is historic and indicative of the outspoken manner with which he dealt with any subject. He struck you as a tough customer to take on in any political debate and yet could approach a citizen off the street with an easy manner that let you know he was working for you.

Morse was not too great to stop in here to tell us what he was thinking in his try for a Senate seat and yet was great enough to have been a driving force behind stopping a multi-billion dollar war. The paradox is as unusual as he was.

There is no uncertainty about it. Oregon and the nation lost a great man when it lost Wayne Morse.

[From the Albany (Oreg.) Democrat-Herald, July 23, 1974]

INTELLECT RULED POLITICS FOR SENATOR WAYNE L. MORSE

It is hard to analyze what Wayne L. Morse might have meant to the three generations of Oregonians and Americans his public life touched at one time or another.

Hence it is difficult to say what his death on Monday takes away from all of us. It wasn't exactly the future because, at age 73. Wayne Morse's futures were used up, for the most part. Perhaps used well, but used up, nevertheless.

Nor was it the past, exactly. For, despite the occasional sneering remark that could be heard where Wayne Morse went campaigning on his last two attempts to gain public office—in 1972 and this year—he did not live in the past any more than any man of his age and accomplishment.

There will be several thousand words written this week by people trying to sort out all that Wayne Morse meant to everybody else. They will be piled atop the thousands of words already written—examining that same question in different circumstances—and will replace the words that were written, then wadded up and thrown out, which is how editorialists and critics hide their most obvious mistakes.

It is not that Wayne Morse, academician and senator, was the kind of dominant figure who makes eulogies and such pale in comparison to a recitation of his accomplishments. It is just that Morse has been a fact of life in Oregon for so long that nobody was really sure he would be anything other than that. So the words that he will get this week are likely to be either too shrill in justification or too maudlin in remembrance.

His vitriolic attacks on many of the public figures of our time will be part of the Morse legend that will be related this week. He once called Lyndon B. Johnson power mad. He once, in 1966, supported Republican Mark Hatfield over fellow Democrat Robert Duncan in the senatorial race. He fought with Clare Booth Luce, who responded with an indelicate remark about the time Morse was kicked in the head by a horse.

He switched parties, from Republican to Independent to Democrat. And he was never very loyal to any of them. "Good" Republicans pulled their hair out when Morse quit that party. (They said much later that they were never so glad to lose anybody.) Democrats pulled their hair when he jumped the traces against Duncan, then pulled some more when Morse kept right on running—and winning the Democratic primaries—after his 1968 defeat by Republican Sen. Robert Packwood.

It is likely that aspiring Oregon politicians of the future will invoke the name of Wayne Morse with the same reverence now reserved by Democrats for Franklin D. Roosevelt and by Republicans for Dwight D. Eisenhower. And they can be pretty much assured, that if Morse were their opponent, he would be having none of it. He would prefer instead to latch into the intellectual laziness that is so much a part of present-day politics and demand to know where and why they stood on the issues that Wayne Morse thought were important.

For all of his anger, independence, and stubbornness, Morse was a man ruled by his intellect. His attacks weren't against a faceless bureaucracy or an ephemeral "them," but against a president who lied, or a presidency that was, in a demonstrable pattern, exceeding the bounds of the Constitution—no matter what was said by the old "new dealers" of the Johnson administration or the "new federalists" of the Nixon administration. If he was wrong, he came by his errors honestly. If he was right, he was often right long before anybody else realized it.

[From The Oregonian, July 23, 1974]

WAYNE L. MORSE

The death of Wayne Lyman Morse at the age of 73 ended a tempestuous political career of a brilliant, eloquent practitioner of dissent. The former Oregon Law School dean who served in the United States Senate for 24 years seemed to be more often in the minority than not. His skill in debate, his filibusters, his party jumping and the sharpness of his accusatory tongue made his name known nationally and worldwide. His friends were loyal. His enemies were legion.

Sen. Morse created for himself a unique role in politics and government as a spokesman for Oregon, a state with a tradition of populist uprisings and independence of voters and politicians. Morse outdid other Oregon mavericks and managed in his Senate terms to impale Democratic and Republican presidents impartially. At various times he denounced Harry Truman, Dwight Eisenhower, Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon. However, he greatly admired Franklin D. Roosevelt under whom he served on the War Labor Board during World War II.

Sen. Morse, a liberal who defeated conservative Sen. Rufus Holman in the 1944 Republican primary with the help of many prominent Republicans who opposed Holman's record of isolationism and general futility, was an early supporter of Dwight Eisenhower for the Republican presidential nomination in 1952. But immediately after Eisenhower's nomination at the Chicago convention, Morse began attacking the nominee. He declared his independence of party and supported Adlai Stevenson. Some political observers were certain that he had hoped to get the vice presidential nomination which went to Sen. Richard M. Nixon.

Sen. Morse's conversion to the Democratic Party lost him hard-core Republican support, but among these were those who had contended that Morse was in the wrong party, anyway. His victories as a Democrat

gave him a stronger base, but this was shattered in the bitter 1968 Democratic primary in which he defeated Congressman Bob Duncan, with Vietnam a central issue, but so divided the party that he lost his seat to Republican Bob Packwood.

Some of Sen. Morse's best friends urged him not to challenge Sen. Mark Hatfield, whom he had endorsed in Hatfield's earlier race against Duncan, in the 1970 senatorial contest, which Hatfield won easily. But Morse would make no concession to age or declining popularity among the voters. Seeking to regain his old seat this year, Morse won the nomination again but lost his last fight at Good Samaritan Hospital Monday.

Sen. Morse probably will be remembered longest for his adamant opposition to American intervention in Vietnam and his denunciations of Presidents Johnson and Nixon for not ending that intervention without waiting for a negotiated settlement. His only Senate supporter in voting against the Tonkin Gulf resolution, which gave President Johnson authority to commit American forces to battle in Vietnam, was Sen. Ernest Gruening of Alaska, who died last month at the age of 87.

A book about Sen. Morse, an unauthorized biography written by A. Robert Smith, Washington, D.C., newspaperman, was published in 1962 under the title, "The Tiger in the Senate." Sen. Morse tried to stop its publication, although it fairly recounts his record to that time of unorthodox politics, his "force and fury," his accomplishments and his failings. Smith wrote that it was not his purpose "to anticipate history's judgment of Wayne Morse." This newspaper, which supported him in his earlier campaigns as the liberal voice of Republicans, came to sharp disagreements with some of his later positions. In one thing all should agree: Sen. Morse was an unusual man whose faith in his own judgment was never shaken by events. The complete biography of Wayne Morse remains to be written.

[From the (Portland) Oregon Journal, July 23, 1974]

THE TIGER CLOSES THE BOOK

The death of Wayne Morse ends a political career the likes of which probably will not be seen again in Oregon, or elsewhere.

This man, who gained the title "Tiger In The Senate," frequently spoke of himself in the third person; and probably this was most appropriate, for he had only one guiding star—Wayne Morse.

For 24 years he was unbeatable as a candidate for the Senate, and in that period it was only when he attempted to step out of this role and become a "favorite son" candidate in the presidential primary of 1960 that he suffered defeat on his home ground.

In the Senate, he was not influential in the sense that, for example, the late Lyndon Johnson was, but few relished the thought of becoming his enemy. And, his incessant pounding, as on the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, sometimes started a swing in public opinion which could be more powerful than any Senate cloakroom cabal.

Morse knew the rules of the political game and could be a loyal party worker. With some notable exceptions, for example his refusal to support Democrat Robert Duncan against Republican Mark Hatfield, he supported the party ticket; but always in the final analysis, there was only one party line for Morse and that was the Morse line.

From the day he arrived on the University of Oregon campus to teach in the law school those who became associated with him recognized that here was a brilliant mind and a driving ambition.

The combination of these gained him the deanship of the law school, the Republican nomination for the Senate and membership in that body as a Republican, then as an independent and finally as a Democrat until his defeat in 1968 by a young political unknown (outside Oregon), Robert Packwood.

Along the way he acquired a host of enemies and a host of friends, for Wayne Morse was one of those men who seem to inspire either hatred or worship.

In his career, he gained nation-wide recognition as a labor mediator, as the author of a host of important education measures and as the gadfly of the Senate.

Wayne Morse had only one career—to follow his star and that star hung over the halls of government in Washington, D.C.

He would not accept defeat and when the end came at age 73, he was using the last reserves of a remarkable store of energy to follow that star. Undoubtedly that is the way Wayne Morse wanted it.

[From the Salem (Oreg.) Statesman, July 23, 1974]

A NEEDED VOICE OF INDIGNATION IS STILLED

In the stunning shock of Wayne Morse's death, memories come flooding back of the three decades during which he was a dominant figure in Oregon's and the nation's politics. The picture which stands clear and apart from all the argumentation and acrimony is of a great man of conviction, of undaunted determination to serve his state and his nation.

At a time when such qualities are desperately needed, the loss of a person of Morse's stature is all the more cause for bereavement.

It was his reputation as an impartial U.S. Labor Dept. arbiter, in which capacity he served while dean of the University of Oregon Law School, which drew attention to him and propelled him into the race for the U.S. Senate on the Republican ticket 30 years ago this year.

He very likely was the only member of that body to serve as a Republican, an Independent and a Democrat. This told the story of his career, as he saw himself guiding a straight course through the seas of politics while the tides of partisanship shifted one direction and another. He charted his course by the star of "constitutional liberalism."

While his difficulties in working with colleagues, party leaders and U.S. presidents were legion, his dedication to principle often found him far ahead of the thinking of his time. The most notable example was his dedicated opposition to the Vietnam war. He was one of only two senators who voted against the Gulf of Tonkin resolution.

His "maverick" alienation from traditional political ties and allegiances kept him from membership in the Senate's "club". His filibusters and refusal to accept political protocol irritated his associates. In mid-term, it always seemed as though Sen. Morse had so thoroughly alienated the political power structure that he could not be re-elected. He loved this role of the underdog and played it to the hilt.

But in election after election, Oregon voters rallied to his exhortations against political pragmatists. He cut through his campaigns with a two-edged sword, condemning the political "ins" while capitalizing on his Senate seniority.

In typical fashion, he never accepted his loss to young Robert Packwood six years ago, only waiting for opportunities to regain his Senate seat.

He died with his political boots on, having won his party's nomination for the U.S. Senate, striding on toward the November campaign.

While The Statesman did not endorse his political loner-ism, we recognize his sincerity and dedication to purpose and the tremendous impact he made on the American political scene.

At a time when the national leadership needs to be charged anew with meeting its obligations and ideals, we have lost a man who knew how to attack that mission with the fervor and righteous indignation it deserves.

[From the Hood River (Oreg.) News, July 25, 1974]

IMPRINT ON HISTORY

Sen. Wayne Morse will never have the one final term in office he wanted so much and was working hard to attain. Death resulting from kidney failure following an infection took Morse this week.

At the time he started his campaign in the primary, he said he wanted to serve during a time he said would be most critical for the United States. Viewing the public disillusionment with the moral tone of the political scene, Sen. Morse felt the integrity he had built into a substantial reputation might again play an important role in the Senate.

Features and news accounts of Morse's life and death will try to focus on a single outstanding feature of his career. Many of them will point to his stand against Vietnam, when he and Sen. Gruening of Alaska were the only two to vote against the Gulf of Tonkin resolution. It was with great pride that Morse could later say his colleagues admitted "Wayne, you were right." But it was to his chagrin that many told him at the time of the voting they knew he was right, but they were voting the other way.

This single issue was far from the only major accomplishment of Morse. More than anything, it was a symbol of how he would not move from principle when he felt he was right. As a U.S. Senator he was instrumental in helping turn the nation toward federal aid to education, and federal entry into financial aid in many fields. This earned him the opposition of many who resisted the welfare state trend.

The senator was intensely proud of the role he played in resolving labor management troubles during his later years. He was equally proud of his record in handling requests and business of individual constituents.

When Wayne Morse was in Hood River during the primary campaign, he said if he were elected, he would work just as hard on a request from someone who had opposed him as he would for those who backed him. "I'll represent all the people," he insisted.

No one could doubt that he meant it, because his opponents and proponents alike agreed on the senator's integrity.

He was called a "maverick," at times, but certainly he would deny the label. He contended that all a colleague with a bill had to do get his support was to show him it was right. He had a deep feeling for the Constitution, and this brought him into conflict with almost every administration during his Senate career.

There is little doubt that Morse will take a place in Oregon and national history books alongside others such as McNary.

Rep. Al Ullman capsuled this thought in his eulogy. "Wayne Morse made a great imprint on the United States Senate, on this country and on our history," he said. "That imprint will endure and will serve as a living memorial to a great man."

[From the Ontario (Oreg.) Daily Argus Observer, July 23, 1974]

A TIGER DIES

Wayne Morse's death leaves a void in Oregon's political scene which will not soon be filled. He was a dynamic person who might take a firm stand on an issue—but presented another side, would change positions with no apparent loss of stature.

The ex-senator certainly let the nation know that Oregon was a part of the United States! During his 24 years in the Senate, he earned his title "The Tiger in the Senate."

During his recent visit to Ontario, Morse showed a vigor and physical toughness few much younger men could match. But perhaps the campaign was too strenuous for the older heart and body—and he was unable to fight off this last illness.

It will be a while before Oregon finds another "Tiger" to send to Washington. Some will welcome the quiet but there are those who say 'at least we knew what was going on when Morse was there.'

Sen. Mark Hatfield said, in reporting the death of Ex-Sen. Morse to fellow senators, "Sen. Morse was a politician from a unique mold—an enigma to many people."

Sen. Morse will perhaps be best remembered here for going to bat for eastern Oregon ranchers during the battle over rangelands. From his efforts came the highly successful "Vale Project" with its tremendous range rehabilitation program.

Even in his retirement, he was busy commenting on national and international events, never forgetting Oregon was home.

Wayne Morse will be missed.

[From KOOS radio]

WAYNE LYMAN MORSE

Mister Integrity, Wayne Lyman Morse, the Tiger of the United States Senate is dead. Mister Integrity, Wayne Lyman Morse, the Tiger of the United States Senate lives. Wayne Morse lives in the hearts and minds of millions of Americans. Wayne Morse lives in the hearts and minds of millions of people in all the countries of the world.

Wayne Morse—to know him was to love him—or hate him—no middle ground. He had none of our common vices. I likened him to a poet chewing tobacco when writing poems. He really gave a damn. Wayne was a perfectionist, lifetime student of all subjects. A perpetual educator. His constant love, other than his wife Mildred and his three daughters, the love he honored . . . the love he sought to protect and the love he sought to defend . . . was the Constitution of the United States.

Yes, Wayne Morse . . . the student, the educator, the arbitrator, the negotiator, the farmer, the perfector of the law, the peacemaker, the scourge of the perpetrators of injustice . . . yes, Wayne Morse beat with the persistence of an unpaid madam at the door of Justice. It is a sad time for the people of our nation . . . our world. And when the ghost of Wayne Morse returns to your mind and your heart, don't stare. Welcome his shade. Goodnight, Sweet Prince.

REMINISCENCES ABOUT THE MAN FROM OREGON: IT'S DOUBTFUL THERE'LL EVER BE ANOTHER MORSE

(By Robert B. Frazier)

Monday, hours after Wayne Morse died, I sat down and recounted some of the thoughts that were going through my head. And now, now, dammit, I'm not through. There was too much to tell.

Unfortunately, I wasn't at that big party up the McKenzie. But Governor Earl Snell was and so were a bunch of rich lumbermen right after the war. So was Bill Tugman, former editor of this newspaper. Bill was a great story teller who never let a good story grow worse.

That night up the McKenzie, somebody pulled out a deck of cards and organized a poker game. Wayne Morse, quite new in the Senate, volunteered to sit in. He paid $100 for a stack of poker chips. The lumbermen expressed concern about the way the new senator was squandering his modest wages.

Morse lost the whole bundle in record time. The lumbermen begged the senator not to send good money after bad, but the senator insisted and bought another stack of chips. He won modestly. Then the lumbermen began bluffing him. The senator showed that he could be bluffed.

As Morse's stack disappeared, Tugman decided to go to bed. "Don't worry about the boy senator," he growled at a lumberman. "Before morning he'll own your goddamn sawmill."

When Tugman woke up in the morning, the game was just ending. Morse had everything on the table. Tugman didn't know how much it was, but guessed it was several thousand dollars. The senator thanked his hosts, jumped in his car and drove to Salem for a speech and to Portland for another. He was back in Eugene that night.

Before he went to the Senate, Morse was president of the Eugene Rotary Club, a matter of Rotary pride at the time. But after he jumped the traces and refused to support Eisenhower and Nixon, Rotarians preferred to forget that he was still one of theirs. It was not for several years that he was to be invited back to speak to his old friends, the friends who had once pounded him on the back and called him Wayne.

About 1954, when he was still banished from Rotary programs, I was with him in the Eugene Hotel lobby. He met a big lumberman and invited him to lunch. "I'm speaking to the Chamber of Commerce," he said. "It's going to be a great speech. You ought to come hear it."

"Hear it, hell," the lumberman told him. "Last time I heard you, goddam it, Wayne, you convinced me and I stayed convinced for three whole days. Now that I know better, I'm going to stay away."

Once Senator Paul Douglas of Illinois, a close friend of the senator and man ideologically tuned to him, and Morse appeared together at the University of Oregon. At a press conference, Senator Douglas confessed, "I like Wayne, but I can't understand his being a Republican. He ought to be a Democrat. But at least he's my kind of Republican."

Morse replied, "I like Paul, too, but I can't understand how anybody that smart can be a Democrat. He'll be a Republican before I ever change parties."

Morse was wrong that time.

The senator was never a close personal friend and most of what I saw of him was in public. Either that or he knew I was a newspaperman, a member of a race of people he neither liked nor trusted. Thus I was never privy to his private feelings. But at least once I sensed his anguish.

It was at the Portland Rose Festival in June of 1953. Less than a month earlier, I had been kicked out of the senator's office. My mission in Portland was to cover the senator's "Homecoming," his first visit to the state since he had refused to support the Republican ticket the previous fall. The other dignitary in Portland that day was Douglas McKay, former governor and then Eisenhower's new secretary of the Interior.

Morse regarded McKay as a boob. McKay was a hero to Oregon Republicans, who knew that he was only the second Oregon man to serve in the Cabinet. Republicans were still angry at Morse for his apostacy. Democrats did not yet accept him.

It was McKay that day who got the applause, Morse who got the silence and the jeers. That must have hurt, but Morse never showed it, at least not publicly.

He could be rough. In 1955, it was rumored that Governor Paul Patterson, a beloved public servant, was ready to take him on in 1956. "I hope he doesn't" the senator told me. "He's not a well man. A campaign against me would kill him. He wouldn't dare run against me." Patterson did decide to run, but had not begun his campaign when he succumbed to a heart attack in January of 1956. Morse's eventual opponent that year was Douglas McKay. Morse won with 396,849 votes, out of 732,254 cast. I wonder if, the morning after election, he did not remember the Rose Festival of three years before.

Sometimes, I think, Morse rather enjoyed the press. He used the press as a whipping boy, just as much as Spiro Agnew ever did. Many a time I sat in a crowd and heard him denounce "that yellow rag" the Register-Guard.

Early in his Senate career, he'd flood the press with more information than anybody wanted. Morse was coming home. That announcement was followed by a series of press releases. Morse was in Illinois, pulling a horse trailer. Now he had reached Wyoming, Idaho by Wednesday. Reporters did everything but interview the nag.

This changed later. He'd slip into town and reporters would try to find him. The wire services would badger us to get an interview.

Then I, or somebody else, would bump into him downtown. "Where ya' been?" he'd ask. "I was waiting for ya' up at the farm. Had a great story to tell ya' about the speech I made on the floor of the United States Senate on the 16th. And ya' know afterward, a lot of Republican senators came up to me and said, 'Wayne, that was a great speech, one of your greatest'.

"And I said, 'Well, Lev., why don't you join me in that resolution?' And Lev said, 'Wayne, you know I can't do that. I've got to think of the voters.' See, he didn't have any independence."

Well, enough of this. It could go on for hours. There may have been more intriguing public figures to follow around over the years. But I doubt it.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, July 28, 1974]

TRUE STORY OF A SENATOR AND HIS PRESIDENT: MORSE DECLINED ATTORNEY GENERAL'S POST

(By A. Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—When the telephone at the Morse residence in northwest Washington, D.C., rang that evening in late 1951, it was the White House calling the senator. Answering, Wayne Morse recognized the familiar voice of President Truman, asking if he could come to see him the next afternoon via the side gate where reporters wouldn't notice his arrival.

"I've called you down here," Truman said next day, "to offer you the attorney generalship of the United States."

Wayne Morse had just begun his second term as a Republican senator from Oregon. The Truman administration was in trouble because of tax-fixing scandals involving officials of the Internal Revenue Service and the Justice Department. Truman realized that his attorney general, Howard McGrath, was too weak to clean up the mess.

"You can write your own ticket," he told Senator Morse." It isn't often that a president gives anyone an offer like this. I'm satisfied that 99.9 per cent of our people are fine public servants. Apparently I've got a few rotten apples in the barrel. I want you to clean them out."

Morse told Truman it would be a mistake to name him, a Republican, but the president replied, "You're no Republican. You're an Independent, and that's what I want."

After discussing the offer far into the night with his wife, Midge, and with three close political advisors, the senator next day declined.

The incident is worth recalling as an object lesson in how an honest president, anxious to effect a clean-up rather than a cover-up, approached the task. No one in Washington was more fiercely independent or less partisan than Wayne Morse, who in ten years on the national scene had gained a great reputation for speaking out against what he considered wrong no matter who was to blame, Truman included.

Upon Wayne Morse's death, several writers noted that he once accused Truman of "ham acting," which illustrates his outspokenness, but also suggests, quite wrongly, that he had

no use for Truman. As Truman himself recalls in his memoirs, Morse later apologized in the Senate for his unkind remark. When Truman read his remarks in the Congressional Record he wrote the Senator a note of appreciation, admitting his feelings "were somewhat ruffled" by Morse's earlier blast. But, Truman added, "I've always been an admirer of yours. Honest men may differ but they may still be friends."

Harry Truman regarded Morse as his friend for the rest of his days. In fact, when I went to Independence in 1960 to interview Truman about his relations with the senator, he refused to see me until Morse sent him a telegram "clearing" me.

"I never talk about my friends behind their backs," Truman told me.

The Truman Library is full of evidence of the mutual admiration that developed between Truman and Morse. Though different in many ways, each admired the other's courage. For Morse, Truman's high water mark of courage was his firing of Gen. Douglas MacArthur; and for Truman, Morse's was his filibuster against the Taft-Hartley labor act which Truman vetoed.

"I always liked Wayne Morse," Truman told me. "Whenever I could have Wayne in my corner, I always wanted him there."

Truman was disappointed at Morse's refusal to take the attorney generalship but not resentful. When I asked why he had offered it to Morse, he replied, "I thought he would clean things up. I thought he would do the job, do the work, as it should be done. People don't understand. They think there is a deep, dark, under-the-table reason. It isn't true with me."

President Truman knew that bold action was required in the face of the gathering crisis over the corruption of his administration, just as President Nixon has felt impelled to act boldly in the face of exposed criminal acts by some of his closest White House aides.

The specific actions of these two beleaguered presidents, however, were significantly different. Truman tried to hire the most uncontrollable clean-up man in town; Nixon fired Special Prosecutor Archibald Cox and defied his successor, Leon Jaworski (until the Supreme Court directed him to cooperate), when he found he couldn't control them or contain their inquiry.

But then Harry Truman had nothing to hide.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, July 25, 1974]

WAYNE MORSE—MORE A PROPHET THAN A TIGER

(By A. Robert Smith)

(EDITOR'S NOTE: A. Robert Smith has been the Register-Guard's Washington correspondent for almost 25 years. As such, he has covered Wayne Morse more closely than any other reporter. In 1962, he published an unauthorized biography of the senator, "The Tiger in the Senate," thus giving Morse a nickname that he wore proudly the rest of his life.)

WASHINGTON.—Among the many efforts to analyze the Senate's champion maverick of the mid-Twentieth Century, none was quite so much to the point as one offered by Wayne Morse himself:

"I sometimes wonder if I'm going at this a little too hard. But then I think of all the men and women who wish there were just one politician in Washington who would speak his mind and cast his vote honestly and freely with only his conscience to guide him. Maybe it's a bit brash to assume that I'm that man, but believe me, I'm trying to be."

To tens of thousands of citizens from coast to coast, Senator Morse was surely that man. Every time he stood up in the Senate and verbalized his—and their—outrage over what he perceived to be wrong in high places of government and business, foreign and domestic, Morse's office was deluged with fan mail.

What Morse revealed in that statement was his own sense of purpose. Though frequently denounced by other politicians, by editorial writers and by some citizens who sharply disagreed with him, the manifestation of support he received from the common folk gave him a sense of fulfillment.

In this sense, as the advocate of lost causes, the spokesman for the underdog, the fighter against great odds, Everyman's senator, Wayne Morse was a notable success.

His means and his ends were not always that noble, of course, and his personal flaws were sometimes more noticeable than his virtues: As the journalist who probably wrote more about Wayne Morse than any other writer, it seems to me only just to confess that while he belonged to us too much space was devoted to his shortcomings, not enough to his longcomings.

But now that he belongs to history, we must pay him his due. He was long on courage, long on vision, long in determination to fight to uphold the Bill of Rights in an era when personal freedom came under constant assault.

He was also brilliant, but there are lots of brilliant pussyfooters in Washington. Morse was different.

Any one of those virtues would be enough to command acclaim for the average public man today—but Wayne Morse was far above average. Indeed, there was nothing average about him.

Having dubbed him "The Tiger in the Senate" in a biography published in 1962, I think in retrospect—looking back upon his whole career—that another symbol might be more appropriate. A tiger in debate he was, but he was much more.

In an era of growing corruption in public and private life, Wayne Morse was more like an Old Testament prophet, a political Jeremiah, condemning kings and commoners alike in their sinful ways, a harsh voice bringing discomfort to the wicked.

He was denounced for not being a healer or a peacemaker—but that was not his mission.

He was stripped of his office for not being all things to all men, for not soothing the masses, and for opposing a national war much too soon—but he did what he had to do, true to his own sense of purpose.

Wayne Morse didn't want to be a voice crying in the wilderness, although often he was. He, like most public men, wanted power and used what power he acquired with considerable skill. He would rather have been a president than a prophet—but that, too, was not the role destiny had marked for him.

At the Republican national convention in 1952 Wayne Morse, then a liberal Republican, was unstinting in his praise of Eisenhower over Taft for the presidential nomination—until Ike, having won it, agreed to take Richard Nixon as his running mate. In his hotel room afterward Morse was a picture of despair.

Professional skeptics that we are, we reporters who covered these events ascribed his sudden coolness to personal disappointment that the ticket wasn't Eisenhower-Morse. His subsequent endorsement of Adlai Stevenson and resignation from the GOP showed how very deep his disappointment had been.

Maybe there was more to it than that. Perhaps Wayne Morse, who knew something about Senator Nixon, visualized what this decision would mean to the Republican party and to the nation in due course, and he wanted none of it.

Perhaps not, and yet he had a genius for perceiving the dark underside of politics and a career-long compulsion for turning it up for all to see.

It was this vision which caused him to be the first in the Senate to oppose America's taking on the war in Vietnam in the name of defending freedom. America was defending a corrupt military regime, cried Morse to the immense discomfort of almost everyone in Washington at the time.

In the process, of course, he gained converts—and undoubtedly a place in history for being one of the two senators to vote against the Gulf of Tonkin resolution authorizing U.S. forces to enter combat in Vietnam.

His last public appearance in Washington, incidentally, was three weeks ago at the National Cathedral to eulogize the only senator who stood with him, the late Ernest Gruening of Alaska, who died a month ago.

Whether Morse's courageous opposition to the Vietnam war was his greatest achievement will be for historians or a later biographer to suggest. He had a model in the unpopular role Sen. Robert LaFollette played as a critic of American entry into World War I.

Yet he may have played a more important role in his nearly 30 years on the national political stage, namely as a symbol of honesty in politics.

Douglas McKay, the former Oregon governor who resigned from the Eisenhower cabinet to run aaginst Morse in 1956, complained that Morse, the hairshirt of Washington, "gave Oregon a black eye." That was in the days when Morse took on the president of General Motors, Charlie Wilson, who as the nominee for secretary of Defense, cracked, "What's good for the country is good for General Motors, and vice versa." And when Morse filibustered against the administration-backed tidelands oil bill.

To McKay's conservative friends and Republican stalwarts, Morse personified the worst thing imaginable—a renegade, a Republican turncoat. But when Morse overwhelmed McKay at the polls that November, it was apparent that a majority of the voters prefererred his brand of independence, his gutsy honesty.

If democracy depends on public faith in the political system and men holding office, corruption in public office becomes a form of subversion, eroding the foundation of the nation. Washington's corruption today is at the floodtide.

Perhaps the greatest contribution any public man or woman can make is to justify our faith in the honesty of those we elect. For tens of thousands of Americans, Wayne Morse more than any other figure of his time did just that.

For those who hated him, and they were legion, he could do little or no right. But for those who admired him, and they are legion, Wayne Morse gave politics a good name. And right now that seems like a considerable legacy for any person to have given his country.

[From the East Oregonian, July 22, 1974]

MORSE WAS QUITE A MAN

(By Dean Holmes)

U.S. Sen. Wayne Morse was quite a man. And there are thousands of Oregonians mourning his passing today. A husky longshoreman, a retired school teacher and an Eastern Oregon farmer, may all shed a tear today.

I became acquainted with the senator 25 years ago. It happened in a Williamette Valley High School where he was making a speech. He was a Republican, and he was, among other things, lashing out at his party's campaign for cutting the federal budget in places like veterans benefits. He was pleading the case for the ex-serviceman that day and he was doing it in typical Morse fashion.

The several hundred students from surrounding towns were tuned in to his speech. The teachers couldn't get that kind of attention.

He always said his best audiences were

high school students. Also, he said he could sense the attitudes of his audiences like a circus performer and when they started coming with him he would turn it on like a fire horse.

He was challenged by Douglas McKay at the insistence of Republican President Dwight D. Eisenhower in 1956. McKay was the popular former Oregon governor and Eisenhower's Secretary of the Interior.

Sen. Morse made a swing that year through Eastern Oregon speaking mostly to high school students. Adults also came to hear the maverick senator, who was lashing out at Eisenhower. The school auditoriums were filled. Neighboring towns closed their schools and bused their students to hear Morse.

He said that swing into Eastern Oregon let him know that he was a winner. He beat McKay by 75,000 votes.

Morse was at home with the common man or the millionaire. He had a legion of friends in both categories.

He didn't stand much on protocol.

He liked to tell of the time he was called to the White House one night for an emergency meeting. He had been out to his Maryland acreage. He drove into the underground driveway of the White House in his muddy Ford sedan with chicken coops in the back seat. He said the security people couldn't believe what they were seeing. He said that car looked strange in the parking garage that was filled with limousines.

Another time he was traveling via train along the eastern seaboard and received a note in the handwriting of President Harry Truman. Morse said Truman wanted him to come to the White House to discuss the attorney general's job. Morse was told to go to a side door in the dark to avoid alerting newsmen.

Always in a hurry, and always in top physical shape, Morse didn't drink or smoke.

Once a drunk on a cafe stool in a small Oregon town wanted to shake the senator's hand. The drunk fell to the floor. Morse, a strong man, picked him up and parked the big man on a stool with a thud. Then with a pleasant smile and a handshake he made the drunk happy and amused the other people. As he left he commented, "After that jolt that fellow won't sleep well tonight."

After he kicked over the political traces of the GOP in 1952 he lost thousands of political friends in Oregon.

In December of that year, after Eisenhower won, Morse came back to Oregon to tell his side of the story. He was invited to speak at Sheridan. The speech was in the high school gym and attracted an estimated 1,200 people in a town of 1,700 population.

The speech also marked something else. It was the first live telecast program from Oregon.

At Sheridan he refused at the last minute to speak at the Catholic Jesuit Novitate because the school administration ruled his daughters or newsmen couldn't attend. Morse said he refused to speak if newsmen were barred.

The political climate changed in later years when he moved from a Republican to an Independent, then finally a Democrat. He lost lots of devoted friends.

On his last visit to Hermiston he attracted only a few of the party faithful. Twenty years earlier he would have filled the school auditorium with students and adults.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, July 24, 1974]

UPS AND DOWNS OF MAKING FRIENDS WITH THE "TIGER": MEMORY OF MORSE BEGAN IN 1941

(By Robert B. Frazier)

I don't know why I feel this way, but I do and I want to set some things down on paper four hours after Wayne Morse died. In more than a quarter century of following Oregon politics, I have never felt as keenly the loss of a political figure. Not even Dick Neuberger, a close friend, which Wayne was not.

Maybe my regret is that Wayne was not a close friend and I am sorry about that. I think I tried. But the rift between Wayne and the Register-Guard was too great. Let me go back to the beginning.

In 1941, I was a reporter for the Oregon Daily Emerald on the campus and Wayne was dean of the law school and already a national figure. There was some hanky panky about a student body election and all agreed that Dean Morse should be the guy to adjudicate it. He found the ballots fraudulent and burned them. I have been following him ever since.

When he campaigned against "Deadwood Dave" Hoover in the 1950 primary, I sometimes drove the car for him, a courtesy that the now much more discreet Register-Guard would not allow. Wayne would sleep as we drove from Bend to Prineville, then to John Day, Ontario, Burns and so on. Sometimes he'd wake up and talk a little. At the end of the day I'd be exhausted and Wayne, after half a dozen speeches, would feel fine.

We were pretty friendly right into 1952 when Bill Tugman, my mentor and predecessor, and Wayne had a falling out about Truman's seizure of the steel mills. The fight got pretty bitter. Wayne was not a candidate that year, so I saw him only occasionally.

That summer the Republicans nominated Eisenhower and young Sen. Dick Nixon. Wayne seemed to support the ticket. But he must have ben seething inside. Maybe he wanted the vice presidential nomination. I knew that he had an intense dislike for Nixon. Morse had been badly snubbed at the convention, with a choice post that he wanted going to an obscure young state legislator named Mark Hatfield.

I did not see Morse again that summer. In late August I left for Cambridge, Mass., to accept a Nieman fellowship at Harvard. In Toronto, I picked up a copy of the Star and read that Wayne would not support the Republican ticket.

Ten days later, I arrived at Harvard and found my mailbox full of letters and Register-Guards. Wayne was taking a hell of a beating. I understood that his wife and children were snubbed in church and that he was being brutally cussed out.

So I wrote to him, telling him that while I did not agree with his decision, I had to admire his courage and guts. I got a nice letter back. He came to Boston and visited with the Nieman fellows at one of our weekly seminars.

On the Sunday before election, he was going to be in Boston again and wrote me about it, inviting me to spend the day with him. One of his activities was to take part in a television show with Walter Reuther of the United Automobile Workers and Maurice Tobin, former mayor of Boston and at that time Truman's secretary of labor.

Wayne was staying at the Parker House. In the taxi to the Statler, where Reuther was staying, Wayne took one of his famous quickie naps. Reuther had recently been the target of an assassination attempt and always had a bodyguard with him. We knocked on the door and this gorilla opened it. Reuther looked around the room corridor and said, "Hi, Wayne, come on in." Morse stepped in and I followed, only to be stopped by the gorilla's hairy arm.

"Walter," said Wayne, "let this boy in; he's as close to me as a member of my own family."

We had a fine day.

That winter, Morse and Bob Smith, our guy in Washington, got into a scrap. The Associated Press joined on Bob's side. On my way home in May of 1953, I stopped in Washington a few days and free-loaded on Bob.

When I went to see Morse, he asked where I was staying and I gulped and said, "With a friend." He ushered me into his inner sanctum, which was festooned with ribbons and plaques and pictures of horses. Then he began.

I have been castigated, chastized and just plain chewed out many times. But this reading off was classic. I could hardly believe it. What had I done? Except for one magazine article favorable to Morse I had not written a line about him for nine months, nor had I written much for the Register-Guard.

Gradually it came through. He had developed a hatred for Tugman and a contempt for Bob Smith. Jack Bell of the Associated Press was on the big list, too. Apparently anybody who looked as if he ought to have a press card in his hat was fair game. He ended up by ordering me out of the office and inviting me never to return.

I came home to cover politics, which meant frequent encounters with the senator. Naturally, I was wary. He was cool, almost icy. After I came onto the editorial page and got my name on the masthead of the paper, the ice froze a little harder.

When he and Dick Neuberger got into their big scrap in 1958, I often held Dick's sore paw. Dick didn't understand what he had done wrong, either.

In 1963 I was walking down the corridors of one of the Senate office buildings when I saw the sign on the door, "Morse of Oregon." I put my hand on the knob and started to turn it.

Then I said, "The hell with it. I've been there." I went over to see Maurine Neuberger instead.

Over the years in the course of business, I'd see Wayne from time to time. After his defeat by Bob Packwood in 1968 something seemed to happen to him. I know he was terribly hurt. And, I think, humbled. Since that defeat, I saw him more than I had seen him for several years. We had several very pleasant talks, and Wayne could be the world's most pleasant guy. He disapproved of my smoking and could not understand how little I cared about horses and cows, but the old animosity seemed to have disappeared.

Then in 1972, when he was running against Mark Hatfield, a funny thing happened. He came to the Register-Guard building. It was, as far as I know, his first visit in 20 years. He came not only once, but twice. The thaw was on.

In his later years, our relationships improved. But I always had the feeling that he thought Bill Tugman was still down here at 10th and High, hurling his thunderbolts. I very much regret that it took so long to repair what had been a fine friendship.

The last time I saw him face-to-face was May 3 when he met with the Register-Guard editorial board. Unlike most candidates, he did not arrive with an entourage of press agents, bodyguards and speech writers. He drove his own car and came in all by himself. We taped a delightful hour and a half of give-and-take.

The paper endorsed Morse in the primary and he telephoned to talk about that. He also invited me up to the farm to hear returns on election night, but I felt it would be inappropriate for me to go.

Usually after an election, we erase tapes of the old interviews and use them again. Saturday I ran across those Morse tapes and almost erased them. Now I don't think I ever will.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, July 24, 1974]

FAR MORE THAN TITANIC POLITICAL FIGURE: MORSE WAS FIRST A HUMAN BEING

(By Henny Willis)

It is not easy to think of Wayne Morse dying. He seemed somehow indestructible, a kind of masterpiece by some Renaissance sculptor who worked in granite and steel.

But, Wayne Morse was more than the ti-

tanic political figure who became—by far—the most colorful, caustic, controversial and crusty politician ever to stride across Oregon. He was first a human being, a warm companion, a genteel and courtly host, a gracious and stimulating conversationalist, an entertaining story-teller?

It is this latter Morse, the very human yet very rare individual, which I feel a deep-seated compulsion to write about. It is also this Wayne Morse, the rancher in the Western hat and the eager coffee-maker who made terrible coffee, that I will miss most.

We first met in 1967, the year I took over the political beat at the Register-Guard. I went out to his Crest Drive home in Eugene for an interview, my first trip to that spacious and imposing, yet eminently comfortable, home he and his wife built in the early 1930s. I was a little apprehensive, because I was new on the political scene and he was in his 23rd year in the United States Senate, a man of gargantuan reputation who was said to chew up political writers at the drop of an adjective. And, hovering above this first visit was his 20-year feud with the Register-Guard.

He greeted me at the door, graciously, and ushered me into the large living room. His wife had remained in Washington, D.C., and he offered me a cup of coffee he had brewed himself, apologizing in advance for how it might taste. The apology was appropriate. It was bad coffee. Later, we would joke together about his coffee, but at that first meeting, I wasn't about to begin our tenuous professional relationship with criticism.

We spent the better part of an hour chatting about various things, mostly Vietnam, and in the process I was subjected for the first time to the Wayne Morse pronouncement on U.S. involvement in Southeast Asia—an oral dissertation that was at once brilliant, rambling, intellectual, emotional. It was a quickie course in constitutional law, a passionate blast at the "Eisenhower-Nixon-Dulles military containment policy" and, more than anything, Wayne Morse's bone-marrow conviction that the war was morally wrong, legally indefensible and intellectually abhorrent.

That first meeting went well, although Morse's rhetorical style and strong convictions against the war made me feel at times more like a college student hearing a lecture than an interviewer asking questions.

There were other such visits, sometimes at the Morse home, occasionally at public gatherings. During the next year, Morse and I came to respect each other and could converse comfortably. He was a magnificent talker, expansive in mood and gesture, and though he always kept the built-in propensity to lecture, the growing familiarity between us made conversation easy and enjoyable.

Occasionally, he'd refer to a piece I'd written about him, saying, "Henny, that was fair reporting," meaning that I'd been fair in my treatment of Wayne Morse. From the old devourer of journalists, it was indeed a compliment.

The personal side of Wayne Morse came more into focus for me following his 1968 defeat by Packwood. The loss meant he was around more for interviews and brief chats; thus we became more comfortable with each other. Morse was not a man to show private emotions, unless they were emotions dictated by public events and his role in those events. He was not someone easily approachable, unlike so many politicians, and he kept his private life to himself. Yet, there were times over the years that brief glimpses of the private Morse broke through.

One such time was at his Eugene home the day Bobby Kennedy died. Though he and Kennedy were not particularly close, certainly not as friends, the assassination touched Morse deeply. In his small kitchen that summer morning, he talked at great length about public life, its rigors and demands, its rewards and challenges. One great regret I have is that I did not tape that conversation, but it does remain indelibly imprinted in memory.

Another time the private Morse emerged for me was in early 1970, when he had called me to come up to his house for an "important announcement." When I arrived, he told me he was not running against John Dellenback for Congress, a possibility that had been rumored for several weeks. We talked more and, somewhere along the line, the conversation turned to his home and his roots in Eugene.

At one point he looked out the large picture window of his living room toward the back part of his 27 acres. There was an unusual wistfulness in his voice and his facial expression and he said: "We're going to have to sell part of this. The taxes are just too high." He seemed to be saying it more to himself than to me. He loved that setting, the cattle pens, the rolling miniature hills, the large trees. He and Midge Morse had lived there for nearly 40 years and had raised their three daughters there. It was their haven from the turbulence of the public arena.

They're saying that I was the last political writer to interview Morse in depth. I don't know about that. If so, I am honored. If not, I treasure the many pleasant moments we did share.

The most vivid recollection I have of Wayne Morse is one of our last contacts with each other. It was at the State Demoforum in the Inn at Otter Crest. Morse had come over to be the keynote speaker at the Saturday night banquet. He seemed relaxed, mingled easily with the delegates and at one point, he sat for more than an hour listening to the delegates tediously debate land-use planning. As always, he was immaculately dressed in dark suit and sporting his latest condescension to male fashion—a colorful striped shirt, instead of his usual plain white. And, as always, he seemed indefatigable, sitting erect during the dull debate (Wayne Morse never slouched), everyone in the room aware of his presence.

After his banquet speech on Saturday night, the press corps automatically headed for the cocktail lounge. We were sitting together discussing, naturally, politics, when in the door walked Wayne Morse and Joe Smith, a long-time Morse colleague and the banquet's emcee. No one at the press table could ever recall seeing Wayne Morse in a cocktail lounge, especially since he was one of the most famous teetotalers in Oregon history. But, there he was. Several tables eagerly sought for him to join them, but he chose to join the press group.

He ordered a ginger ale from the mini-skirted waitress and proceeded to discuss anything the reporters wanted to talk about, which at that time was mostly his own campaign, his chances of winning the possible impeachment of Richard Nixon. Then, for some reason undiscernible to anyone present, the conversation shifted to Morse's early years. He discussed his boyhood on a Wisconsin farm, his traveling in a buggy to hear the famous orator and politician, Sen. Robert La Follette, and his later contact as a university student with La Follette.

"I once was engaged in a debate on some subject and drew the side I really didn't want to have," he said. "I talked to La Follette about that predicament and he told me something I've never forgotten. He said: 'Wayne, do you want to win the debate or educate the audience?' I told him I wanted to do both. After the debate competition, I got a telegram from La Follette and it said simply: 'You did both.'"

Wayne Morse was immensely proud of that telegram and I am immensely proud to have known the man they have billed the Tiger of the Senate. That night, over a ginger ale, he was no tiger, but a warm, friendly, interesting man with a trove of fascinating stories to tell about Bob La Follete, Harry Truman and Franklin Roosevelt.

And, there's something I never got a chance to tell him. You did both, senator, you did both.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, July 26, 1974]

MORSE REMEMBERED AS "SENATOR'S SENATOR"

(By Jerry Uhrhammer)

SALEM—Oregon's political establishment paid its last respects here today to former Sen. Wayne Morse.

An overflow crowd at a memorial service in the state Capitol's House Chamber heard the "Tiger of the Senate" eulogized as a "senator's senator" and a champion of law, whose courage and conviction should be emulated in these days of Watergate.

The memorial service here was to be followed by a funeral service this afternoon at the First Congregational Church in Eugene. Morse, whose ofttimes stormy Senate career spanned 24 years, died Monday at the age of 73 from kidney failure.

The crowd that filled the House chamber for the memorial service was dominated by government figures and politicians, including some political opponents from Morse's past.

Gov. Tom McCall, hospitalized Thursday afternoon with an viral-intestinal infection, left the Salem Memorial Hospital about 9:30 a.m. today and—while reportedly feeling dizzy at times—came to the Capitol to deliver his eulogy to Morse as scheduled.

Looking drawn and somewhat shaky, McCall called Morse "our most eloquent petitioner, under the constitutional right to petition the government for a redress of grievances."

McCall said, "The young and many of their elders view most politicians with immense cynicism—a cynicism fostered outrageously by political leaders who defend Watergate with the canard that 'everybody does it.'

"So the young have the notion that almost everybody is on the take from the oil companies, and ITT, and the milk trust, and that everybody with any influence at all can dodge taxes, and steam open other people's mail.

"But they do not believe it of Wayne Morse, and, oh what his past has taught us! . . . He told us that personal and national principles cannot be changed to accommodate your bank account or your political party or your friends or even your enemies. In his uncompromising way, he encouraged us to stiffen our backs against compromise of principle."

Concluded McCall: "Let us now take up his burden as our memorial to his name."

The governor's press aide, Ron Schmidt, said McCall planned to leave the Capitol immediately after the service and spend the next 48 hours at home recuperating from his illness. Schmidt said the governor no longer had a fever and the sharp pains and cramps he suffered at the onset of the infection Thursday had disappeared, but he still felt dizzy.

McCall was the first of six speakers who eulogized Morse during the memorial service. The others were Senate President Jason Boe, House Speaker Richard Eymann, Sen. Mark Hatfield, former Minnesota Sen. Eugene McCarthy and a representative of AFL-CIO President George Meany, Morris Novick of Washington, D.C.

Hatfield spoke of Morse's love of the law. He "always remained a tutor of the Constitution to all who would listen," he said.

Hatfield said it was "that love which produced such bristling indignation whenever he felt others were jeopardizing the sanctity of constitutional law . . . All these qualities equipped Wayne Morse for the most valued contribution he made to our country: his unceasing drive to bring the nation from war to peace. That is how Americans will remember him best," Hatfield said.

Boe called Morse a "national symbol of courage" whose leadership in causes he believed just transcended party lines and narrow political ideologies.

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, July 22, 1974]

FRIENDS, RIVALS PRAISE MORSE

The death today of former U.S. Sen. Wayne Morse brought quick expressions of sorrow from political figures in Oregon and Washington, D.C.

Gov. Tom McCall, who ordered flags flown at half staff on state buildings until after the Morse funeral, said:

"Democracy has lost a very good friend. Wayne Morse was a brilliant counsellor, a courageous man, an American who really understood freedom. We loved him for being the Tiger of the Senate. We stood behind him and said, 'That's telling 'em Wayne.' His politics weren't always those of a majority of Oregonians, because he was often far out front, leading causes not yet popular. But, he himself was immensely popular, because we always could depend on him to say what he thought. And that's the first lesson of integrity."

U.S. Sen. Bob Packwood, the man who beat Morse in 1968 and was to face him again this November: "Wayne Morse was a man of integrity and courage. He was never afraid to fight for his convictions—as dean of the UO Law School and as Oregon's U.S. senator for 24 years. He will be deeply missed by Oregon and the nation. Mrs. Packwood joins me in expressing our deepest sympathy to Mrs. Morse and the family."

U.S. Sen. Mark Hatfield, who defeated Morse in 1972. "Senator Morse was a politician from a unique mold and an enigma to many people. His interest was substance and his commitment to issues produced a unique Morse style. When convinced of a position on an issue, he was not swayed by political considerations or pressures. Those of us who have fought for nearly a decade to change U.S. policies in Indochina owe a debt of gratitude to Wayne Morse."

U.S. Sen. George McGovern, a long-time ally of Morse in opposing U.S. Vietnam policies: "The passing of Wayne Morse so closely after the death of Ernest Gruening deprived the nation of its two most courageous and persistent critics of the Vietnam tragedy. He was one of the 20th Century's most powerful voices for justice and peace."

U.S. Sen. Mike Mansfield, D-Mont.: "Wayne Morse was a man of independence who served his state and nation with credit and distinction. He was an effective senator who feared no one, answering only to his conscience. His loss is Oregon's and the nation's."

U.S. Sen. William Proxmire, D-Wis.: "He was a man of remarkable intelligence and rock-like integrity."

Oregon Senate Pres. Jason Boe, D-Reedsport, whom Morse beat in the 1974 Democratic primary: "Sen. Morse was a unique man in the annals of the political history of this state and nation. His courage, wisdom and ability to take a stand in spite of long odds will be remembered as long as a political system exists in this country. Both Oregon and the nation have suffered a grievous loss."

Oregon House Speaker Richard Eymann, D-Springfield: "He was one of Oregon's finest citizens since the beginning of statehood. As one who encouraged him to run for the Senate this time, his death is particularly grievous to me."

Congressman John Dellenback, R-Ore.: "I'm terribly sorry. He died the way he lived, with his boots on and in the middle of a fight for what he believed. Oregon has lost one of her giant trees and the nation is the poorer."

Orlando Hollis, former UO Law School dean and long-time colleague of Morse's: "I have known Wayne Morse since he came to Oregon in 1929. Oregon and the nation have lost a public figure whose influence will be with us for a long time."

Secretary of State Clay Myers: "I have great admiration for this high-principled, brilliant and able maverick. Wayne Morse's integrity serves as an example to all Americans. He was a towering figure in the U.S. Senate."

Lane County Democratic Chairman Dorothy Leeper, a close Morse friend: "His keen intellect, rare wisdom and integrity were a guiding light to so many of us. In an era of corruption and confusion, he held the torch high. His place in history remains untarnished and he will be recorded by historians as one of the great statesmen of our time. His was a profile in courage."

State Treasurer James Redden: "It is not only the citizens of Oregon who have lost a friend and champion, but the citizens of the world."

State Democratic Chairman Caroline Wilkins: "I am only one of many thousands who feel this great loss. The pursuit of his convictions and strength of courage helped shape more than a quarter century of our nation's and state's political history."

Former congressman Charles Porter of Eugene: "Wayne Morse was my ideal as a public servant even before I met him 28 years ago. What I saw of other senators during my four years as a member of Congress affirmed my opinion. Wayne Morse's virtues were classic—deep concern for the oppressed and disadvantaged, a keen intellect, tireless industry, fearless independence and, above all, integrity. . . ."

[From the Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, July 23, 1974]

MORSE EULOGIES STRESS HIS INTEGRITY

Eulogies for former U.S. Sen. Wayne Morse brought warm recollections from his friends and colleagues as they recalled his fighting style.

Morse died Monday at the age of 73. Integrity was the word spoken most often by those who remembered him.

President Richard Nixon, one of the targets Morse hit most often with his sharp tongue, said Monday he will write a personal letter of condolence to Morse's family.

In Eugene, Morse was praised by former associates. And the city council adopted a resolution expressing sympathy to the Morse family and calling the former senator "one of the most distinguished citizens in our history."

"I have always admired his courage and often felt that he was much more often right than he was wrong," said Fred Cuthbert, professor emeritus and former dean of architecture at the University of Oregon. Morse was one of the first faculty members Cuthbert met when he came to the U of O in 1932.

"I was present at one of Morse's famous lambasts at Dr. (William Joseph) Kerr when he was appointed to be chancellor and interim president of the university," Cuthbert said.

Morse, then one of the youngest law school deans in the United States, said "the plot to put him (Kerr) into office stank to high heaven," Cuthbert recalled.

"And Kerr was at the meeting when Morse said it. Kerr didn't crack a smile on that one or even move a muscle."

The installation of Kerr as chancellor was part of a movement to take the university out of Eugene in unification of the State System of Higher Education.

"He was one of the great men to be sent back to the U.S. Senate from any state," said Cuthbert. "That feeling is shared even more on the east coast."

Aaron Jones, owner of Seneca Sawmill Co. in Eugene and a long-time acquaintance of Morse, called his death "a tragedy."

"Although I think of myself as a good Republican, I intended to support Morse and vote for him this time. He exemplified to me honesty and ethics in government—which is obviously in dire need at the present time. I felt he was one of the most staunch friends of the lumber industry and a most intelligent individual in regard to the lumber business, multiple use and log exports.

"I intended to cross over party lines this election, regardless of Morse's age. I can't say how bad I am touched by his death."

Jones knew Morse personally and worked closely with him in regard to the Japan log export bill. He was among those who went to Japan to gather information that led to the so-called Morse Amendment.

Jones recalled how he visited Morse in his home in 1940 as Morse's supporters talked of him some day running for President.

"It was a great thrill for me as a young student just starting college," Jones said. "The strategy was being laid for him to run for President some day—and it should have happened."

Another Eugene lumberman agreed that Morse helped the lumber business.

"In most respects, Wayne Morse was a very good friend of the forest products industry," said L. L. "Stub" Stewart, president of Bohemia, Inc.

"He spent very little time here, but when he did he was very effective. One of his great accomplishments was when he singlehandedly got the log export prohibition through the Congress.

"He was truly a great guy and a very controversial one."

Eugene Attorney Otto Vonderheit first met Morse when Vonderheit was a student at the U of O law school. Later "I visited him in Washington during the war and he was discussing the political maneuvers then of Truman and Roosevelt and so on. And he was incensed with the way they handled politics.

"He was always a man of great integrity and real high principle. Even in his first term, he was trying to get things done with integrity . . . He was just a real great man. That's about all you can say."

Acting Eugene Mayor Tom Williams said: "I am deeply saddened that a man who has given his life to public service and has made a powerful contribution toward solving American and world problems has passed from the scene.

"The death of Wayne Morse is especially tragic to this community of which he has long been a member. I want to express our profound respect for a most exemplary citizen and to extend to his family our condolences. Their loss is indeed shared by this community and by our country."

Oregon Rep. Robert Duncan, former congressman and candidate for Congress in Oregon's 3rd District, said, "A turbulent, combative and very productive life is at an end. Senator Morse asked no quarter and gave none. His was a life of great accomplishments, embracing elements of greatness that will not soon be forgotten."

Former Sen. Maurine Neuberger, whose husband, the late Sen. Richard Neuberger, was the object of a Morse feud, called Morse's death, "the end of an era."

Oregon Research Institute Director Paul Hoffman, a friend of Morse, praised him in an eloquent memo to the institute staff. "He will be remembered as the senator who always placed principle above politics; who never backed off from a controversial issue; who refused to be intimidated by the procession of corporate and political giants he found it necessary to challenge," Hoffman wrote.

On the Oregon coast, Morse was also remembered.

Mayor Paul Geuy of Florence said that Morse was popular on the coast because he was very responsive to people there.

"He was easy to talk to and not ashamed to come to this area," Geuy said. "We felt that he represented us whether or not we liked him personally."

Geuy recalled that Morse was always very active in seeking federal improvement and maintenance projects for the jetty system at the mouth of the Siuslaw river.

The mayor said that Morse once astonished a Florence businessman by remembering the man's name after meeting him once several years prior in Baker.

"He didn't even have a geographical reference," Geuy said.

He said that he asked Morse about his tremendous recall for names, and Morse told him:

"I always try to remember their first names and forget about their last. That way I know everybody by their first name."

[From The Eugene (Oreg.) Register-Guard, July 24, 1974]

HUNDREDS JOIN IN CAPITAL'S MEMORIAL TO MORSE

(By A. Robert Smith)

WASHINGTON.—Several hundred of Wayne Morse's friends and admirers in the nation's capital gathered at the National Cathedral Tuesday to sing and pray and to hear him praised by former allies and adversaries, including one who had supported him for president in 1960, and another he had tried to unseat in 1972.

In the congregation were senators, congressmen, former cabinet members, men and women who had worked on his office staff, and common folk, black and white.

Leading off was Sen. Mark Hatfield, R-Ore., who Morse crossed party lines to endorse for re-election in 1966 but, after his own defeat in 1968, tried to unseat two years ago.

Wayne Morse was "a man of the earth," said Hatfield, a man who treasured Oregon's ranges and forests and made a bedrock commitment to preserve and protect them.

Hatfield led the congregation in reading Psalm 119, which ended, "I have applied my heart to fulfill thy statutes, even unto the end."

The Morse for president booster was Bishop Smallwood Williams, a long-time leader of Washington's large black community, who called him "one of the greatest senators who ever sat in the U.S. Senate."

"He would invite me to have breakfast with him in the Senate dining room," recalled the minister, "and that was back in the 1950s when the restaurants of Washington were lily white" and a black guest in the senators' private lunch room was rare indeed.

Whenever a Southern senator came near, Morse would get up and with great courtesy say, "Senator, I want you to meet my good friend," and introduce his black companion. Some senators blushed with embarrassment, the bishop recalled, but one paid Morse a "left-handed compliment" by saying, "I differ with your racial views but one thing I can say is that you practice what you preach."

"The hungry children of the capital loved him," Williams asserted, because Morse was instrumental in getting a school lunch program and other aid for depressed blacks here. "He was a fierce fighter against all forms of discrimination," Williams said.

The congregation stood and sang "Rock of Ages."

Rep. Claude Pepper, D-Fla., paid tribute to the volume of education bills that came out of the Senate when Morse was chairman of the Senate Education Subcommittee, and to his work on behalf of better relations with Latin American democracies.

"He was like a knight of the round table," said Pepper, "raising his lance for every good cause—and what a record he made."

George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO, recalled they first met when they served on the War Labor Board in the early 1940s, and, after Morse entered the Senate, labor "always wanted to have him on our side." After Morse's defeat in 1968 by Sen. Bob Packwood, Meany said, "How often have we said, "If only we had a Wayne Morse to lead this fight on the Hill.' "

Packwood in the congregation heard Meany add that labor "hoped for his return to the Senate."

Joseph Rauh, a Washington attorney and leader in civil rights causes, paid tribute to Morse's dedication to the Bill of Rights. He said: "Millions of people today who owe their rights to Wayne Morse never knew his name."

Recalling Morse's leadership in the long fight for home rule in the District of Columbia, Rauh said, "Every Washingtonian should thank God for Wayne Morse when they cast their first vote this fall."

Former Supreme Court Justice Arthur Goldberg called Morse "a zealot" who "railed against immorality and abuse of power." He likened him to the prophets of the Old Testament.

"Some critics thought him too self-righteous, that he wore a hair shirt and was intolerant of others' failings," said Goldberg, "and yet his heart was filled with love for others." And, he concluded, Wayne Morse "left an enduring profile in courage.

Among those attending the memorial service were Willard Wirtz, secretary of Labor in the Johnson cabinet; Esther Peterson, consumer affairs adviser to LBJ; Joseph Califano, President Johnson's administrative assistant; John Kenneth Galbraith, former ambassador to India; Sens. Frank Church, D-Idaho, Edward Kennedy, D-Mass., Alan Bible, D-Nev., Clifford Case, R-N.J., Jacob Javits, R-N.Y., Claiborne Pell, D-R.I., and Peter Dominick, R-Colo.; and Reps. John Dellenback and Wendell Wyatt, R.-Ore.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senator from Michigan (Mr. GRIFFIN) is recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

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

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

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the distinguished acting Republican leader has indicated he does not wish to use his time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The order will therefore be vacated.

Under the previous order, the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD) is recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am empowered by the distinguished Senator from West Virginia to abdicate the time which has been allocated to him.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The order will be vacated.

ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business of not to exceed 15 minutes, with statements therein limited to 5 minutes.

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

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

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection——

Mr. COTTON. I object; sorry.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The objection is heard.

The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk continued to call the roll.

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 11:53 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House agrees to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9456) to extend the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1970 for 3 years, with an amendment in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate.

COMMUNICATIONS FROM EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. ABOUREZK) laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION (S. DOCKET NO. 93-106)

A communication from the President of the United States proposing a supplemental appropriation for the fiscal year 1975 in the amount of $73 million for the Atomic Energy Commission (with an accompanying paper). Ordered to be printed and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

NOTICE OF INTENT TO INTERCHANGE JURISDICTION OF CIVIL WORKS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of Agriculture giving notice, pursuant to law, of the intention of the Departments of the Army and Agriculture to interchange jurisdiction of civil works and National Forest lands at Libby Dam and Lake Koocanusa project in Montana (with accompanying papers). Referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE OF APPROPRIATION FOR THE GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Deputy Director of the Office of Management and Budget reporting, pursuant to law, that the appropriation to the General Services Administration for "Allowances and Office Staff for Former Presidents" for the fiscal year 1975 has been apportioned on a basis which indicates the necessity for a supplemental estimate of appropriation. Referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT BY THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the estimated value, by country, of

support furnished from military functions appropriations (with an accompanying report). Referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT BY THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense reporting, pursuant to law, on transfers of amounts appropriated to the Department of Defense. Referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT BY THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on funds obligated in the chemical warfare and biological research programs during the second half of fiscal year 1975 (with an accompanying report). Referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION BY THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD

A letter from the Acting Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Aviation Act of 1958 so as to assure opportunity for the Board's participation and representation in certain court proceedings through its own counsel as a matter of right and to provide for all review of Board actions in the Courts of Appeals (with accompanying papers). Referred to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF THE NATIONAL RAILROAD PASSENGER CORPORATION

A letter from the Vice President of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation transmitting, pursuant to law, a report for the month of May 1974 on the operations of the National Railroad Passenger Corporation (with an accompanying report). Referred to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON THE CENTRAL RAILROAD CO. OF NEW JERSEY

A letter from the Secretary of Transportation transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the Central Railroad Co. of New Jersey (with an accompanying report). Referred to the Committee on Commerce.

NATIONAL GAS SURVEY

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission transmitting Volume III of the National Gas Survey entitled "Technical Task Force Reports" (with an accompanying report). Referred to the Committee on Commerce.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Power Commission transmitting a copy of the following publications:

The National Power Survey "Energy Distribution Research Task Force Report" and "Sales of Firm Electric Power for Resale, 1968–1972" (with accompanying reports). Referred to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT ON THE COST OF SHIPBUILDING

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report on the Relative Cost of Shipbuilding in the Various Coastal Districts of the United States (with an accompanying report). Referred to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare transmitting, pursuant to law, a report concerning grants approved by the Department financed wholly with Federal funds (with an accompanying report). Referred to the Committee on Finance.

LETTER FROM MR. NGUYEN MINH TRUNG OF QUANG NGAI, VIETNAM

A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Congressional Relations transmitting from the Embassy in Saigon a copy of a letter from Mr. Nguyen Minh Trung of Quang Ngai, Vietnam (with accompanying papers). Referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS OTHER THAN TREATIES

Two letters from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs of the Department of State transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States within the past 60 days (each with accompanying papers). Referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

REPORTS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of reports of the General Accounting Office for the month of July 1974 (with accompanying papers). Referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

Four letters from the Comptroller General of the United States each transmitting, pursuant to law, reports of the following titles: "Need for a National Weather Modification Research Program"; "Need for More Effective Management of Community Mental Health Centers Program"; "Federal Claims Collection Act of 1966: Progress and Problems"; and "The Brazilian Economic Boom: How Should the United States Relate to It?" (with accompanying reports). Referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

PROPOSED DISTRIBUTION OF TUSCARORA JUDGMENT FUNDS

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed plan for the use and distribution of the Tuscarora judgment funds awarded in Docket 321 before the Indian Claims Commission (with an accompanying report). Referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

INTERIM REPORT OF THE SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare transmitting, pursuant to law, the second interim report on the administration of the Health Professions Educational Assistance Act (with an accompanying report). Referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting a draft of proposed legislation providing for the continuance of civil government for the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (with accompanying papers). Referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

A letter from the Architect of the Capitol transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of all expenditures during the period January 1, 1974 through June 30, 1974, from moneys appropriated to the Architect of the Capitol (with an accompanying report). Ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PATENTS, TRADEMARKS, AND COPYRIGHTS—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE—(REPT. NO. 93-1135)

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, submitted a report entitled "Patents, Trademarks, and Copyrights," pursuant to Senate resolution 56, 93d Congress, second session, which was ordered to be printed.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. McCLELLAN (by request):

S. 3960. A bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code with respect to registration for unpublished works and with respect to the fees of the Copyright Office, and for other purposes. Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUGH SCOTT:

S. 3961. A bill to authorize the release of one million five hundred fifty-three thousand five hundred pounds of cadmium from the national stockpile and the supplemental stockpile. Referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 3962. A bill for the relief of Ilias Tsakalis; and

S. 3963. A bill for the relief of Steve Wing-On Yan. Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HATFIELD (for himself and Mr. PACKWOOD):

S. 3964. A bill for the relief of U.S. Pumice Co., Los Angeles, Calif. Referred jointly, by unanimous consent, to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 3965. A bill for the relief of Miss Evelyn R. Rey. Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HELMS (for himself and Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT):

S.J. Res. 238. A joint resolution to designate March 16–23, 1975, "Demolay Week." Considered and passed.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. McCLELLAN (by request):

S. 3960. A bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code with respect to registration for unpublished works and with respect to the fees of the Copyright Office, and for other purposes. Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

COPYRIGHT FEE BILL

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President. I introduce, by request, a bill to amend title 17 of the United States Code with respect to registration for unpublished works and with respect to the fees of the Copyright Office, and for other purposes.

I am introducing this legislation at the request of the Librarian of Congress. It provides for the first general increase in Copyright Office fees since 1965. No action is anticipated on this legislation this year, but I am introducing it now so that it may be studied by interested parties. The Congress will wish to consider the impact of this fee increase on authors and other creators.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed at this point in the RECORD a letter from the Librarian of Congress stating the justification for the legislation.

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

THE LIBRARIAN OF CONGRESS,
Washington, D.C., August 20, 1974.

Hon. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, New Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. EASTLAND: I am submitting for your consideration a proposed general increase in the fee schedule for the Copyright Office.

The primary purpose of the proposed bill is to increase the fees payable to the Copyright Office for registration of claims to copyright and other services rendered in or-

der to bring the cash receipts of the Office more nearly in line with its expenditures.

Since the enactment of the present copyright law in 1909, the Congress has revised the schedule of Copyright Office fees three times, in 1928, 1948 and 1965. From 1909 until the fiscal year 1942 the applied fees of the Office exceeded its expenditures. This relationship was reversed beginning with fiscal year 1943, and the ratio of fees to costs continued to decline until the enactment of the 1948 fee schedule. Copyright Office income exceeded expenditures in the next year for the last time. Thereafter, the ratio of applied fees to expenditures declined again until the enactment of 1965 fee schedule. After a temporary increase, the ratio of applied fees to expenditures declined again. For fiscal 1973 the ratio was 47 percent. If we include the estimated value of deposit materials selected by the Library of Congress, the ratio of income to obligations reaches 122 percent.

This decline in the ratio of cash receipts to expenditures has occurred principally because of salary increases of employees of the Office, which itself is a reflection of the marked increase in the level of prices in our economy as a whole. Other factors are major cost increases in supplies, printing, and mailing.

It is our estimate that the proposed fee schedule, if applied to claims entered and services rendered in fiscal 1973, would return to the Government 79 percent of the sum appropriated to the Office.

The draft incorporates the language and format of the fee schedule in the copyright revision bill, S. 1361 and H.R. 8186 but with increased charges. The Register would be authorized to fix fees for special services and for preparing copies of C.O. records on the basis of cost and to waive the fees for the United States Government and its agencies for occasional services.

A lower fee is proposed for unpublished works in recognition of their lower processing cost and the requirement of a second registration after publications. We also propose elimination of the present artificial barrier in section 12 to unpublished registration for books, periodicals, maps, and sound recordings. Changes are proposed in sections 1(e), 19 and 24 in order to make clear that certain references in these sections apply to works registered under section 12 as well as to published works. Consequential changes are proposed in sections 2 and 13.

The present law does not establish a fee for issuance of an import statement in connection with the importation of books under ad interim copyright. A fee of $3.00 is proposed for this service.

The proposed bill would abrogate the special provision of the present law which permits registration without any fee of works of foreign origin, under certain circumstances. This special provision was enacted in 1949 in recognition of the difficult hard currency situation in post-war Europe; it now seems outmoded.

We would propose an effective date of six months after enactment in order to enable the Copyright Office to prepare for the administrative problems of a fee increase. The paper shortage and printing delays especially require this amount of preparatory time. We would also clarify in section 2 that the new fee schedule applies to claims and other items received in the Copyright Office on the effective date and to services rendered on that date. The old fee schedule would apply if the claims or other items were received in acceptable form in the Copyright Office before the effective date and to services rendered before that date.

I join with the Register of Copyrights in recommending introduction of this bill and subsequent approval.

Sincerely yours,

L. QUINCY MUMFORD,
Librarian of Congress.

By Mr. HATFIELD (for himself and Mr. PACKWOOD):

S. 3964. A bill for the relief of U.S. Pumice Co., Los Angeles, Calif. Referred jointly, by unanimous consent, to the Committee on the Judiciary and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, the beautiful Three Sisters Wilderness Area in Oregon faces a serious threat of pumice mining. Because of a loophole in the 1964 Wilderness Act, which allows mining in wilderness areas, the U.S. Pumice Co. has claims in the area which it fully intends to mine. In my judgment, it would be irresponsible to stand by and watch the desecration of an area which the Congress has recognized as magnificent and unique for the purpose of supplying pumice for scouring bricks or pumice stone.

In the long run, I believe that the Wilderness Act of 1964 must be amended. Mining in wilderness areas is simply inconsistent with the purposes for which these areas are preserved. We in Oregon, however, must now deal with the immediate problem in the Three Sisters Wilderness Area.

The U.S. Pumice Co. has announced its desire to obtain access for motorized vehicles to the claims. While the Forest Service has denied access until an operation plan is submitted to them, the company will probably file a lawsuit against the Government to gain entry. The miners want to move a truck and front-end loader into the area for what they call mining claim assessment work.

The bill I am introducing today, which is similar to legislation I introduced in 1971, would provide for the reimbursement of the amount expended by the U.S. Pumice Co. in relation to their claims and would ban mining in the Three Sisters Wilderness Area. I believe that this is a fair approach and the best way to completely resolve the issue.

Mr. President, because of the twofold nature of this legislation, I ask unanimous consent that it be jointly referred to the Senate Committee on the Judiciary and the Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

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

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, the people of Oregon are united in their belief that mining this land would be totally inappropriate. As a sample of the opinion of my constituents, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Oregon Journal on this topic be printed in the RECORD.

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

PUMICE MINERS, GO HOME

The U.S. Forest Service ought to resist every way it legitimately can the announced intention of the U.S. Pumice Co. to build a road and drive mining machinery into the Three Sisters Wilderness west of Bend.

It would be an outrage if U.S. Pumice ever were to strip mine the block pumice to which it holds claims on Rock Mesa, at the southwest foot of the South Sister. The time to stop the miners is before they get started, and that means now.

The reason U.S. Pumice is able to assert its claim to the right to whittle part of the public's lands down into bunion scrapers and griddle cleaners is that under federal law, mining is the one commercial activity still allowed in official wilderness, from which all other mechanical intrusions are barred. That loophole in favor of the miners is a tribute not to logic or national necessity, but solely to their lobbying power and to the complaisance of the congressmen who allowed it to be inserted in the 1964 act which set up the national wilderness system in its present form.

Wilderness and grinding, roaring, dusty strip mining simply don't mix. It is absurd to suggest, as another Portland newspaper did in an editorial the other day, that for U.S. Pumice to open up its strip mine might not be so bad after all.

It is true that Rock Mesa is only a "jumbled tangle of rock," to borrow the other editorial writer's phrase, but so is the adjoining South Sister itself, not to mention Mt. Hood. Who, these days, would advocate mining on the Oregon beaches on the ground that after all, they're only sand?

It also is true that there once was a Model T road leading from the Cascade Lakes Highway to near the foot of Rock Mesa. But traces of that road are fast disappearing, now that it has been closed. Once let U.S. Pumice send its bulldozers and rock trucks crunching into that area, across the easily eroded lava gravel of the Wickiup Plain, and there will be a manmade scar on the wilderness that will last for decades.

U.S. Pumice does have a legitimate claim, under existing law, to the pumice, but that does not mean that it should be allowed to mine it. The best solution probably is for our members of Congress to obtain legislation to buy out those claims—preferably at a price based not on the ultimate value of the rock, but on the relatively trivial amount U.S. Pumice has spent on them so far.

The pumice mine project is thoroughly unwelcome in Oregon. It has not one single advocate other than the Los Angeles-based mining company itself. It must not be allowed to happen.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

S. 2711

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. Mondale) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2711, a bill to allow an additional income exemption for a taxpayer or his spouse who is deaf or deaf-blind.

S. 3955

At the request of Mr. METZENBAUM, the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. RIBICOFF), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HUGHES), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSTON), the Senator from California (Mr. TUNNEY), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. WEICKER), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. MCGOVERN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. NELSON), the Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. HASKELL), and the Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL) were added as cosponsors of S. 3955, the Foreign Investment Review Act.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 132

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I am pleased to announce that Senators DOLE, MOSS, and HUMPHREY have requested that their names be added as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 132.

This bill would authorize the President to issue anually a proclamation

designating that week in November which includes Thanksgiving Day as "National Family Week."

Since Senate Joint Resolution 132 was introduced by me on June 29, 1973, 15 Senators have joined as cosponsors. In addition, a number of Governors—including recently the Governors of Alabama, California, Georgia, Louisiana, Maine, Nebraska and West Virginia—have issued similar proclamations calling upon the citizens of their respective States to observe such a week with appropriate ceremonies and activities.

Obviously there is widespread interest in having 1 week set aside each year to recognize the importance and necessity of, and to express appreciation and gratitude for, the American family. We can all salute the beneficial role of the family unit in our country's heritage and in our modern democratic system.

In light of the heightened interest in having a "National Family Week," I fervently hope that the Subcommittee on Federal Charters, Holidays, and Celebrations and the Judiciary Committee will take favorable action on Senate Joint Resolution 132 in the very near future.

SENATE RESOLUTION 393—SUBMISSION OF A RESOLUTION RELATING TO A REPORT ENTITLED "THE COST OF CLEAN AIR"

(Referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration.)

Mr. RANDOLPH submitted the following resolution:

S. RES. 393

Resolved, That the annual report of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to the Congress of the United States (in compliance with section 312(a) of Public Law 91-604, The Clean Air Act, as amended), entitled "The Cost of Clean Air", be printed with illustrations as a Senate document.

SEC. 2. There shall be printed one thousand additional copies of such document for the use of the Committee on Public Works.

GENERAL REVISION OF THE COPYRIGHT LAW—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 1389

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senators from California (Mr. TUNNEY and Mr. CRANSTON), I submit an amendment to S. 1361, a bill for the general revision of the copyright law, title 17 of the United States Code, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by Senator TUNNEY, together with the text of the amendment, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHN V. TUNNEY

This amendment will impose the same penalty for willful infringement of the copyright in a motion picture as is provided in this bill for the willful infringement of the copyright in a sound recording.

As we all know, willful copyright infringement—pirating—of sound recordings has become a massive business. This prompted the Congress, in 1971, to enact legislation making it a crime to pirate sound recordings. Experience has shown, however, that the present penalties for record piracy are inadequate. In most cases, the relatively small fine which results from a conviction of the law does not deter the pirating operators; the fine is just added in as a cost of business.

In recognition of this fact, the drafters of this copyright bill have provided special treatment, in section 506, for record piracy. Section 506 spells out penalties for criminal infringement of copyright; that is, in the words of the bill, infringement which is willful and for purposes of commercial advantage or private financial gain. The penalty for this crime is set at a $2,500 fine and/or one year in prison for the first offense with a $10,000 fine and/or three years in jail for subsequent offenses. In the case of record piracy, however, section 506 provides a special scale of penalties: $25,000 fine and/or three years in jail for the first offense and rising to a $50,000 fine and/or seven years imprisonment for subsequent offenses. These are stiff penalties, designed to realistically deter very lucrative pirating enterprises.

Mr. President, the purpose of my amendment is to apply the same high level of deterrent penalties for record piracy to film piracy.

Pirating of motion picture films has become big business. Because it violates Federal law, the Federal Bureau of Investigation is directly involved in hunting down violators. The Bureau has recently set up a special unit working out of its Los Angeles office to deal with film pirating. Unlawful duplication of films is largely done in the United States, and the resulting sixteen millimeter prints are shipped throughout the world where they are sold or rented to home users, theaters, and for outdoor rural exhibition. The largest number of prints is shipped to South Africa, the Caribbean countries, and Latin America.

It should be noted that, as a result of this piracy, the Federal Government is being cheated of substantial tax revenues as well as further impairment of its foreign dollar earnings. Those who pirate films do not pay taxes on their income and rarely are their dollar earnings abroad legally or officially repatriated. But, legitimate American film producers are major dollar earners abroad; indeed, among the largest of any industry proportionate to the total volume of business done. The industry pays substantial Federal taxes on its earnings here and abroad.

The major film companies in my State of California employ, on a continuing basis, a large law firm and investigating agency in an effort to track down film pirates at a cost of several hundred thousand dollars annually. A recent lawsuit against one such piratical enterprise cost the industry some $350,000. The existing criminal penalties are of such a nature as to make it worthwhile to continue pirating.

Indeed, in view of the so-called Stevens Amendment in this bill which permits widespread taping of program material by and in behalf of offshore cable systems located in Alaska, Hawaii, and possibly Puerto Rico, the opportunity for increased illegal piratical taping may be enhanced. By giving statutory permission to tape and record programs, the Congress is now authorizing the physical creation of the copyright owner's work. These copies could become the basis for large scale world-wide piratical trading in filmed television programs. The Stevens Amendment would legally allow the creation of the very kinds of copies and tapes that the television and film industry has so strenuously tried to eliminate.

I appreciate that the proponent of this amendment, my distinguished colleague from Alaska (Mr. Stevens), assures me that the economics of the present taping operation require that the tapes be erased and reused. However, I cannot be entirely sure that some future offshore cable operator may not find it lucrative to allow some of his legally created tapes to be put to illegal purposes. I sincerely hope that this will never happen—but to make sure that it does not, I urge that the penalties be made very, very stiff.

There is very good reason, therefore, to make the penalties for film piracy the same as for record piracy—very heavy. The need for a deterrent is obvious. As opposed to the record piracy enterprise, which must literally have a factory continually pressing out records or duplicating tapes, the film pirate needs little equipment and can turn an enormous profit on sale of a very small number of units—even one or two. Thus, deterrence is essential.

The different nature of film and record distribution also explains the slight difference in legislative language applicable to the two media. In the case of sound recordings, the increased penalties apply to infringements of the copyright given in subsections (1) and (3) of section 106. These two subsections protect the copyright holder against infringement by unauthorized reproduction or distribution of the copyrighted work. In the case of the film piracy covered by my amendment, the heavy penalties will also apply to subsection (4) of section 106—unauthorized performance of a copyrighted work.

In the case of records, this provision is not needed, since the performance of pirated records or tapes normally occurs in the home by thousands of individuals. Criminal enforcement at this level is futile and unfair. In the case of film, however, the performance must take place, in most cases, at a theater or other public or private place where people are gathered. Some businessman must be involved in arranging, advertising, and receiving compensation for the performance of the pirated film. It makes very good sense to make this person liable for severe criminal penalties if he knows that he is performing a pirated film. In many cases, the distributor is the only person who can be reached by legal process. Therefore, subsection (4) is added in my amendment, but the effect is to give films the same protection as is afforded to sound recordings by section 506.

AMENDMENT NO. 1839

On page 138, line 36, following the words "Section 106" insert the following: "or the copyright in a motion picture afforded by subsections (1), (3), and (4) in Section 106".

ENERGY TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ACT OF 1974—AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 1840

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

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, I submit an amendment for printing which I intend to propose to the pending bill. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendment be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1840

On page 9, after line 17, insert the following:

SEC. 6. Section 8 of the Act of June 19, 1886 (24 Stat. 81; 46 U.S.C. 289) is amended by inserting at the end thereof the following: "Nothing in this section shall prohibit a foreign vessel from stopping at a port or place in the United States and temporarily disembarking passengers for a period not exceeding forty-eight hours, or such longer

period as the Secretary of the Treasury may determine necessary for the safety of such ship or passengers."

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1841 AND 1842

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

Mr. COTTON submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H.R. 8193) to require that a percentage of U.S. oil imports be carried on U.S.-flag vessels.

AMENDMENTS NOS. 1843, 1844, AND 1845

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

Mr. JAVITS submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H.R. 8193), supra.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I support the important objective of this bill to increase the use of U.S.-flagships in the importation of oil into this country. This objective becomes more important as we find ourselves in a position of increasing reliance on foreign oil sources. However, I also recognize that there are strong objections which have been voiced against the approach of H.R. 8193 on various grounds, especially including the inflationary impact of increasing the cost to consumers of imported oil over already skyrocketing prices.

I believe it is essential that we place a reasonable limitation on the amount charged that is more effective than the "fair and reasonable rates" limitation presently contained in the bill. That limitation cannot be expected to adequately protect the consumer unless the prices charged by American ships are required to bear a reasonable relationship to prevailing world charter rates.

The fair and reasonable rate provisions of H.R. 8193 are generally interpreted as referring to compensatory rates for U.S.-flag vessels or rates that cover fully allocated costs. Such costs for U.S.-flag vessels operating on major oil trade routes are approximately twenty percent higher than foreign flag vessels. The charter rates prevailing in world tanker markets generally are lower than the compensatory rates for U.S.-flag tankers, but at any time they may exceed such compensatory rates.

Various estimates have been made as to the potential impact of this bill on increasing the price of imported oil. It has been argued that this legislation will force the oil companies to reveal information, now largely hidden, about how prices are currently calculated for the flag of convenience fleet, and that this might even result in a diminution of prices. On the other hand, some administration sources predict price increases aggregating billions of dollars from this legislation in its present form.

The amendment I introduce today will at least insure that this legislation will not result in any significant price increases to consumers by conditioning the American-flag preference requirement on the availability of American-flag tankers at no more than 10 percent above the prevailing world rate, with the proviso that American-flag ships will not have to reduce their prices below what will give them a fair rate of return.

I submit that this is a reasonable compromise that meets much of the strenuous objection that has been made against the bill, including those of the administration, and that it will protect the consumer against artificial price increases due to this legislation while strengthening the U.S. merchant marine.

Mr. President, I am offering an additional amendment to waive 15 cents per barrel of the license import fee on refined oil products. This is comparable to the 15-cent waiver contained in the Senate Commerce Committee bill with respect to crude oil imports

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the amendments I submit today be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1843

On page 4, lines 15 and 16, strike "to the extent that such vessels are available at fair and reasonable rates for such vessels" and substituting "to the extent that such vessels are available at fair and reasonable rates, not to exceed: (1) a rate equal to a world scale charter rate of 110, if the prevailing charter rate is less than world scale 100; (2) 110 per centum of the prevailing world scale charter rate, if such prevailing rate is equal to or exceeds 100."

AMENDMENT NO. 1844

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

SEC. —. On or before February 1, 1977, the Secretary of Commerce shall submit to the Congress a report concerning the effect of the United States-flag preference requirements of this Act, together with his recommendations concerning such requirements.

AMENDMENT NO. 1845

On page 9, strike lines 7 through 17 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 5. (a) License fees payable pursuant to Presidential proclamation for imports of crude oil imported into the United States shall be reduced by 15 cents per barrel for a period of 5 years from the date of enactment of this Act if the Secretary of the Treasury determines—

"(i) such crude oil is transported by privately owned United States-flag commercial vessels; and

"(ii) the amount resulting from the nonpayment of such license fees is passed on to the ultimate consumers of such crude oil in whatever form it is when ultimately consumed.

"(b) License fees payable pursuant to Presidential proclamation for imports of oil products into the United States shall be reduced by 5 cents per barrel for a period of 5 years from the date of enactment of this Act if the Secretary of the Treasury determines—

"(i) such refined oil is transported by privately owned United States-flag vessels; and

"(ii) the amount resulting from the nonpayment of such license fees is passed on to the ultimate consumers of such refined oil."

ADDITIONAL COSPONSOR OF AN AMENDMENT

AMENDMENT NO. 1613

At the request of Mr. HOLLINGS, the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) was added as a cosponsor of Amendment No. 1613 concerning the plight of our men missing in action in Indochina, intended to be proposed to (S. 3471) the Military Construction bill.

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 119 AND SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 130

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by him in connection with certain hearings scheduled by the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BAYH

Mr. President, the Senate Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments is scheduling further hearings on two proposed amendments to the Constitution: Senate Joint Resolution 119, for the protection of unborn children and other persons, and Senate Joint Resolution 130, to guarantee the right of life to the unborn, the ill, the aged or the incapacitated.

The next day of hearings will be on Thursday, September 12, in room 318 Russell Senate Office Building, beginning at 10:00 a.m.

Any persons wishing to submit statements for the hearing record should contact the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments, room 300 Russell Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20510.

NOTICE OF HEARING BY THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOUNDATIONS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, at the request of the distinguished Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by him and an announcement pertaining to hearings of the Subcommittee of Foundations be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HARTKE

On September 9th and 10th, the Subcommittee on Foundations will hold hearings which will examine the role of private foundations in public broadcasting. The hearings will commence each day at 9:30 a.m. in room 2227 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building.

[PRESS RELEASE]

FINANCE SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOUNDATIONS ANNOUNCES HEARINGS ON ROLE OF PRIVATE FOUNDATIONS IN PUBLIC BROADCASTING

Senator Vance Hartke (D., Ind.), Chairman of the Finance Committee's Subcommittee on Foundations, today announced that the Subcommittee will hold two days of hearings next month on the role of foundations in public broadcasting.

Senator Hartke stated that the purpose of the hearings was to determine what role foundations had in the early days of public broadcasting, what role they are now playing, and what role they are likely to play in the future. The Senator noted that this inquiry was particularly appropriate since the President has recently proposed legislation to aid in the long-range financing of public broadcasting.

The hearings will take place at 9:30 a.m. on September 9 and 10 in the Finance Committee hearing room, Room 2227, Dirksen Senate Office Building.

Requests to Testify.—Senator Hartke advised that witnesses desiring to testify during this hearing must make their request to testify to Michael Stern, Staff Director, Committee on Finance, 2227 Dirksen Senate Office

Building, Washington, D.C., not later than August 29, 1974. Witnesses will be notified as soon as possible after this cutoff date as to when they are scheduled to appear. Once the witness has been advised of the date of his appearance, it will not be possible for this date to be changed. If for some reason the witness is unable to appear on the date scheduled, he may file a written statement for the record of the hearing in lieu of a personal appearance.

Consolidated Testimony.—Senator Hartke also stated that the Subcommittee urges all witnesses who have a common position or with the same general interest to consolidate their testimony and designate a single spokesman to present their common viewpoint orally to the Subcommittee. This procedure will enable the Subcommittee to receive a wider expression of views than it might otherwise obtain. Senator Hartke urged very strongly that all witnesses exert a maximum effort, taking into account the limited advance notice, to consolidate and coordinate their statements.

Legislative Reorganization Act.—In this respect, he observed that the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, requires all witnesses appearing before the Committees of Congress "to file in advance written statements of their proposed testimony, and to limit their oral presentations to brief summaries of their argument."

Senator Hartke stated that in light of this statute and in view of the large number of witnesses who desire to appear before the Subcommittee in the limited time available for the hearing, all witnesses who are scheduled to testify must comply with the following rules:

(1) A copy of the statement must be filed by the close of business on Friday, September 6.

(2) All witnesses must include with their written statement a summary of the principal points included in the statement.

(3) The written statements must be typed on letter-size paper (not legal size) and at least 50 copies must be submitted before the beginning of the hearing.

(4) Witnesses are not to read their written statements to the Subcommittee, but are to confine their ten minute oral presentations to a summary of the points included in the statement.

(5) Not more than ten minutes will be allowed for the oral summary. Witnesses who fail to comply with these rules will forfeit their privilege to testify.

Written Statements.—Witnesses who are not scheduled for oral presentation, and others who desire to present their views to the Subcommittee, are urged to prepare a written statement for submission and inclusion in the printed record of the hearings. These written statements should be submitted to Michael Stern, Staff Director, Committee on Finance, Room 2227, Dirksen Senate Office Building not later than September 30, 1974.

CHARLES A. LINDBERGH

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, it is most appropriate that we pay memorial tribute to Charles A. Lindbergh, aviation pioneer and genuine American hero.

Charles Lindbergh was unusually courageous and greatly gifted in his field. Like many men of his stature he generated controversy by his words and gained fame through his deeds. He also suffered great personal tragedy; and, had something of a murky record on Nazi Germany before World War II.

But few of us who lived through the tense hours of Lucky Lindy's historic flight will ever fail to remember the jubilation at his safe landing in France, nor will we forget the charm, the personal confidence—and the sense of partial bemusement—Lindbergh first manifested on his triumphant return to America. Indeed, these qualities proved to be the essential characteristics of the man throughout his life. And throughout his life Charles Lindbergh retained a sense of deep personal dignity and detachment from the tumult of his times and the notoriety of his heroic feat.

He was one of our first and most ardent conservationists, warning us early of the danger implicit in the unwise use of technology and its devices.

Charles Lindbergh was on the whole an authentic national hero—with a confidence in the essential limitlessness of human possibilities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the following tribute to Charles A. Lindbergh, which appears in the September 9, 1974, issue of Time magazine, be printed in its entirety in the RECORD.

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

THE LONE EAGLE'S FINAL FLIGHT

In a sense it was a stunt, a daredevil adventure that no man who was concerned about his safety and his future should have attempted. But Charles Lindbergh's 1927 pioneering solo flight across the Atlantic in a single-engine plane that cruised at less than 100 m.p.h. was surely the most glorious stunt of the century—one of those pristinely pure but magnificently eloquent gestures that awaken people everywhere to life's boundless potential. For most of his life Lindbergh was looked upon as an argonaut of the air age, a Ulysses from Minnesota. When he died of cancer of the lymphatic system last week at age 72, America lost not only one of its pioneers of the machine age but perhaps its last authentic hero.

Lindbergh's father, a populist Republican Congressman from Minnesota, had taught him to be totally self-reliant—"One boy's a boy; two boys are half a boy; three boys are no boy at all," Lindbergh fondly quoted him as saying—and the son always had a vigorous contempt for the herd mentality. Itching to fly ever since he first saw an airplane as a child, Lindbergh spent a year and a half at the University of Wisconsin. Then, unable to sit any longer in a classroom, he enrolled in a flying school in Nebraska.

"I began to feel that I lived on a higher plane than the skeptics of the ground," he later wrote. "In flying, I tasted a wine of the gods of which they could know nothing. Who valued life more highly, the aviators who spent it on the art they loved, or these misers who doled it out like pennies through their antlike days? I decided that if I could fly for ten years before I was killed in a crash, it would be a worthwhile trade for an ordinary lifetime."

The young pilot barnstormed the country after he finished flying school, offering plane rides at $5 a head to farmers and small-town people. Later he flew airmail between St. Louis and Chicago, which in the primitive conditions of the '20s was about as hazardous as riding the Pony Express through a tribe of angry Comanches. A natural flyer, with as certain a feel for the whim of his plane as a bareback rider for his horse, he was ineluctably drawn to aviation's biggest prize: $25,000, offered by a New York hotel owner for the first successful completion of the 3,600-mile solo flight between New York and Paris. With the backing of some young St. Louis businessmen and $2,000 from his own savings, Lindbergh ordered a plane built by Ryan Airlines in San Diego to his peculiar specifications; it was in effect one giant gasoline tank with wings, a propeller and a bucket seat. He named it *The Spirit of St. Louis,* and in May 1927 flew it to New York.

MYSTERIOUS CHEMISTRY

Other flyers were waiting for the good weather of spring to try the distance. Learning that Atlantic squalls would soon lift, Lindbergh decided to be first and lifted off from Long Island's Roosevelt Field even before the weather turned. The *Spirit* was so weighted with fuel that he cleared the telephone lines at the end of the runway by only 20 feet. His route took him up through New England, over Nova Scotia and Newfoundland, past the green southern tips of Ireland and England, and finally over the Channel to France.

Even before he landed, some mysterious chemistry, an interaction between his own personality and public need and desire, had caught the imagination of millions. For the 33⅓ hours of the flight, many people on both sides of the Atlantic talked of little else but the chances of a man who had already been dubbed "the Lone Eagle." Shortly after 10 p.m. on May 21, he circled Le Bourget Airport, but was puzzled by what looked like enormous traffic jams on the nearby roads. He quickly found out the cause; even before the *Spirit's* propeller stilled, both Lindbergh and his plane were engulfed by shouting, crying, joyfully hysterical Parisians.

SIMPLE DIGNITY

The shouting and the hysteria did not stop for years thereafter, but Lindbergh managed to retain his simple dignity. "He stood forth amidst clamor and crowds," said U.S. Ambassador to France Myron Herrick of the 25-year-old pilot, "the very embodiment of fearless, kindly, cultivated American youth—unspoiled, unspoilable." Lindbergh was offered a $1 million movie contract, another $1 million to go into vaudeville, and presents that range form a live monkey to a home in Flushing Meadows, N.Y. Most of the presents were declined or turned over to the Missouri Historical Society, and one of the few contracts he accepted was one to write his own story, *We*—the other person being his airplane.

The Lindbergh name was magic all over the world, and the extent of his fame is impossible to understand now, when celebrities are made daily on TV. If he sent shirts to the laundry, they were not sent back. If he wrote a check, it was never cashed. If he checked a hat, it was somehow lost. All became souvenirs, precious talismans of the otherwise cynical Jazz Age.

Two years after his flight, Lindbergh, now an aviation consultant, married Anne Morrow, the bright, pretty daughter of Dwight Morrow, a rich New York City banker who was then serving as U.S. Ambassador to Mexico. Anne was a writer, later destined for fame on her own, and together they settled down to a quiet, productive life in New Jersey. Peace was short-lived, however. In 1932, the Lindberghs' first and then only child, 20-month-old Charles Jr., was kidnaped from a second-floor nursery. Ten weeks later, the body was found in a shallow grave in some woods near the Lindbergh home. Bruno Richard Hauptmann, a Bronx carpenter, was later convicted in probably the most celebrated trial of the century, and then electrocuted for the murder. Throughout the search for Charles Jr. and throughout the Hauptmann trial, the Lindberghs were hounded by the press, which treated their ordeal with savage sensationalism. Finally, Lindbergh packed up his family (there were eventually five other children) and moved to Britain and then France, where he stayed until the eve of World War II.

Impressed by the progress of Nazi Germany's air machine, and equally appalled by the lack of preparedness in Britain and France, Lindbergh in 1941 joined America First, an isolationist group, in urging the U.S. to stay out of the war. Britain and

France were doomed, he said, and Germany and the Soviet Union would eventually destroy each other. Though he immediately volunteered for service after Pearl Harbor, President Roosevelt would not forgive his earlier opposition to America's policy of helping the Allies, and he refused him a uniform. As a civilian consultant to the War Department, however, Lindbergh was able to perform valuable service in improving planes and fighting techniques, both on the assembly lines at home and on the battlefields of the South Pacific.

Nonetheless, Lindbergh never recanted his isolationist position. While he was never an anti-Semite or a fascist, as some charged at the time, he remained appallingly insensitive to the true evils of the Hitler regime. "His self-confidence thickened into arrogance," said English Writer Harold Nicolson, an old friend. "His mind had been sharpened by fame and tragedy until it had become as hard, as metallic and a narrow as a chisel."

After the war Lindbergh, while still remaining a high-level consultant to Pan American World Airways, became an early, ardent and passionate conservationist, traveling around the world in the cause of the environment. In his last years his favorite spot was a simple, five-acre retreat on the Hawaiian island of Maui. And Maui was where he chose to die and be buried. When doctors at Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center in New York told him last month that he had only days to live. Lindbergh, confined to a stretcher, had himself flown to Maui, where he arranged the details of his funeral and burial as meticulously as he had planned his flight to Paris 47 years before. Following his instructions, he was buried within eight hours after his death. Hawaiian cowboys crafted a roughhewn casket of eucalyptus wood, and a grave was quickly dug atop a cliff overlooking the Pacific. His body was dressed in a khaki work shirt and dark cotton work trousers and, according to his wishes, his pallbearers also wore simple work clothes. The other mourners, including his wife and his son Land, wore Hawaiian-style attire.

STORIED VICTORY

In contrast to the spartan funeral, tributes poured in from over the world, more befitting a great leader than a man who considered himself a simple aviator. President Ford said that Lindbergh "represented all that was best in our country—honesty, courage and the will to greatness." It is doubtful whether younger generations could fully appreciate his achievement. For those who were listening to their radios in 1927, however, or who have the wit and imagination to re-create the epoch in their own minds, Lindbergh's daring, lonely journey will remain forever matchless, a storied victory of one man over nature, his own fears and the imponderable odds against him.

LAST FLIGHT OF CHARLES A. LINDBERGH

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, last Thursday, August 26, the Washington Star-News "People" section carried an article on the last flight of Charles A. Lindbergh. I would like to share this article with my colleagues because it is a testament to the ultimate consideration on the part of one of America's greatest heroes.

LAST FLIGHT

During the filming of the biographical film "The Spirit of St. Louis" several years ago, United Air Lines pilot William J. Picune served as a stand-in for Charles A. Lindbergh. Eight days before Lindbergh's death this week, Picune was the pilot of the plane that carried the stretcher-borne Lindbergh to Hawaii. Picune asked Lindbergh if he would like the plane to circle the island of Maui once before landing. "He said, 'Oh, no, captain, I don't want to inconvenience the other passengers.' "

Mr. President, not one of us would have been inconvenienced.

THE DEATH OF GEN. CREIGHTON W. ABRAMS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I would ask that we pause a moment to reflect on the untimely and tragic death this morning of Gen. Creighton W. Abrams, Chief of Staff of the Army.

While I did not know General Abrams well, I knew of and respected his dedication to his chosen profession.

Leading American soldiers during 38 years of service and doing his country's bidding in three wars, General Abrams was recognized early for exceptional ability. He was a fearless and brilliant armored leader under General Patton in World War II.

During the turbulence of the Korean war and the tragic Vietnam experience, he was a tower of strength to his colleagues and to his men who called him "Abe." Assuming leadership of the Army during its most difficult period in recent times, he returned it to health under the volunteer concept, winning the confidence and admiration of the Nation as he did so.

On Capitol Hill, General Abrams' name was a byword of professionalism, candor, and personal integrity. His proposals were tempered with caution and balanced with a keen appreciation for the needs of the country. Once Congress had acted in national security matters, he carried out its will in a spirit of unselfish duty and patriotism. I would remind you that it was General Abrams who took the lead in disestablishing unneeded military headquarters, in improving the ratio of combat to support forces, and in restoring a proper balance to the grade structure of the Army. His vision of service was above any narrow or parochial view. For that reason, he was rarely seen in the Halls of Congress, lobbying for this project or that system. He deliberately avoided the bypaths of press agentry and public relations. Instead, he did his job within the Army, whose men knew him and loved him. To American soldiers everywhere, this deep-voiced craggy-faced, but gentle, man epitomized what a general should be. They recognized in him the highest ideals of duty, honor, and service to country.

Mr. President, the country mourns the death of this outstanding soldier. Mrs. Mansfield and I extend our sincere condolences to his wife, Julie, and his children. He will be in our prayers.

EDUCATION PROVISIONS OF THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

Mr. CLARK. Mr. President, on Saturday, September 7, I will be meeting with munity from the entire State of Iowa to representatives of the education com- explain the landmark education bill which was recently enacted into law. The distinguished chairman of the Education Subcommittee, Mr. PELL, has compiled a concise summary of the provisions of the bill, and I ask unanimous consent that this factsheet be printed in the RECORD for the benefit of those Iowa citizens interested in the new law.

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

FACTSHEET ON THE EDUCATION PROVISIONS OF H.R. 69 AS REPORTED BY THE COMMITTEE ON CONFERENCE

The conference report on H.R. 69 extends the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the impact aid laws, the Adult Education Act, the Bilingual Education Act, and the Indian Education Act through fiscal year 1978. It also extends the Education of the Handicapped Act through fiscal year 1977 and the Emergency School Aid Act through fiscal year 1976.

TITLE I, ESEA

The Title I formula is amended to allocate funds on the basis of more current data. State agency programs for handicapped, migrant, and neglected and delinquent children will receive funds in accordance with the new formula and will continue to receive funds "off the top" in accordance with established practice. No State agency will receive less than its fiscal 1974 allocation. Each local education agency will receive at least 85% of its previous year's allocation. The 1975 authorization is estimated at $3.1 billion for LEA grants.

Part B of Title I, incentive grants to States with a high tax effort for education, is continued with a maximum appropriation of $50 million.

Part C, grants to areas with high concentrations of low income children, is extended through 1975.

Authority is contained in the bill for a separate authorization which permits the Commissioner in special circumstances to make grants to school districts which are receiving less than 90% of their previous year's allocation.

A by-pass for non-public school children is included.

OTHER TITLES

Titles II, III, and VIII of ESEA are extended through 1978 and Title III of NDEA is extended through fiscal year 1977. These programs may not be funded in any year in which there is a consolidation of programs as described below.

CONSOLIDATION

State operated programs are combined into the following divisions:

(a) "Libraries and Learning Resources" included ESEA I, NDEA III, and the guidance and counseling portion of ESEA III.

(b) "Support and Innovation" includes the balance of ESEA III, Nutrition and Health and Dropout Prevention from Title VIII, and ESEA V.

Consideration must be forward funded and during the first year there will be a 50% hold-harmless for each person.

A by-pass for non-public school children is included.

Total discretion is given to local educational agencies on spending under Libraries and Learning Resources. States distribute funds under Support and Innovation on a project grant basis.

Also adopted is a provision for a simplified State application for ESEA I, II, III, NDEA III, Adult Education, Vocational Education, and Education of the Handicapped.

The Special Projects Act is included which provided an "incubator for new categorical programs. Under this concept new programs

will be protected for a period and then will compete for funding without the protection of set-asides. These new programs include Women's Educational Equity, Career Education, Consumer's Education, Gifted and Talented, Community Schools, Metric Education, and Arts in Education.

IMPACT AID

Effective in fiscal 1976, amendments are accepted which will include guaranteed funding for public housing children of 25% of entitlement, equal to about $53 million in 1976. Entitlements for military children remain as in current law. Entitlement rates for civilian children are reduced slightly for those who live within the same county (from 50% to 45%) and for those who live within a different county in the same State (50% to 40%). Entitlements for those who live in a different State are eliminated except that those payments will be reduced over a number of years as the result of hold-harmless provisions.

School districts with a 25% or more of their enrollments "a" children will be guaranteed the full amounts of their entitlements for these children.

No school district which received more than 10% of its budget from impact aid will have its payments reduced less than 10% each year. Districts which receive less are guaranteed 80% of their previous year's payments. Also every district is guaranteed that it will not lose any regular impact aid funds due to the inclusion of public housing children.

Handicapped children of military personnel will be entitled to a payment of 1½ times that of other children. These funds must be used for the purposes of providing special education for these children.

Funds which a district receives as the result of public housing children must be used for programs of compensatory education.

ADULT EDUCATION

The Commissioner's 20% set-aside is deleted and all funds are to be allocated to the States. Up to 20% of a State's funds may be used for high school equivalency programs.

The program of adult education for Indians is continued through 1978.

HANDICAPPED

All existing programs for the handicapped are extended through fiscal year 1977. For fiscal 1975, $630 million is authorized to be allocated among the States on the basis of total population ages 3–21. These funds will be particularly helpful in meeting requirements for the education of all handicapped children facing many States as the result of court decisions.

States are required to show how they will meet the needs of those children.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Authorizations are increased and special emphasis is placed on the training of personnel. Funds are also provided to States to assist them in developing their capacities to develop programs of bilingual education.

A national assessment of the need for bilingual education is to be conducted in 1975 and 1977 and sent to the Congress.

Also included is a program of fellowships for students who will enter the field of training teachers in bilingual education.

READING

A new program of reading improvement is included. Funds are authorized for grants to local educational agencies and States for comprehensive programs of reading improvement and projects which show promise of overcoming reading deficiencies. Also included are funds for special emphasis projects in reading, for the training of reading teachers on public television, and for reading academies.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Included are two new programs which provide funds in fiscal 1975 for bilingual vocational training and bilingual vocational education.

INDIAN EDUCATION

The Indian Elementary and Secondary School Assistance Act is extended through 1978. Up to 10% of the funds are to be made available to Indian controlled schools.

An annual authorization of $2 million for special training programs for training teachers of Indian children is included and a program of fellowships for Indian students is also included.

OTHER PROGRAMS

The Emergency School Aid Act is continued through 1976. The authority to fund educational parks and the set-aside for metropolitan areas programs are repealed.

An amendment to authorize the CLEO program to assist disadvantaged students to prepare for and attend law schools is accepted.

The Ethnic Studies program is extended through 1978.

A program of grants to States to assist them in planning State equalization programs is included. Grants range from $100,000 to $1,000,000 per State depending upon population.

MISCELLANEOUS FEATURES

An upgraded National Center for Education Statistics within the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education is created.

Regionalization of the Office of Education without an act of Congress authorizing such regionalization is forbidden.

Congress is afforded the opportunity to disapprove regulations for any Federal aid program for education.

Parents of students and students attending post-secondary institutions are afforded the right to inspect their school files and the release of documents in those files is restricted.

THE BICENTENNIAL OF ST. JOHN THE EVANGELIST CHURCH

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, on September 15, 1974, St. John the Evangelist Church will be 200 years old. For two centuries this church, which is located in the Forest Glen-Silver Spring area of Maryland, has served the people of Maryland and the District of Columbia. Although often overlooked, St. John the Evangelist Church should be considered a focal point in the Free State's cultural legacy, as well as a landmark in the establishment and organization of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States.

The historic tradition of the St. John the Evangelist Parish stems from the colonial era, when the first of three structures was built on the site of the present church. The original church was established and dedicated by Father John Carroll in 1774. The church, or the Rock Creek Mission as it was then known, became the center of a vast and influential missionary effort which reached throughout the greater Washington area. Rapidly Father Carroll's mission became one of the most important religious organizations in the Southern Colonies.

A key to the success of the mission, and the historic tradition which it fostered in Maryland, lie in the character of its founder, the Reverend John Carroll.

Father Carroll was a member of the distinguished Carroll family who has left their mark in many ways on Maryland and the Nation. His cousin, Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, was a signer of the Declaration of Independence, a noted revolutionary leader and U.S. Senator from Maryland. According to contemporary accounts, John Carroll possessed tremendous energy, eloquent speech, and a towering intellect. His studies took him throughout Europe and he traveled to the major centers of learning and culture of his day. It was as an ordained Jesuit that Father Carroll returned to America. Although he took no active part in the Revolutionary conflict, he nevertheless, supported the rebellion from the pulpit.

At the request of the Continental Congress in 1776, Father Carroll accompanied the American commissioners on the ill-fated trip to Montreal seeking to enlist Canadian support for the American cause. Although the mission failed, Father Carroll was of notable assistance to Franklin, Chase, and Charles Carroll.

Following the Revolution, with most American religious organizations in chaos, Father Carroll petitioned Rome for the power to allow American Catholics to choose their own religious leaders. This was especially important, because the French were plotting ways to gain control of the Catholic Church in the United States. Permission was granted, and in 1790, John Carroll was named as the first Roman Catholic bishop in the United States.

As bishop, Carroll continued his great work of organizing the Catholic Church in America, and writing—notably his famous address on the death of Washington. In addition, he did outstanding work in the field of education; establishing Georgetown College—which he eventually turned over to the Society of Jesus; St. Mary's College in Baltimore; Mount St. Mary's College in Emmitsburg, Md.; and he asisted other religious orders in projects such as the establishment of the Dominican's College of St. Joseph which is also located in Emmitsburg.

In 1808, Baltimore was made an archdiocese and John Carroll became the first American archbishop. Archbishop Carroll was in Baltimore during the bombardment of Fort McHenry in 1814. As a witness to this significant happening in our Nation's history, the archbishop helped to record these events in letters to friends and other writings. He continued his fine work until his death in 1815, leaving the Catholic Church a strong and viable religious body.

Mr. President, the St. John the Evangelist Church is deeply rooted in the traditions and history of Maryland and the United States. The parish has since had many distinguished visitors and religious leaders, including Cardinal Gibbons, who laid the cornerstone of the new church in 1893. In the church's cemetary are buried some of the most famous families in Maryland and Virginia, including the Carrolls, the Brents, the Digges, the Morgans, the Moshers, and the Chiltons. It was said by the Rev. Thomas O'Gorman, D.D., on the growth of the American church:

St. John's, Forest Glen, was the Bethlehem of the church in America and Baltimore was the Jerusalem . . . on the spot had

sprung the Catholic hierarchy of this country; on this spot was planted the mustard seed from which had grown a great tree; and St. John's Chapel, founded here by Father Carroll, has impregnated the entire country with Catholicism . . . John Carroll in this country was the Father of Religious Civilization as George Washington was of Temporal Civilization.

Mr. President, it is indeed a pleasure for me to join in congratulating the parishioners of St. John the Evangelist Church as they mark this significant milestone in the history of Roman Catholicism in America.

DEAN RUSK, FORMER SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, the University of Georgia is very fortunate to have on its faculty the only living former Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, who served under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. Mr. Rusk was Secretary of State during some of the most turbulent times in recent history, and he brings to the university a wide range of experiences and knowledge that has been of great benefit to his students and associates.

Now the Sibley professor of international law in Athens, Ga., he has earned a warm reputation among the members of the academic community as one who enjoys his work and gives of himself tirelessly.

Many of the Members of the Senate know my fellow Georgian, and I think they will read with interest an account of his activities and interests now that he has left Washington. He has had and continues to have a profound influence on the course of events here and abroad.

An article appeared in the Atlanta Journal and Constitution magazine of August 18, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE SUPERSTAR PROFESSOR—DEAN RUSK IS GETTING HIGH GRADES ON HIS PERFORMANCE AT THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

(By John W. English)

In his four years at the University of Georgia, Dean Rusk has generated enough press coverage in both local and national media to make P. T. Barnum seem like a bush league novice. Despite all the public attention, Rusk, the nation's only living former secretary of state who served two full terms, insists he's trying to be as private a citizen as possible.

After eight hyperactive and hectic years as a mainstay of the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, Rusk might have been expected to slow down when he settled into the Safuel H. Sibley chair of international and comparative law at Athens. Instead he has become the quintessential, peripatetic Mr. Chips, not only teaching his classes and seminars and earning the praise of his students, but also performing an impressive range of service activities for the university as well.

Unlike some faculty superstars elsewhere who spend their time traveling or are cloistered writing memoirs or best sellers, Rusk is on campus most of the academic year and accessible to students and faculty colleagues. In his cozy, green-carpeted office he sits surrounded by inscribed photographs of historical figures he worked with, and reads, prepares lecture material, grades student papers and chats with visitors.

He seems to be genuinely enjoying the academic life, after a 28-year detour from his first teaching job at Mills College. His former dour public image gone, he is relaxed and sociable. Conversations are full of friendly banter and wit. When his wry sense of humor surfaces, listeners are delighted.

Rusk makes about 50 off-campus speaking appearances a year, usually in the region and most often in small towns or on other campuses. His audiences have been varied: distinguished scholarly and legal groups, the national Jaycee convention, local church groups, commencements, Navy officers' wives in Athens. But his messages are always topical and often global, a reflection of his concern about the growing mood of American isolationism and his respect for ordinary citizens and their ability to understand complex foreign policy issues.

As an architect of modern history, Rusk also gives his listeners a seasoned historical perspective on current events. For example, he recently reminded the Atlanta Kiwanis Club that detente with the Soviet Union, the cornerstone of current foreign policy, actually began under President Kennedy with the nuclear test ban treaty of 1963.

As he often did in press briefings at the Department of State, he still probes what he calls "the fog of the future." In a talk to American Legionnaires, he warned that the United States might not be sitting at the table of superpowers in 10 years unless it maintains a steady defense posture with its allies, particularly Europe.

Since leaving Washington in 1970, Rusk has kept a low personal political profile, hesitating to criticize President Nixon and only recently nipping at Secretary of State Henry Kissinger. However, Rusk has publicly expressed the opinion that while impeachment would probably have little impact on foreign relations, he "would give odds against impeachment." He also noted that senators who have already spoken out for Nixon's resignation may have a conflict when asked to take an oath of impartiality to try the President.

On Kissinger's personal diplomacy approach, Rusk expressed concern that "he may become the only spokesman that other governments will receive and listen to," yet he praises his successor's negotiating talents. He doesn't try to second-guess the Nixon administration because he now lacks complete information.

Although known to be weary of the Washington scene, Rusk does continue to share his experience and knowledge with members of the current administration by serving on the advisory committee of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency and on the State Department's law of the sea panel. Recently he also agreed to serve on a Democratic party task force seeking "sober, responsible and bold" solutions to foreign and domestic issues of the 1970s.

On campus, Rusk often guest-lectures to classes in political science, history and journalism and earns a warm reception, even from those who earlier opposed his Vietnam policies. Students comment that they are impressed with his openness dignified "Southern gentleman" presence, his incredible recall of details of historic events and his ability to clarify issues and to articulate his views.

Rusk has also drawn on his personal connections with the mighty to attract such figures as Arthur Goldberg, the late Earl Warren, Gen. Earl Wheeer, Patricia Roberts Harris and Pierre Salinger to campus events. When his undersecretary of state and close friend George W. Ball attended the annual alumni seminar in February, the inevitable comparisons were revealing. In discussing China, Rusk's formal diplomatic style and conservative positions were in clear contrast to Mr. Ball's more free-wheeling, critical stance.

"When China went communist in 1949, we (the U.S.) had some of the feelings of a jilted lover," Rusk told the 400 assembled alumni. Later he said: "It will take a great deal of patience, time, persistence to get agreements on large or small points which might be in the interests of both sides but (control) of Taiwan will, for some time, remain the bone in the throat for both sides."

"Lamentably maladroit" was the way Ball characterized America's recent relations with China. He also called the present U.S. policy towards China a "reprise of an old theme"—the open door policy of the turn of the century.

Much of the credit for the success of the China seminar, which drew more than twice as many alumni as past events, goes to Rusk, according to Tyus Butler, alumni relations director. "He has given generously of his advice, time and counsel," Butler said. "As keynote speaker in 1971 and a seminar participant for the past two years, he has been a major factor in the success of the program."

Rusk has also recently aided the university's educational television station, WGTV, with its Great Decisions series by appearing on three of the eight shows and helping with others. On those shows, broadcast in March and April, he talked on "The Atlantic Community," "The President Vs. the Congress: Who makes Foreign Policy Decisions?" and "Cuba and the Panama Canal."

Great Decisions producer James Shehane said of Rusk's assistance: "Without him, we couldn't have done the series. He's been extremely helpful in contacting participants for the show because he can pick up the phone and get someone like Treasury Secretary William Simon."

In another recent public television show, Rusk appeared on William F. Buckley's "Firing Line," and admitted that he may have made at least two mistakes in judgment about Vietnam: "I underestimated the tenacity of the North Vietnamese and I overestimated the patience of the American people."

Unless asked directly, however, Mr. Rusk avoids discussing Vietnam and says it will be up to future historians to decide 10 or 20 years hence whether his policies contributed to a durable peace there or not.

Dealing with newsmen occupies more of Rusk's time than he likes, though he rarely refuses an interview. Recently he has told groups of journalists—such as the American Society of Newspaper Editors, Sigma Delta Chi, the Georgia Press Association and the Georgia Association of Broadcasters—both good news and bad.

"I do believe that the American people are better served by the totality of their news media than are the people in any other country I've visited," he tells media people. "The press has a duty to get the news. There are times when public officials have a duty to keep their mouths shut. This creates a built-in tension between press and officials, which in my view is wholesome and must never be eliminated either by law or some sort of treaty between the press and public officials.

But Rusk worries aloud about the press' problem of extraction—choosing what news to report in limited time and space. "Citizens ought to know that there is a lot going on to which they have no access. It is difficult, therefore, for the average citizen to get a view of reality—especially of the government—from the media."

Another annoyance Rusk has with the press is its neglect in not verifying information before it's published. When Neil Sheehan, the New York Times reporter who prepared the Pentagon Papers for publication, came to Athens to speak, Rusk visited with him informally and criticized the Times'

secret handling and sensational release of the documents. "The New York Times' editors did not call together the Washington press corps and say, 'Here's some material the people have a right to know,' and then make it available to all the press," Rusk said. "No. They postponed the people's right to know for three months in order to insure that the New York Times would give it to them as a scoop."

Rusk also wondered why Sheehan never called to ask if any of the statements attributed to him in the Pentagon Papers were true. According to Rusk, the Times man admitted he had no satisfactory explanation.

Rusk has publicly charged David Halberstam with incomplete reporting in the book "The Best and the Brightest." "Although he said in his introduction that he interviewed 400 sources, Halberstam never interviewed me or some of the other principals I have checked with, namely Bob McNamara and Walt Rostow," Rusk said.

Rusk hinted he might write an article answering Halberstam's popular version of recent history. In his first year out of office, Rusk put his own recollections of his Washington years on tape for the Kennedy and Johnson libraries. He says this tape will not be made public for 20 years.

International law affecting the environment has become one of Rusk's academic passions and he has been chiding the press for ignoring the law of the sea conference in Venezuela in June. Rusk wrote an article in a campus newletter about the meeting's significance. In it he said:

"Unless the world community can achieve major advances in the law of the sea within the next year or two, we may see a race for the national control of open ocean areas comparable to the race for control of land areas which occurred when Europe exploded into great colonial empires. . . .

"It is of even more importance that we recognize that the outcome of the conference can affect each of us in our daily lives and that the human race is at a crucial fork in the road: either we shall create a new, rational and fair law of the sea or we shall find ourselves in a new era of tension, controversy and possible violence."

Raising such contemporary issues is Rusk's forte, and when an inter-American colloquium was held on campus, the law of the sea was on the agenda.

On the challenge of establishing a durable peace in the world, Rusk sees his role now as "strengthening and deepening the processes of international law. It is on that point I have decided to spend the time that remains to me. I'm not going to pretend to write any prescriptions on the other aspects of the problem because, in a certain sense, my voice comes out of the past. A new generation will have to take hold of these questions and find the answers. The generation that is leaving the scene cannot prescribe the answers to those entering the scene. One of the things my generation can do is pray that some answers are found."

Rusk expresses an enormous confidence in the younger generation. "I've visited a lot of campuses in the last four years and have found that this generation is more alert, better informed and more concerned with real issues than those of the past." At the same time, he urges students not to ignore the mistakes of their fathers and repeat those of their grandfathers.

"I hope your generation can put another 25 years without a hostile nuclear-weapon firing on to the 25 we've recorded," he often tells students.

Rusk gets his points across to students subtly both in the classroom and in informal contacts. The student journalists on the University of Georgia student newspaper, the Red and Black, quietly recognized that Rusk made good copy with his insights and cogent quotes. When the Middle East war erupted last fall, news editor Joyce Murdoch went to see him and wrote a long front page story of their discussion. Later the article won her first place and a $900 scholarship in a national newswriting contest.

Red and Black editor Susan Wells said, "Mr. Rusk not only lends prestige to the law school and campus, but he's also very open to students and even gave us an exclusive interview after refusing to see others from the press."

In the classroom, Rusk is an inventive teacher, usually talking eloquently about complex matters from brief notes. Drawing from his own experience, he likes to pose ethical issues for students to consider. He once asked journalism students how they would handle this dilemma: You are a reporter covering the State Department and a friend there leaks a confidential document to you. What should you do: have your friend indicted for giving away government secrets which may harm the national interest or use the information in a published story and protect your source? He thus gets students to consider larger issues in the context of current problems.

"He's not just a history book of the law but he keeps current with the law and is participating in it," said Bill Aileo, past student editor of the Georgia Journal of International and Comparative Law. "He's been a great resource for students writing journal articles, either helping in their research or in editing. He's also put us into contact with some of the top people in international law who have made contributions to the journal: Phillip Jessup and Harding Dillard of the World Court and the late Wilfred Jenks of the International Labor Organization. Mr. Rusk even wrote an article on the legal regulations on the use of force which we published."

Aileo, who just graduated from law school, said Rusk had also helped several students find out about job opportunities in government agencies that they'd never even heard of.

As a senior faculty member, Rusk has handled his share of administrative responsibilities, and has served on the University Council, a faculty body, and the UGA Press Committee, the book publishing division.

For his contributions to the university thus far, Rusk earns accolades from president Fred C. Davison:

"Since returning to his native state, Mr. Rusk has established himself as a teacher of rare ability and extraordinary energy. It has been my privilege to be present among groups of all ages when Professor Rusk has talked with them. With enthusiasm and skill, he performs the noblest task of a teacher: that of kindling the minds of his listeners, whoever they be.

"His almost incredible breadth of experience is combined with unusual recall, and the constant evaluation and re-evaluation of ideas, so evidently a part of his thought processes, place him in what must be a small group of master teachers. He accepts the demands of eager listeners and learners modestly but generously, bringing honor and distinction to the campus and to Georgia."

Rusk accepts such acclaim with characteristic modesty. His career both in academia and public life has been studded with honors—a Rhodes fellowship, more than 20 honorary degrees and most recently an endowed chair at the Lyndon B. Johnson School of Public Affairs at the University of Texas.

Mrs. Johnson created that distinguished professorship in his name with a grant of $500,000 from the LBJ Foundation in recognition of his loyalty and service to the late President. Rusk earlier had donated his appointment books—one of the few items he took with him when he left the State Department—to Texas' LBJ library.

Although he left all his public and private papers in the State Department, Rusk claims that almost everything about the Kennedy and Johnson administrations has become public knowledge, except for some of the "kitchen gossip." And though he admits he has been working on a book "in a rather desultory fashion," he is supremely discrete and presumably won't reveal that gossip. At the annual Law Day in early May, Rusk acknowledged that he is getting on in years. In a simple ceremony at the university law school, an oil portrait of him—resplendent in his red Oxford robe—was dedicated before a small gathering, including Sen. Edward M. Kennedy as guest of honor. Rusk said he wanted to thank artist Henry Nordhausen for softening the lines of age and bringing out more humanity than he probably had. The portrait, a gift of the Loridans Foundation of Atlanta, which also contributes part of his annual salary, hangs near the main rear entrance to the building.

Surgery last August slowed Rusk down last fall, but he resumed his busy schedule the second half of the past school year. Since he has already turned 65, he has two more years before reaching the university's mandatory retirement age. Until then, he will draw one of the highest state salaries—$46,000. According to most estimates, he earns it.

SAYINGS OF PROFESSOR RUSK

"When I was a small boy, I remember a preacher saying, 'When you point your finger at someone else, you're pointing three fingers at yourself.' "

"There are times when a public official ought to be silent or even when the public would prefer not to know the whole brutal truth."

On his new anonymity: "A man came up to me in the Atlanta airport and asked, 'Aren't you John Foster Dulles?' I replied, 'If I am, there's been quite a miracle.'"

"Coup d'etats blow up like a summer storm. There were 82 during my term of office and not one caused by the CIA."

"At any given point, half of the people want someone else to be President."

On the apolitical nature of most citizens everywhere: "When I was a boy in Cherokee County, we didn't get up every morning and beat our chests and say, 'What can we do for Woodrow Wilson today?' "

"In a speech on China, I once said in short words and short sentences what we'd been saying for some time in long words and unintelligible sentences, and everybody thought this was new policy."

To members of an audience who had to leave early: "Don't worry about me. I've been walked out on by Mr. Gromyko."

"Governments don't like to be overthrown."

On the authenticity of the Khrushchev memoirs: "They were edited. There are no vulgarisms in them and Khrushchev was vulgar."

"I believe man will do what is necessary to survive."

"The press demands complete candor from a public official on every subject except one—namely, what he thinks about the press. I think it's fair to say the press can dish it out, but doesn't like to take it."

"As I grow older, I become allergic to long speeches—either listening to them or giving them."

"There's nothing more dangerous than a security treaty you don't mean. If we want to make them a bluff, we'd better get out of them."

When the Vietnam peace settlement seemed imminent, he told reporters: "The situation looks pregnant, but I want to see the baby before I describe it."

"We are all prisoners of the information we get."

SOVIET STALLING ON DÉTENTE

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, as a result of the most recent summit meeting and other events, it appears that progress on a meaningful détente has practically come to a standstill.

Past history shows us the Communists have used détente throughout history for various reasons but such moves have never seriously deterred their efforts toward world domination.

A recent editorial on this subject entitled "Soviets Stalling on Détente" appeared in the August 19, 1974, issue of the Aiken, S.C., Standard newspaper.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent this editorial be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

SOVIETS STALLING ON DÉTENTE

A preparatory meeting to plan a European Security Conference received scant news mention recently when it quietly folded its tent for the summer, planning to reconvene on Sept. 2. The conference, intended to lower tensions between the Western allies and Communist East Europe, cannot even agree on what to talk about if it ever does convene.

The significance of the summer recess is that it precludes the possibility of reaching an agreement this year on how best to reduce the tensions in Europe. And so another timetable for detente has been derailed.

It is hardly surprising. Detente on the Washington and Moscow levels has not been receiving high marks either since the dramatic meeting last month in Moscow between President Nixon and Leonid Brezhnev. Sobriety has supplanted expectation.

Students of Soviet relations with capitalistic societies should not find the roller coaster aspects of detente surprising. Detente, by any other name, dates back to 1921 when Lenin, following his consolidation of power, decided that his country needed a period of rehabilitation. He proceeded to negotiate regular diplomatic relations with capitalist powers, using their superior technology and productivity to prop up the Soviet economy. Thus was detente born.

Lenin's detente came to a close when Stalin emerged as his successor and embarked on a period of militarization in about 1930—a period which continued for more than a quarter of a century until the dictator died. His successor, Khrushchev renewed Russia's on-and-off-again detente in 1957, but called it "peaceful coexistence." Khrushchev did not have peace in mind, but wanted a breathing spell so that the Soviet Union could recover from the economic damage that Khrushchev had created and from the political wounds of the power struggle that led to his winning office.

Since 1921, four years after the Communists conquered Russia, there has been no intention on the part of the Soviet leaders to alter the basic policy of Communistic imperialism. Moscow has used detente for the same reason that football teams use halftime pauses—to rest and to reassess strategy.

The failure to achieve significant limitations on offensive arms at the Moscow meeting last month and the stalemate at the European Security Conference reveal glaringly that Brezhnev is a practitioner of the same Soviet art of leadership. He could not maintain the facade of detente as long as his predecessors did because times have changed. The dooms-day nature of strategic weapons leaves less lattitude for concessions and the complexity of missiles and atoms mandates precautions on the side of extra safety.

What the future holds is uncertain. It is clear, however, that as the current cycle of detente approaches another decisive point the United States can best be prepared to face it by keeping our nation healthy and our powder dry.

IS THERE STILL HOPE FOR FARMING IN NEW ENGLAND?

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to three articles which have appeared in New England regional publications in recent months.

The three are closely related and the message in each is applicable not only to all the States of New England, but to any State which has lost self-sufficiency in food production, the aesthetics of open fields and pastureland, and, to resort to that trite phrase, "farming as a way of life."

I would like to quote excerpts from two of these articles and then ask that the full text of the third be printed at the conclusion of these remarks.

Mr. President, let me point up these quotes by citing a rather astonishing statistic.

At the time of the Civil War, my native State of New Hampshire was only 40 percent forested. Today, it is estimated that as much as 85 percent of the State is tree covered.

The implication of this is spelled out in an essay written by Leander Poisson for the Speaking Out page of the New Hampshire Times earlier this year.

Incidentally, Mr. President, many of us in my State welcomed the appearance of the New Hampshire Times on the publication scene and are rejoicing over the growing success of this splendid new statewide newspaper.

The author of this particular Speaking Out column is an architect and former professor who argues that New England's economy will get worse before it gets better, because the region is too dependent upon food and energy from far away places.

The thrust of his argument is found in the following paragraphs. Mr. Poisson writes:

The most critical energy crisis that New England faces is exaggerated by the fact that its agricultural base has been destroyed . . .

As a region, New England was almost 50 percent self-sufficient in food production at the close of World War II. Less than 100 years ago, it was 100 percent self-sufficient. *It is at present just barely two percent self-sufficient.*

In order to survive as a populated area, New England must have as its first priority the restoration of its agricultural base.

To underscore Mr. Poisson's case, and to do it on positive note, I'd like to quote from the publication which inspired the founding of the New Hampshire Times and happily influenced its thrust and format—the Maine Times.

Earlier this year, Maine Times Editor John Cole, writing in his personal column, had this to say:

The Maine fields that once grew grain for the creatures, food for the farm family and the farm community have been reclaimed by the woods. I see those on my travels. It is third or fourth growth now—contorted pasture pine, alder, popple, birch and early oak. These are woods without grandeur, without the giants that once were cleared for corn. To most travelers the woodlots might appear to have always been so scruffy; yet each of them is laced with dauntless rows of rock, piled three generations ago by men who marked their pastures where the spindly trees now grow.

These are not woods but what's left of fields that were plowed by men and animals every spring as soon as the snows melted, the ground thawed and the March winds blew enough to dry the mud. In my southwestern part of Maine, and across New Hampshire and Vermont there are hundreds of thousands of acres of popple, birch and scrawny pine that once were turned, planted and harvested with the rhythm of every passing season. But with the coming of the machine, the Industrial Age, the wonders of chemical-corporate farming, lettuce for 200 million Americans could be grown in California, corn in Kansas, apples in Washington and beef creatures in Texas and Montana.

Mr. President, John Cole then goes on to point out that this trend may have run its course, declaring:

The high-energy, high-waste farming that allows us to shred lettuce today that was packed yesterday in California is coming to an end. The cost of moving those crates from here to there has become so high that New England's short growing season is no longer such a liability. There soon won't be petroleum enough or pesticide enough to grow everyone's apples on Oregon trees; the withering orchards of Maine's abandoned farms will be revived again; and beef creatures will once again graze in new pastures bordered by old rock walls.

Mr. Cole concludes:

From the fields that were once forests and then became woods will come the foodstuffs that will allow much of the New England community to become more self-sustaining than it has been for a century. The job will be done because changing economics will make it good economics.

Mr. President, there are certainly some who would question such a positive assertion; those who might well concede the desirability of restoring New England's agricultural base but would remain skeptical that it could ever be accomplished.

For those I would recommend a close reading of the third and final article I cite, an article written by the famous poet and literary historian Malcolm Cowley for the August issue of another handsome new and most promising regional publication, Blair & Ketchum's Country Journal. Country Journal, though published in Vermont, again embraces in its coverage all of New England.

Mr. Cowley, who has lived on an old, 7-acre tobacco farm near Sherman, Conn., since 1936, says developers' dollars and rising costs are squeezing farmers out of existence.

But, he answers "Yes" to the question asked in the title of his article—"Is There Still Hope for Farming in New England?"—if we act now.

Mr. President, because I believe Mr. Cowley's message and recommendations are so important—again, not only to New England but to every State with similar agricultural problems—I ask unanimous consent that the full text of his article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Country Journal, August 1974]

IS THERE STILL HOPE FOR FARMING IN NEW ENGLAND?

(By Malcolm Cowley)

Memories first, before we try to summon up the future. Hope is to be found there, I believe, but it depends partly on the world situation (food, fuel) and partly on national, state, and local policies regarding the use of land. We can raise our voices about those policies; indeed, we had better do so without delay. Meanwhile it is a wry pleasure to think about the fairly recent past of what used to be a Connecticut farming town.

When I first came to Sherman more than forty years ago, it was reported by the census as having 330 people and something like 100 farms; I forget the exact number. Most of the farms didn't deserve the name; they were simply fields and a house where an old couple subsisted with the help of a cow, a flock of chickens, and usually a team of superannuated horses. In the valley north of the Center, though, were rich tobacco and dairy farms. The hills were grassy there and dotted with cattle to their rounded tops. On the valley floor were big white houses, red barns, and silos like baronial donjons standing guard over luxuriant fields of corn, alfalfa, and tobacco. Driving past them on a winding dirt road was like exploring Arcadia.

I remember how marginal farms, mostly in the South End, were abandoned as old couples died off or moved to Danbury. I remember when the last field of tobacco was planted during World War II; that year the crop couldn't be sold because the tobacco warehouse had closed. I remember how dairy farmers complained of not being able to earn a decent living and how one after another sold off his herd. More and more houses were built for people who had jobs in Danbury or did freelance work in New York. The town was becoming residential, and it was also becoming forested as trees crept down from the hillsides and at places crossed the valley. There were no Arcadian vistas any more.

Sherman is still a good town, more determined than most to preserve its rural character, but today it has only three dairy farms. Three other dairymen sold off their herds last spring. Among those herds the best was that of my friend and neighbor Kenneth Edmonds, who, incidentally, had been taking care of my only field. He paid rent for it too: a truckload of manure each fall. I don't know what will happen to the field after Ken stops mowing it, but there was no use pleading with him. Ken was tired; he had been milking cows twice a day, seven days a week, for fifty years. Now he is looking forward to his first vacation.

What is happening in Sherman had already happened in most of the state, and most of New England. Connecticut now has fewer than 4,000 working farms—not half so many as in 1960—and the number includes part-time operations, as well as little factories cranking out eggs or broilers from a production line. Dairying, however, has been the chief agricultural activity, and the state now has only 900 dairy farms, with the total falling by more than ten per cent each year. Rhode Island has 700 farms of all types, not many of which send milk to market. The state agricultural college recently sold off its prize bulls, as if to mark the end of an era. In Massachusetts Governor Francis W. Sargent has established an Emergency Commission on Food. He said at a news conference last September, "We must reverse a thirty-year trend which has resulted in the virtual disappearance of food production in this state."

One can hardly blame the farmers for going out of business. They are capable men, for the most part, but they are faced with more problems than a genius should be asked to solve. Manpower is often the most urgent problem. The farmers are growing old—fifty-eight is their average age in Connecticut—and they need help with the chores. Help is almost impossible to find, except at a price the farmer is unable to pay. "The younger generation just doesn't want to be tied up for seven days a week," Ken Edmonds says. "They don't want those hours staring them in the face every day."

Another problem is the high cost of machinery, fuel, feed, fertilizer, baler twine—in fact, of everything the farmer has to buy. Except for roughage, most of which comes out of his own silo, almost all his supplies are shipped in from other parts of the country, at very high freight rates. How much he pays for the supplies depends on the open market (and to some extent on the big midwestern processors, with their notions of what the traffic will bear). The selling price of milk at the farm is something else again: it is fixed by the government and seldom rises as fast as the cost of feed and fertilizer. From 1968 to 1972, gross farm income in Connecticut rose by $6.5 million, while net farm income was falling by $12.2 million. In 1973 net income was further reduced by a fantastic increase in the cost of supplies.

Property taxes are a less serious problem in Connecticut than in some of the other New England states. By the terms of Public Act 490, passed in 1963, a farmer can ask to have his land assessed at its "use value," generally much lower than its value as commercial real estate. The law has reduced tax assessments on farmland by an average of something like sixty-five per cent. On the other hand, there has been no reduction in state or federal inheritance taxes. The state tax is high in Connecticut, and it is levied on the same estimate of net worth as the federal tax. When a farmer dies, the Feds move in to value his land at the inflated price that a developer might pay for it. The farmer's heirs might wish to stay on the land, but instead they have to sell it off as the only way to find money for the tax collectors.

Inflated land values are perhaps the greatest present threat to agriculture in New England. The threat is all the greater for a special reason, namely, that the best farmland, fairly level and well drained, is also the best for residential and commercial development. It used to be the marginal farms that were abandoned; now more and more, as population spreads, it is the richest farms that are taken over. How can a young dairyman—granted that there are still a few of these—compete with a real estate syndicate eager to invest foreign money? How can he afford to pasture cows on land that will cost him from $1,000 to as much as $10,000 an acre?

In the South and the Middle West, older men with capital still buy land for the income it will yield from crops or cattle, but the present yield in New England is too low in relation to land values for anything but tax-loss farming (and not much of that). In Connecticut, for example, the last 900 dairymen are working seven days a week for an average return of 3.9 per cent on the market value of their land, stock, and equipment. They could sell off everything, pay a capital-gains tax, invest the remaining proceeds in bonds or certificates of deposit, and—to judge by the financial pages—they could earn much more than their present farm incomes by living in idleness.

So once again, what are the prospects for a revival of farming in New England? I still think that the long-term prospects are good, owing to worldwide shortages of food and also to the fact that western and southern farmers are now facing many of the same problems (besides such problems of their own as drought in the High Plains and deteriorating cropland). But the short-term prospects are bleak, and even our distant hopes might be foreclosed. That is, our New England farmland might be lost forever unless steps are promptly taken to help the remaining farmers stay in business and encourage younger men to take their places.

The first step might be a joint resolution presented for adoption by the various state legislatures. It might read something like this: *Resolved that the preservation of open farming and grazing land is to the best interests of the people of [Connecticut, Vermont, etc., and is an effort deserving the aid and encouragement of the state government.*

What good, you might ask, would a resolution do? At the very least it would lead to wider discussion of an urgent problem. If the resolution is adopted after many arguments have been heard, it will provide a reasoned basis for various measures that must be taken if farming in New England is to be maintained at anywhere near its present level, not to speak of its being revived or extended. Some of the measures will interfere with the plans of land speculators, while others will cost the states money. New Englanders, like Scotsmen, always want to know why public money should be spent.

And why should it be spent in an effort to preserve farmland? Why should we continue trying to compete with western agribusiness? Why shouldn't we resign ourselves to importing all our food from other parts of the country: milk from Wisconsin, potatoes from Idaho, lettuce from Arizona, and apples from the state of Washington? Or again, why should we mourn—as most of us do—when one farmer after another is forced by age and economics to abandon his fields and let them grow up into scrubby woodland? Or when he sells them to a developer with plans for still another residential suburban, a vacation community, an industrial park, or a supershopping center under acres of asphalt?

Here I won't repeat the ecological answer: that this populated region needs meadows and streams, woods and wetlands, a diversity of open spaces to depollute the air and maintain a supply of drinkable water. "The farmer is the keeper of these lands," says a thoughtful paper recently issued by the Connecticut Conservation Association.[1] "He is the steward of the land. As long as he remains, these resources remain. When he is gone, all too often these irreplaceable natural entities are buried."

Yes, the ecological answer is true and reasonable, every word of it, but my own feeling for New England goes beyond reason into the darker realm of love and aversion. I love the countryside as it was—and as it is today in scattered areas like the Upper Connecticut Valley, the Lamoille Valley, or the Harlem Valley across the state line in New York. I hate to live in the midst of neglected fields, which seem to reproach me; I even hate to drive through miles of scrubland crossed at intervals by stone fences. A deprived and resentful landscape seems to be closing in on me. When the road comes out into open farmland, I feel a sense of relief, as if I were drawing a free breath after years in prison. "Isn't this fine, for a change," I say in mantalk, while my wife uses the forbidden word: "Yes, it's beautiful."

Beauty in itself isn't enough to persuade a state legislator that he should vote for an appropriation, but beauty in New England has an economic value. Almost the whole region has found that tourists are an important source of revenue. The better the region looks, the more tourists will be attracted, not to mention vacationers and permanent residents (for whom there is room enough, if their new communities don't gobble up the farmland). The more farms are preserved, the more pastures are reclaimed, the better

[1] For a copy of the White Paper on agriculture in Connecticut, to which I am greatly indebted, write to Robert F. Kunz, Director, Connecticut Conservation Association, Bridgewater, Connecticut 06752.

(more beautiful) the region will look, and—as most legislators already realize—the more it will comfortably yield in state and local taxes.

That is by no means the only economic argument for a revival of agriculture. Every farmed or grazed or gardened acre produces something that adds to the wealth of the community—and the statement is true even when the farmer is losing money. If he makes it instead, much of the money goes into improving the farm or the neighborhood. Think of the big white handsome clapboard houses and the brick houses, weathered pink, that dot the New England countryside or cluster in villages. Except in coastal areas, most of those houses grew out of the soil, either directly or indirectly—directly, if they were built with money from corn, tobacco, cattle, Merino sheep, or Morgan horses; indirectly, if they were built by merchants or bankers who prospered from dealing with local farmers. Now that so many of the big houses have to be propped up with New York or Boston money, they seem to me a little less substantial.

"Don't make subjective judgments," I tell myself. "Don't say anything that isn't realistic." Well, here are a few realistic statements.

Every good field abandoned is a loss to the community. Henceforth the field produces nothing, though in thirty years it might yield a meager crop of firewood or pulpwood. If it becomes part of a residential development, this in turn produces nothing (except from a few backyard gardens, rather more of these in 1974 than in 1973). Essentially the new residents are here in their role as consumers, and almost everything they consume is trucked in from a distance. Even their incomes are imported from the larger towns where they work in offices or factories. The new residents are pleasant people and they make a contribution to the community by showing good will and public spirit, but what they contribute in taxes is seldom enough to pay for what they demand in services (new schools, sewers, paved highways kept free from snow, and everything else that a suburb expects). When a farming town in Connecticut goes residential, taxes on old-time property owners are very soon tripled or quadrupled, and they are forced to sell off their acreage.

Once again that isn't the whole story. Those farmed acres in New England once supported—in many areas they still support—a network of local industries and commercial enterprises. Depending on the type of farming, there are (or were) canneries, creameries, cheese factories (now surviving only in Vermont), carding mills (now a few in Maine), feed mills, slaughterhouses, tobacco warehouses, and woodworking plants willing to pay a farmer cash for a few wintercut logs. As farming dwindles in one area after another, those local enterprises vanish and the skills they encouraged are forgotten. The remaining farmers not only lose their local outlets but feel lonelier than ever after the Grange Hall becomes a franchised supermarket. There are personal tragedies involved. I think of E. A. Robinson's miller, the one who hanged himself after a last word to his wife:

"There are no millers any more,"
Was all that she had heard him say;
And he had lingered at the door
So long that it seemed yesterday.

"That is Robinson in a sentimental mood," I tell myself; but I remember that the private sentiment is connected with a blow to the public economy of our whole region.

The process has gone too far to be simply reversed. When or if farming is revived in New England, it will have to be a different sort of farming, either more intensive, or on a broader scale. Meanwhile some practical steps can be taken to halt the decay, to put heart into the remaining farmers, and to keep the countryside open by restoring the pastures.

The white paper on Agriculture in Connecticut puts forward several measures that would help to keep farming alive in the state. Among these it lays most stress on the creation of "agricultural preserves" and on the purchase by the state of "development rights" to open land. Later I shall have something to say about that purchase. As for creating agricultural preserves, it is a practice started by California in 1965. It has been rather more successful in New York, where the enabling act was passed in 1971, and it is now being considered for adoption on a wider scale by New Jersey.

In New York such agricultural preserves, or districts, are initiated by the farmers themselves, who must agree, in each case, that 500 or more contiguous acres should be placed in the district. Their application is reviewed by the county government and discussed at one or more public hearings. If approved by both the county and the state, the district can be officially protected. Protection means briefly "No development," but it has other features as well. Local governments cannot restrict farming practices—such as spreading manure—beyond the requirements of health and safety. Public agencies that want to acquire land in an agricultural district must prove that other acceptable sites are not available. Public-service districts are restricted in their power to tax farmland for services (water, sewage, etc.) that farmers do not require. Also commercial farmers can request annual property-tax assessments based on the agricultural value of their land.

Each agreement runs for eight years, after which it must be reviewed to see whether the land it covers still meets the requirements for an agricultural district. So far, such districts comprise 1.5 million acres, or one-fifth of the best farmland in New York. Apparently the agreements have worked where adopted, and they have led to some glorious battles with public utilities and dam builders, notably in the rich Schoharie Valley. The Connecticut Conservation Association recommends a similar system of preserves for its own state, but with refinements embodied in the still pending New Jersey plan. Since the system will reduce the tax basis of local governments, the CCA recommends that the towns be reimbursed for what they lose. The purchase of development rights would also cost money, and—rather than a bond issue to supply it—the CCA believes that it should come from a statewide tax of perhaps four mills on real-estate transfers.

The CCA also suggests other measures that would help to keep Connecticut farms in operation. Briefly they are: (1) subsidies to farmers who permit hunting, fishing, and picnicking on their land; (2) farm markets on state-owned land along highways or even in state parks; (3) college workshops for farmers on management and production techniques (but who would milk the cows while the farmer was attending the workshops?); (4) better training and placement programs for farm labor (and perhaps subsidies to make farm work more competitive with industry); (5) a low-interest revolving loan fund to assist in farm improvements; (6) lower taxes on farm buildings as well as land; (7) negotiating lower insurance costs; and (8) educational loans or grants-in-aid for students planning to be farmers.

Most of those eight measures are directed toward solving the special problems of Connecticut, which is prosperous, thickly peopled, and in immediate danger of losing all its farmland, besides most of its open space. In northern New England the state governments have less money that can be devoted to loans and subsidies. The remaining farms there are different, with fewer plowed fields, except in the Aroostook and the Lake Champlain Valley, and more of the land is in pasture. The immediate problem, the one that demands thought and subsidies. is how to keep the pastures open.

My friend the novelist Wallace Stegner, who lives on the West Coast but owns many northern Vermont acres, has some lively comments. "The horrid fact about New Hampshire," he says, "is that too many city people loved it too much, and hence bought chunks of it, and having no skill or time for farming, pronounced *famine*, they let it grow up to weeds and chokecherry and spruces and tough little cedars. In Vermont things haven't gone as far as in New Hampshire (I'm totally ignorant of Massachusetts and Connecticult), but they're going.

"We have discussed, in Greensboro, some alternatives: reforesting, which produces a fourth-rate wilderness"—[but not always, as I maintain in a forthcoming article for *Country Journal*] "cooperative mowing and plowing, which is hard to do in the face of Vermont individualism and recalcitrance; and hippy occupation, which takes care of a garden plot and not much more. No city feller can afford, by himself, the machinery it takes to keep a farm's hayfields and pastures open. He has to *be* there to do it with stock, because cattle and sheep won't eat maple seedlings and ash seedlings and so on after they're a year or two old, and neither will they eat ferns and junk and weeds after the first few weeks of the growing season. Result: leave stock out of a pasture or a woodlot for a year or two and there's no recovery—you have to plow or poison, and start over.

"My guess is that an association or cooperative of people determined to keep the pastoral (as opposed to the wilderness or the subdivided) character of New England would get substantial support—clutches of tractors and machinery here and there, clutches of hired hands who would plow up, harrow, disk, etc., and keep open those farms that have ceased to be farmed, and fallen into the hands of professors from Princeton, the Mafia, California speculators, Florida speculators, and local peasants determined to make a pile subdividing. Once the farms are opened, they can be kept open with grazing, as you suggest—either sheep or cattle, if they're managed right, and rotated among the fields properly, will do it."

I like Stegner's idea of landowners' cooperatives; the situation is desperate, and volunteer action would help immensely. But my own guess is that the cooperatives, if they were to thrive, would need state aid and encouragement, perhaps in the form of subsidies for reclaiming pastures. State road crews might be made available for mowing and brush cutting (of course at a fee to the landowner). Controlled burning is another suggestion. It is a very old practice in the Maine blueberry barrens, but elsewhere in New England it has never been widely adopted, I suppose for fear that the fires might spread. Why not have pasture fires that are supervised by the local fire department? Again there is the great question of fencing, which is indispensable on grazing land, but is also expensive. In some areas the old stone fences might be mended once again; they would still make good neighbors. For areas where they were never built, or would cost too much to repair with high-priced labor, might it be possible to invent or adapt some cheap form of portable fencing? I think about those miles of snow fencing that highway departments keep in storage: might they be rented out during the summer?

Then I remember England, where I saw sheep farmers driving from one pasture to another with truckloads of fence panels, which apparently they had made for themselves out of crossed saplings.

Those suggestions are made from the depths of my inexperience, and I hope that the various agricultural colleges will set themselves to finding better answers. Meanwhile I might quote again from Stegner's letter. "I have a friend," he says, "whom per-

haps you know—Frol Rainey of the U. of Pennsylvania Archaeological Museum—who has installed forty or fifty sheep on his Greensboro farm, and hired a retired farmer to live in the farmhouse and look after them." I do know Professor Rainey and know his farm as well; it is a fairly level hilltop and, until the milking herd had to be sold off, it was said to be the highest dairy farm in Vermont. Stegner continues, "It's not a paying proposition as yet, but there's substantial federal support, and with more acreage and a bigger flock, he might make it go." I hope he makes it go, and if he needs more acreage, he can probably rent it at a reasonable figure—not buy it—from neighbors eager to have their pastures kept open. With the present high cost of acreage, fairly large-scale farming on leased land has become a possible development in New England.

For the farmer such a practice has two obvious advantages: it enables him to broaden out his operation, and it greatly reduces his capital investment. For the landowner, leasing his land to an active farmer also has advantages (beyond such payments as he might receive, which would not and should not be large). It would maintain the value of his land and the attractiveness of the neighborhood. In states with laws like Connecticut's Public Act 490—New Hampshire has recently adopted a similar measure—it would permit him to apply for a lower tax assessment on his property.

When I gloom about the situation on walks through abandoned fields, it seems to me that the practice of leasing land for agriculture might be vastly extended. Associations of landowners—Wallace Stegner's suggestion—would have more acreage to offer than individuals. And what about the land trusts that are becoming more numerous in southern New England, to meet the threat that a whole town will be built or paved over? One such trust is active in Sherman. So far it has acquired only forest and scrub and swampland, but isn't cultivated farmland even more precious to the community? Some of the trusts have talked about venturing into this new field. Nature Conservancy, which I think is the only trust that operates on a national scale, has been offered about 1,800 acres of Connecticut land in Bridgewater and New Milford. George D. Pratt, Jr., who made the princely offer, is a lifelong conservationist who attached a condition to the gift. There are three farms on the land, and Pratt wants to have them kept in operation. So far Nature Conservancy has had no experience in farm management. Two of the farms are rented and hence present no serious problem, but the third, in New Milford, is the richest and most productive dairy farm in the neighborhood. Fortunately Pratt's experienced farm manager, Peter Petersen, has agreed to go along with the deal and to train a successor before he retires.

Land trusts that will operate or lease out farms are only one of many possibilities. What about the broad tracts of New England that are owned by the states or by the federal government? Most of this land is utterly unsuited to agriculture and should be kept as wilderness or devoted to tree crops or recreation, but there are areas of richer soil whose use might be reconsidered. I think of interstate highways with their habit of seizing more land—often in fertile valleys—than is conceivably needed by present or future traffic. Some of the surplus land is mowed once a year by the road crews. Couldn't it be grazed or plowed by farmers, at no public expense, so long as nothing was built on it? Also I think of the Saratoga Battlefield across the Hudson, an expanse of 2,432 acres most of which used to be farmland. It is a handsome park only part of which is visited by the public; the rest is woodland or meadows that are mowed—again once a year—by the National Park Service. If they were grazed instead, the magnificent view over the Hudson Valley would be preserved and the land would look more as it did when Johnny Burgoyne surrendered.

Returning to the private sector, what about ski resorts, a subject on which my ignorance is abysmal? I know, however, that trails and slopes have to be kept free of brush, and I presume that much of the work is done with defoliants such as the Army used in Vietnam. Sheep, however, are the ancient and still the best mowing machines for steep slopes. Mightn't sheep growers add to their incomes by contracting to do a sprout-removal job for resort operators? There are problems involved, but I should guess that most of these will be solved after we have lost most of our grazing land and after the rest of it becomes more precious to the region and the hungry world.

In the case of highly productive land in immediate danger of being taken over by jerry builders, some public agency—state, county, or town—might buy the land to keep it from going out of production. That bold step was first considered by Suffolk County, at the eastern end of Long Island. There the situation is deteriorating. Suffolk has been a very rich agricultural county, famous for potatoes, ducklings, and cauliflower, but its farmland is rapidly disappearing under suburban developments; very soon it will have vanished. Apparently Suffolk farmers have not made use of the New York law that permits the creation of agricultural reserves. The law offers many advantages, but not enough of them, in this case, to counterbalance the glittering offers of real-estate speculators.

Two years ago John V. N. Klein, the County Executive, came up with the proposal that Suffolk should float a bond issue big enough to pay for half its remaining agricultural land—that would be 30,000 acres—and then lease back the acres to operating farmers. The proposal was beautifully simple, and it attracted inquiries from twelve states that thought of adopting it. In New England it would be justified only in the case of highly productive acres—truck farms, for example, or the shade-grown-tobacco fields of the Hartford Basin, important to the economy of the state, but now being built over. Even in rich Suffolk County, it involved more money than the county legislature thought it could raise; the proposal had to be scaled down. In a later form it undertakes, as a beginning, to preserve 12,000 acres of agricultural land. Some of the acres would be bought outright, as in the original scheme, and leased back to farmers. More of them, however, would not change ownership; the county would simply buy "development rights" to keep them from being built upon or subdivided. Meanwhile the price of Suffolk land has continued to rise. Even development rights would now cost more than Klein's earlier figure of $45 million, a sum that the county legislature was willing to make available. Last spring he had to request an additional $15 million, with the request still pending.

The purchase of development rights by a public agency—if the rights are worth money and the agency can pay for them—is clearly of advantage to farmers who want to stay in business. It gives them fresh capital that can be used for stocking and improving the land. It reduces their tax assessments in states where they haven't the benefit of a law like Connecticut's Public Act 490. When a farmer dies, the Feds can't appraise his land at its development value, which has ceased to be part of his estate. His heirs have a smaller inheritance tax to pay and, if they wish, they can still be farmers.

Those are a few of the measures by which New England farms might be kept in operation, while waiting for an agricultural revival that is likely to come, but might otherwise come too late. Some of the measures had better be adopted promptly, if our region is not to become a wilderness hatched and spangled with housing developments. So far we have been waging a purely defensive struggle against the panzer divisions of invading bulldozers. We win victories here and there, but we are certain to lose the war unless we can assemble other forces, including an agricultural interest strong enough to undertake a counter-offensive against the spoilers.

THE MAINTENANCE OF OUR MILITARY STRENGTH

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, public note should be taken of the fact that Secretary of State Henry Kissinger made a strong statement recently in behalf of maintaining our military strength.

This statement was made at the annual American Legion convention in Miami Beach, Fla., and was the subject of an editorial comment in the August 24, 1974, issue of the Charleston, S.C., News and Courier newspaper. As a renowned arbitrator of military disputes and a man who has faced the hard bargaining of Communist rulers, Secretary Kissinger understands well the significance of military strength.

Of particular interest was Secretary Kissinger's comments that we must keep our conventional forces as well as our nuclear forces at a high level of strength. This means providing the infantrymen with tanks, armored personnel carriers, antitank weapons, attack helicopters, and other armaments which would be used in conventional conflicts.

He noted that challenges at the conventional level might well be more difficult to counteract than those in the strategic realm. This is a point which Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger has also found necessary to make in recent public pronouncements.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Charleston newspaper article entitled, "Maintaining Military Muscle" be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

[From the Charleston (S.C.) News and Courier, Aug. 24, 1974]

MAINTAINING MILITARY MUSCLE

When Secretary of State Kissinger urged earlier this week that the U.S. keep militarily strong, he was addressing American Legion conventioneers, but he also may have intended his remarks for the Senate, where attempts were being made to chop $1 billion from the Pentagon budget. Whether Mr. Kissinger's speech had a double purpose or not, what he said re-emphasized a line of thinking that many brush aside in this age of nuclear weapons.

In an area of rough strategic balance, Secretary Kissinger said, the threat of an all-out nuclear war becomes less believable. Attack and retaliation capabilities are such that the risks in nuclear warfare have an inhibiting effect. "Thus," Mr. Kissinger said, "challenges at the conventional level may become more difficult to prevent . . . our conventional forces must therefore be strong. They keep the nuclear threshold high by helping to contain, discourage or altogether prevent hostilities."

Military might sufficient to deter aggression by conventional means therefore strengthens the American diplomatic hand. If nuclear war is unthinkable and a conventional war appears unwinnable, the remaining alternative is negotiation. When ade-

quate military muscle can reduce tensions and convince would-be aggressors that the conference table is the only place to profitably settle differences, two great arguments are made for maintaining armed forces with first-rate capabilities.

While presenting a case for a strong defense, Secretary Kissinger also gave assurance that the U.S. has departed from one track of a foreign policy course set about 25 years ago. Referring to recent fighting on Cyprus, Mr. Kissinger said the U.S. could not be the world's policeman, but will use its influence for conciliation and peace. That should make happy those who have argued that the policeman's role long has been too costly and too thankless.

SIKKIM THREATENED WITH ANNEXATION

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, India, a nation of more than 600 million people, is attempting to assert total control over Sikkim, a tiny nation of only 200,000 people.

Regrettably, this is not the first time that India has employed coercion and military force to achieve political ends. Twice before, in the case of Goa and in its conflict with Pakistan, India has used military force in an effort to expand its boundaries and to alter the map of South Asia. Indeed, I can think of no other nation since World War II that can match the Indian Government's record of forceful expansion of its boundaries. It was last year that India dispatched troops to Sikkim, presumably to maintain order, and now India has announced its intention to virtually swallow Sikkim through the questionable unilateral action of amending its constitution.

In a poignant public address, the formal leader of Sikkim, Chogyal Palden Tondub Namgyal, has revealed to the world the plight of the people of Sikkim. Sikkim's unique status, under which it has enjoyed considerable autonomy and independence while retaining close ties with India, is being fundamentally threatened.

I earnestly hope that India will reconsider its policy, and will refrain from dictating to Sikkim such a fundamental change in its political status. Only by adhering to the international principle of self-determination, and thus allowing the people of Sikkim to decide their own fate, can India contribute to a just and legitimate solution to the political future of Sikkim.

In the New York Times of September 2, 1974, there appeared a valuable and perceptive analysis of the current situation in Sikkim. I ask unanimous consent that the article, entitled "Sikkim Leader Says India Illegally Seeks Absorption," be printed in the RECORD.

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

SIKKIM LEADER SAYS INDIA ILLEGALLY SEEKS ABSORPTION

(By Bernard Weinraub)

NEW DELHI, September 1.—Prime Minister Indira Gandhi's decision to place Sikkim under Indian sovereignty has unleased angry attacks on the Indian Government.

In a message released today the Chogyal, or titular ruler, Palden Thondub Namgyal, told Mrs. Gandhi that assurances of Sikkim's separate identity, guaranteed under a 1950 treaty, were being "negated by current hasty moves in the Indian Parliament for Sikkim's representation without the genuine consent and knowledge of the Sikkimese people."

He said that the present steps "will amount to unilateral abrogation of the 1950 treaty and integration of Sikkim into India."

Meanwhile, The Statesman, an English-language daily published in New Delhi and Calcutta, commented: "Few in this country can really believe that what India needs most urgently at the moment is control over more territory and people."

"SORRY PROGRESSION"

Another newspaper, The Hindustan Times of New Delhi, said acidly: "Only the most blind or cynical will derive any satisfaction over the sorry progression of the Indian presence in Sikkim from that of friend to master.

"The crusading zeal and decisiveness that the Government displays over Sikkim has not been available for tackling the more urgent problems and mounting crises at home. Perhaps there is no need for the common man to ask for bread. He's getting Sikkim."

The Government decided, last week that Sikkim, a small Himalayan protectorate of India's would have the status of "an associate state," enabling it to have representation in the Indian Parliament. The Government insists that the move was at the behest of the Sikkim Assembly for "fuller participation of Sikkim in the economic and social institutions of India," and would not erode the special personality of Sikkim.

But politicians, many supporting the Government, and newspapers this weekend viewed the move as placing Sikkim firmly within India as a virtual 22nd state. Before the current move, India was responsible for the protectorate's foreign relations and defense, and kept an eye on domestic matters as well.

Sikkim, with a population of 200,000, has served as a buffer between Chinese-controlled Tibet and the Indian border. Within the last year, the Chogyal has been stripped of his powers by India and is now a figurehead.

His wife, the former Hope Cooke, a 1962 graduate of Sarah Lawrence College, has been living in New York.

Officials here are puzzled why Mrs. Gandhi decided to press for a constitutional amendment that would further link Sikkim to India. Some Indian political sources maintain that the Chogyal, who is a Buddhist with ethnic links to Tibet, has been carrying on secret talks with China to try to assure Sikkim's independent status, thus alarming India.

DRAWS ANGRY ATTACKS

Others say that the ethnic Nepali Hindu majority in Sikkim stirred Indian fears that the populace would some day seek to merge with nearby Nepal.

Sikkim will probably not resemble an actual Indian state, but there will probably be a modicum of separate and distinct identity.

In any event, the Government's move to place Sikkim firmly within the Indian orbit has stirred angry attacks by critics who claim that tensions with China will increase, that India will gain international enmity and that surrounding countries such as Nepal, Bhutan and even Bangladesh will further resent India's dominance on the subcontinent.

Moreover, there was anger that the Government was rushing with only one day of debate, in an effort to reduce controversy about the measure.

So far, numerous parties—ranging from the right-wing Jan Sangh to the Communist—are supporting the Government on Sikkim. A handful of Opposition figures, however, as well as the press have been caustic.

Last year Sikkim's Nepalis rebelled against the Chogyal, charging corruption, election-rigging and nepotism. New Delhi persuaded the Chogyal to hand over the administration to an Indian official. The Chogyal also agreed to allow a free election to the Legislative Assembly. His supporters were routed and the way was opened for India to cement her grip on Sikkim.

THE CANCER CIRCUIT RIDERS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, there appeared in a recent issue of Parade magazine a very interesting article entitled "The Cancer Circuit Riders." It is a story of a tremendous undertaking and successful execution of a well-organized program against the ravages of cancer by the University of Alabama Medical Center in Birmingham. I believe it is an encouraging story that should be told far and wide.

I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed as a part of my remarks in the RECORD.

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

THE CANCER CIRCUIT RIDERS

(By Theodore Irwin)

BIRMINGHAM, ALA.—Medical "circuit riders" fanning out from here to other cities and towns in the state are helping to salvage lives of thousands afflicted with cancer.

In an aggressive drive to alert private physicians to the latest research advances in treatment, the University of Alabama Medical Center has been sending out specially trained doctors, nurses and technicians as missionaries, in effect. They come from a new regional Treatment Demonstration Unit, one of seven scattered through the nation as part of the National Cancer Institute's cancer control program.

Behind the campaign is the realization that too many unnecessary deaths from cancer occur each year from outdated treatment. "We sell optimism, urgency and the latest treatment," says Dr. John R. Durant, director of the university's Cancer Research and Training Center. "The time has come for the end of pessimism, procrastination and painkillers. The greatest detriment to treatment of a cancer patient is a physician's attitude of despair. If he thinks nothing can be done, he sends the patient home to die. But even if the patient is going to die, the quality of survival is very important."

Other cancer specialists tend to agree that many physicians—GP's, internists, pediatricians, gynecologists and surgeons—haven't kept up with new treatment techniques. Some resist using chemotherapy (drugs) because of past reports of severe side effects and little benefit. Certain older doctors still rely on what they learned in medical school decades ago.

The average M.D., points out Dr. Sidney Arje of the American Cancer Society, is not equipped to cope with the full therapeutic approach. Too often the doctor starts treatment and then, when the patient deteriorates, he is referred—too late—to a cancer center.

Studies reveal that only a low percentage of our population, particularly in small towns and cities, receive proper treatment for cancer.

There was, for example, a case cited by Dr. Durant of a woman whose breast cancer spread to other parts of her body so that she lost the use of her legs and arms. The patient never received chemotherapy—the doctor had just "watched her."

In one city of 65,000 a physician gave a patient too much radiation, resulting in a destroyed lung. In Gadsen (pop. 54,000) a doctor who took X-rays of a man saw spots on a lung but thought it was a viral infection or tuberculosis. It turned out to be cancer. In another town a surgeon wasn't aware that in breast cancer he doesn't always

have to do a radical mastectomy (total removal of a breast).

THE PURPOSE

It's to prevent and correct these and other grave misjudgments that Treatment Demonstration units like Birmingham's have been created.

Knowledge is "delivered" by visits—a kind of road show—to groups of doctors and hospital staffs in other Alabama cities as well as through seminars, lectures and tumor clinics. At local meetings, doctors present their problem cases for guidance. Within the past year, the Birmingham cancer experts have made 20 road-show trips, making contact with more than 400 licensed physicians.

Besides Dr. Durant, 32-year-old oncologist (cancer specialist) Dr. John R. Carpenter, director of the Prototype Chemotherapy Network, goes out on the circuit-riding trips, providing information about new drugs and where to get them.

Connie Henke, an attractive, sandy-haired nurse who is a clinical specialist in oncology, takes along the new drugs and shows nurses and doctors how to use them. Miss Henke is one of four missionary RN's, and the Birmingham unit expects to have 10 before long.

DR. ROTH'S TASK FORCE

Another important element of the task force is a Radiation Therapy Network, headed by Dr. Robert Roth. The idea is to help doctors, radiologists, and technicians learn the right exposure to radiation and to see that a community cobalt machine is adjusted correctly.

Driving a van that's a motor home converted into a testing lab, radiation technologist John Killough has traveled some 25,000 miles, on 153 trips to hospitals. When special treatment problems arise, Dr. Roth or a staff radiation physicist accompanies Killough.

Although the cancer circuit riders go only where they're invited, there's more demand for them then can be met. "Doctors out there on the firing line," says Dr. Durant, "are really hungry for information."

When a demonstration was scheduled, for instance, in Decatur (pop. 38,000), 50 doctors in the area showed up. For two-day formal presentations by Dr. Durant at the university's center, as many as 100 physicians pour in.

PROGRAM STRONGPOINTS

Of the various types of cancer, Birmingham's outreach program began by concentrating on blood malignancies—childhood leukemia, Hodgkins disease, five other cancers of the lymph system—and most recently, breast cancer. The blood-type cancers were chosen because recent dramatic advances in therapy have greatly improved survival chances for these patients and because they are difficult to treat without knowledge of the latest information.

Among the more than 50 new anti-cancer drugs investigated and approved in the past decade, nine have been found acceptable for leukemia (plus radiation), five or more for Hodgkins and other lymph cancers, as many as six for breast cancer. Cancers of the colon-rectum, lung, pancreas and some other sites have generally not responded effectively to medication. Where drugs can be useful, alone or in combinations, they must be given at the right time, the dosage adjusted to the patient's condition. That's where Birmingham's chemotherapy demonstrators do their job.

Linked to the show-and-tell program is the University Cancer Center's back-up services for consultation. The objective: whenever feasible, a cancer patient is to be treated in his home town, by his own doctor, in cooperation with the center's oncologists.

Doctors participating in the drug and radiation networks utilize MIST (Medical Information System via Telephone), a kind of hot line. When a local doctor believes a patient has cancer, he calls the center over a toll-free line. A center oncologist sends him a plan for drug and/or radiation treatment, details for evaluating the patient's condition, and other instructions. Nurse Connie Henke may see the patient and doctor, fetching needed drugs.

A good many of the doctors taking advantage of the MIST system have been reeducated through the roadshow demonstrations. And case after case reported by oncologists indicated that people have definitely benefited.

Last fall, for example, Dr. Durant and a radiologist visited Sylacauga (pop. 12,255) to tell area doctors what can be done for Hodgkins and other lymph disease. Then, in December a 54-year-old salesman was found, through a biopsy, to have a large tumor in his abdomen. Right after the patient emerged from the operating room, his physician, Dr. James Wright, phoned Dr. Durant, who arranged for the salesman to be brought to Birmingham's Cancer Center. Following treatment with radiation and drugs, the patient was sent back to Sylacauga for Dr. Wright to continue the therapy. By January the salesman had returned to work, still under Dr. Wright's supervision.

In Tuscaloosa, Dr. Durant recently gave a talk before 15 physicians on the value of adriamycin, a new drug for cancer of connective tissue. A doctor in the audience happened to have a woman patient with this type of malignancy, but he didn't know how to cope with it. As a result of the demonstration, the woman, with a liver full of tumor, was treated with adriamycin plus DTIC, another drug, and blood transfusions. Her liver is now back to normal.

In such cases, oncologists usually avoid the word "cure." With cancer, it's "remission," "partial remission" or "total remission." Realistically, normal life expectancy becomes a possibility.

RESULTS DO SHOW

"At the very least, modern treatment can improve the quality and quantity of survival for those not cured," points out Dr. Diane P. Fink, director of the Cancer Control Division of the National Cancer Institute.

Largely due to research and cancer control projects, survival rates for some types of the disease have been steadily rising. With childhood leukemia, which used to be invariably fatal within a year of onset, about one-fourth of those afflicted can now expect to live free of symptoms at least five years. At certain cancer centers, as many as half of these patients survive five years or more. In Hodgkins, Dr. Durant maintains that seven out of 10 patients at Birmingham's center return to good health, though he can't say for how long.

As viewed by Dr. Charles G. Zubrod of the National Cancer Institute, "Chemotherapy is now clearly responsible for producing normal life expectancy in at least 10 types of widespread cancer." Besides leukemia and Hodgkins, these include cancers of the muscles, bone, skin and kidney.

Dr. Durant believes that about 15 percent of cancer patients in the country are dying needlessly or prematurely. In Alabama alone, he maintains that treatment demonstrations could save 1500 lives each year—and this state is sparsely populated.

In addition to the Birmingham project, similar demonstration programs have been launched simultaneously in Los Angeles, Denver, Cincinnati, Hanover, N.H., and two in New York City. These including Birmingham's, are reaching out to some 120 hospitals.

Recently the National Cancer Institute has also established 14 demonstration networks for breast cancer and five networks for head-and-neck cancer. As times goes on, new knowledge permitting, other types will be added.

Meanwhile, most cancer cases continue to be handled by community private physicians. As the medical circuit riders reach them with their message—that cancer is not always a dirty word—patients and their families, too, will find many of their fears allayed by brightening hope.

(People in need of treatment who want to know about the nearest Cancer Center in their area can write to: Cancer, Bldg. 31, Room 10A23, National Cancer Institute, Bethesda Md. 20014.)

OUR NEW PRESIDENT

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, after the brief Senate recess we returned to our duties here in the Senate with a new President at the helm.

Speaking with my constituents and others in the Nation I find they are impresed with the style and openness of President Gerald R. Ford.

He has brought to our Nation just the right type of leadership after the long nightmare of Watergate. As has been stated by others, he is the right man at the right time.

It is my hope the Congress will give him the support he needs to set the country on a firm course. He has correctly assessed our No. 1 problem as inflation but if he is to succed in dealing with it wide public and Congressional cooperation will be required. In that regard, I pledge to him my efforts to help reduce Federal spending and bring about a more businesslike management of the public's resources by the public money managers in Washington.

To accomplish these goals President Ford will need strong support. An editorial calling for such support appeared in the August 21 issue of the Aiken Standard, Aiken, S.C. I ask unanimous consent that this editorial entitled, "Ford Needs Full Support" be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

FORD NEEDS FULL SUPPORT

When Gerald Ford stepped into the Oval office as the 38th President of the United States he undoubtedly felt many emotions. In the modern day context his rise to office is indeed a log cabin to White House story.

Starting as an adopted child, he progressed steadily through many walks of life with an unwavering sense of purpose, hard work, integrity and a fine appreciation of American institutions.

His purpose and will should stand Mr. Ford in good stead as he takes the bridge of the ship of state. So will his depth of experience in government—25 years in the House of Representatives and 10 months as vice president have given him a deep understanding of the workings of Congress and the White House. A lawyer by profession he also has a fine appreciation of the judiciary branch.

Mr. Ford's unique qualifications, his steadiness and his friendships in Congress—indeed his low-key approach—are comforting in view of the trying times that lie ahead as the United States dresses its wounds and seeks to recover some of the time lost by the distraction of Watergate.

By the same token, Americans should recognize that Mr. Ford is not Merlin the magician. Our national problems are deep-seated. They are massive in size and not susceptible to any easy or magical cure.

We believe, however, that as Americans enter the post-Watergate era, they can begin to assess the issues with the conviction that morality in the executive branch will not be a problem. At the outset was can we address ourselves with undivided attention to world peace, inflation, the energy crisis, pollution and the spectrum of other problems. Mr. Ford begins his term of office with the knowledge that 479 of the 535 members of Congress voted for his confirmation and the fact that an overwhelming majority of voters in 1972 cast their ballots for the conservative philosophy that he represents.

Nevertheless, the new chief executive still will need the full understanding and cooperation of the American people as well as Congress. We must accept at face value his assertion that he will serve the nation first and think of his political future second.

The dynamism of the American Constitution has brought Mr. Ford to the highest office in the land and the most powerful position of leadership in the world. The constitutional process should continue to quiet the raging national waters in the critical days ahead.

NEED FOR PEACE IN CYPRUS

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, in behalf of the congregation of St. John Greek Orthodox Church in Charleston, W. Va., I ask that the following letter be printed in the RECORD to express their prayer for peace and freedom in Cyprus.

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

AUGUST 22, 1974.

Hon. SENATORS AND CONGRESSMEN OF THE STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA.

HONORABLE GENTLEMEN: We, the Congregation of St. John Greek Orthodox Church in Charleston, West Virginia, are proud of the fact that we were born and reared in America, the blessed land of prosperity, Democracy and human equality. We are also proud of the fact that our ancestors reached the shores of this land, coming from Greece and from Cyprus where the dignity of man and Democracy were proclaimed three thousand years ago.

Whereas we were reared under the influence of these two backgrounds as proud Americans of Greek decent, we now find out and proclaim the following:

That Liberty, Democracy and the pursuit of Happiness are taken away from the freedom loving people of Cyprus,

That an Alien power, Turkey, has invaded the island and conspired to bring this about.

That our government in Washington and the other great powers of the free world have not as yet used their forceful influence to restore the freedom of the Cypriot people.

That in the mean time unbelievable atrocities that remind dark ages, killings, rapes, bombings, and other brutalities are committed by the Turkish soldiers in violation of all human rights.

That in Greece, itself a strong indignation is arousing against our country and the fact that we have left Cyprus all alone.

That Greece is ready to go to war in order to defend the Freedom of Cyprus as all peaceful means of achieving this have been exhausted,

We urge you, our elected representatives, to bring before the Congress of our land this mesage and ask them to put and exert all their influence on our government for peace and Freedom in Cyprus.

We join together with the other five million Americans of Greek descent in a voice of protest, for what is going on in Cyprus.

We have elected you to represent us and all we are asking from you is to do Just that!

We ask you to do your duty, as Americans and free people. Save Cyprus. Save peace.

Sincerely yours,

FR. TERRY LINOS AND THE CHARLESTON COMMITTEE FOR JUSTICE IN CYPRUS.

SENATOR RANDOLPH AGAIN STRESSES NEED FOR AFFIRMATIVE ACTION TO COMBAT RUINOUS INFLATION—CONFERS WITH MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. President, this morning it was my privilege to confer with our distinguished majority leader, MIKE MANSFIELD, concerning the critical economic problems confronting the Nation and the urgent need for affirmative solutions by the Congress and the executive branch.

Senator MANSFIELD is to be commended for publicly warning of the prospects for a serious recession and comparing present conditions to the 1930s. I agree with his assessment and made similar comment in the Senate on August 22.

It is absolutely essential that we move and move at once on all fronts to curb the ruinous inflationary conditions which are having a disastrous impact on our citizens. As I warned last February and a few days ago, only dramatic and drastic programs will lead to solutions to the grave problems of our economy—action is needed now.

Mr. President, I am deeply disturbed by news reports that the President's Executive Director of the so-called Economic Summit Conference has discounted the possibility of major actions this year and firmly indicated that no large scale antiinflationary programs will be undertaken until the start of 1975.

AMBASSADOR McGHEE LOOKS AT WELFARE

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. President, I have recently read a most perceptive article on the issue of welfare reform written by George C. McGhee, former American Ambassador to West Germany, an official of the National Urban Coalition and currently president of the Federal City Council. "A New Look at Welfare" in the Saturday Review, pleads the case of the need to reform welfare rather than to eliminate it—a reform which would permit us "to take deep satisfaction in being citizens of a country that is compassionately concerned for its people." Because I feel this is of such a timely nature, I ask unanimous consent that Ambassador McGhee's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

A NEW LOOK AT WELFARE

To most Americans *welfare* is a dirty word. It connotes wangling and weaseling for public dollars. It has been made to seem that our welfare system is somehow at odds with the national character. This attitude unquestionably reflects the American tradition—in most respects a sound one—that people should look after themselves. We tend, however, to take a stereotyped view of welfare as a system in which lazy loafers who refuse to work are supported by those who do. Naturally, everyone dislikes paying hard-earned money for taxes that maintain spurious projects.

Europeans, from the time of Bismarck in the mid-nineteenth century, have accepted the ultimate responsibility of the State for the well-being of its people. Americans, I believe, see the magnitude and complexity of the welfare problem, but many tend to look at welfare astigmatically, distortedly—from one side only.

Like everyone else, I naturally oppose giving welfare to those who don't need it and to those who refuse to work. With 25 million Americans living below the official "poverty level," and unemployment at 5.2 percent in January and going up—it is not surprising that at last report, 14,700,000 Americans were receiving $1,782,000,000 a month in welfare. Of those, however, 73 percent comprised the aged, the infirm, and dependent children. But I also question severely the easy assumption that many able-bodied people prefer idleness to work. A few years ago this question was investigated thoroughly by a blue-ribbon Commission on Income Maintenance Programs, chaired by a hard-headed Chicago industrialist, Ben Heineman. The Heineman panel concluded that people do work if the opportunity is available. Apart from the few unfortunate misfits of modern society, when able-bodied people are not working, the reason is usually that they cannot find a job.

Cheating is reprehensible, particularly when its done with public money. However, there is, I believe, a tendency to magnify cheating on welfare. Even though businessmen occasionally cheat on taxes, no one is advocating abolition of the free-enterprise system. Let's eliminate the cheating—but not welfare.

I would like, therefore, to propose another way of looking at welfare. As we seek to improve it, why can't we view it with pride as we would our local United Givers Fund or any other community undertaking that enlists our social zeal? Why don't we think in terms of the indispensable role welfare plays in helping the elderly couple around the corner who have lost their pension through no fault of their own or the mother whose husband has died and who has children to support? Why do we always have to look at it in terms of cheaters? Why can't we take deep satisfaction in being citizens of a country that is compassionately concerned for its people?

Certainly, we must tighten up the regulations. At the same time, however, we must devise a better way than now exists for helping those who *need* help. Setting national standards for welfare levels and for competence in administration is one example. Providing aid to the working poor is another, and it is long overdue. Many who work a full week just don't earn enough to support their families.

It is to President Nixon's credit that early in his administration he launched a far-reaching welfare-reform program called the Family Assistance Plan. The Committee for Economic Development, a top-level business group strongly supported the program. The plan provided a $2400 minimum for a family of four, a figure which at that time was exceeded only in the wealthy states. The plan also provided for aid to the working poor. The program passed the House but was defeated by deep-seated opposition in the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. Why? Partly over disagreement on the legitimate issue of work incentives but also because the plan suffered for want of sustained White House interest. One can only hope that the recent introduction of the Federal Supplemental Security Income Program for establishing an income floor for the aged and disabled presages a new interest in welfare by the administration.

Like national defense, welfare should be a matter beyond party. Politics and human

suffering don't go together. Welfare is not the beginning but the end of efforts to better the lot of our citizens. We must start with full-employment efforts, an adequate minimum wage, unemployment and health insurance, and social security—which are not gifts but come largely from contributions by employers and employees.

At the same time, let's also decide as a nation that we intend to do the right thing by those who—after all these assists—still need help. And let's decide that in extending such help, we will be generous and will not wince if it's called *welfare*.

DISPOSAL OF CHEMICAL MUNITIONS

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the Department of the Army has notified the Senate, by letter dated July 30, 1974, of its plans for disposal of a portion of the deterrent stockpile of chemical agents and munitions stored at the Rocky Mountain Arsenal, Colo.

I will continue to report significant events involving the chemical and biological warfare programs which are under the purview of the Armed Services Committee.

Since this is a subject of general interest, I ask unanimous consent to have a copy of that letter printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

SECRETARY OF THE ARMY,
Washington, July 30, 1974.

Hon. GERALD R. FORD,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In October 1973, I advised the members of Congress that determination had been made that the portion of the U.S. National deterrent stockpile of chemical agents and munitions stored at Rocky Mountain Arsenal, Colorado, need no longer be retained. These stocks include agent GB stored in underground tanks, one-ton containers, bombs and missile warheads.

This determination provided authority for preparation of detailed disposal plans for on-site demilitarization/detoxification of munitions and agent GB and the eventual elimination of the possible risk associated with the storage of this materiel in close proximity to as populated an area as Denver. It is planned to accomplish the disposal of these stocks concurrently with the on-going disposal of obsolete M34 GB filled clusters at Rocky Mountain Arsenal. You were advised of the initiation of the M34 disposal program on 26 September 1973.

In developing disposal plans for the deterrent stocks, the initial segment selected for disposal is 189 tons of agent GB contained in five underground storage tanks which will be neutralized in the same facilities and under the same stringent controls afforded the agent currently being drained from the obsolete clusters. Operations will consist of draining the agent from the underground tanks, chemical detoxification, evaporation of water from the resultant agent-free salts, and storage of the dried salts in sealed drums at Rocky Mountain Arsenal. The ultimate disposition of these salts will be the subject of a separate action which will encompass all of the salts resulting from the agent GB disposal program. Existing emission control standards will continue to ensure that emissions will be within the existing standards established by the State of Colorado as well as Federal guidelines.

Secretary Schlesinger has requested that I notify you of this disposal action planned for initiation during September 1976. I am also notifying the Speaker of the House of Representatives of this action. You will be advised as plans are approved for disposal of the balance of the deterrence stocks at Rocky Mountain Arsenal.

The plan for disposal of 189 tons of agent GB has been reviewed by the Acting Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service. Since the disposal of the deterrent stockpile at Rocky Mountain Arsenal is essentially an expansion of current operations, a Supplement to the environmental statement covering the M34 cluster disposal program has been filed with the President's Council on Environmental Quality. The Council has approved this action.

The Department of Defense is taking extensive precautions to protect the health and safety of the public and personnel who will be involved in this operation. It is also taking extraordinary precautions to assure that there will be no adverse effect on the environment.

Sincerely,

HOWARD H. CALLAWAY.

THE SENATE SHOULD REMEMBER THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION'S IMPORTANCE

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, the Senate has returned to business today after a much needed Labor Day recess. It is fortunate that we have had this time to pause and collect our thoughts and energies, for we return to deal with a large volume of business. Several committees have recently reported or will soon report their recommendations on major legislation concerning tax reform, health care and insurance, and measures to deal with the Nation's economy. These are pressing issues which call upon the Senate to make critical decisions.

It is easy for us to be caught up in the issues of the moment, but it is vital that we consider without delay the Genocide Convention, which was favorably reported by the Foreign Relations Committee 3 years ago and has languished in the full Senate since then. In the narrow view of some it is not of the same immediacy as the fight against inflation, but no one who remembers the holocaust of the Second World War will doubt the tremendous significance of this treaty. President Harry Truman first submitted this treaty to the Senate some 25 years ago; it is inexcusable that we have not dealt with it in all this time.

By ratification of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, the Senate will formally and substantively make known its condemnation of this terrible crime. The Second World War presented us with this profound issue three decades ago, and it is still with us. Let us address the immediate issues of the moment. But let us not forget the fundamental issues of our generation. Mr. President, I urge the Senate to ratify this Convention before the end of this session.

PROCUREMENT REFORM PROGRESS: LATEST GAO MONITORING REPORT

Mr. CHILES. Mr. President, in December 1972, the Commission on Government Procurement completed a 2½-year study and submitted to the Congress and to the President a four-volume report with 149 recommendations. The main thrust of these recommendations is to replace the present patchwork and fragmented Federal procurement process with an integrated system for more effective policymaking, management, and control. I was privileged to be one of the 12 Members who served on the Commission which included three other Members of the Congress, the Comptroller General of the United States, and representatives of both the executive branch and private business. With his usual foresight, Congressman CHET HOLIFIELD, who served as Vice Chairman of the Commission, asked the General Accounting Office—GAO—to report periodically on the executive branch response to the 149 Commission recommendations.

GAO's just-released report shows that substantial progress has been made over that previously reported. Executive branch positions either have been established or are in process on more than three-fourths of the recommendations. Implementing actions on 25 of them have been initiated and are completed on four others.

The Congress, I am happy to say, has initiated legislative action on 33, or more than half of the Commission recommendations directed to Congress. One piece of legislation implements the Commission's first and key recommendation—the creation of an Office of Federal Procurement Policy—OFPP—to fill a void in executive branch leadership. That bill, S. 2510, has now been sent to the President for signature. The status of other legislation introduced is summarized in chapter 3 of the GAO report which I will include at the end of my statement.

I was pleased to see from the GAO report that the executive branch has accepted the eight recommendations the Commission considered next in importance to creation of the OFPP—to establish a modernized and unified statutory framework for all Government procurement. Senator ROTH and I hope to introduce legislation shortly to implement these recommendations.

For all this progress, however, the Comptroller General observes in his report that much remains to be done and recommends that the executive branch place priorities on completing some of the more urgent reforms. I wholeheartedly agree. Such reforms include those which will set in motion the six basic functions in OFPP legislation just sent to the President—Commission recommendations A-10, A-11, A-15, A-16, A-22 through 26, and D-1. I note from the GAO report that executive branch positions have been established on only one of these recommendations, and no implementing actions have been completed.

For example, the status of recommendations to implement the national policy of reliance on the private sector is the same now as it was 6 months ago. The interagency task group responding to the recommendations, led by the Office of Management and Budget—OMB—has not yet developed a first draft of its position or even provided a target completion date. In view of the task group's inability to make substantial progress over the past 15 months in arriving at a position, GAO has recommended that OMB, first, reevaluate the task group

effort and membership; second, insure that a positive program is being actively pursued; and third, reach agreement with the task group on a target completion date. I trust these recommendations will be heeded.

Another high priority executive branch reform is the General Services Administration—GSA—wholesale operation which competes with private enterprise. Each year GSA spends billions of dollars to satisfy Federal agency needs for commercial products but does not charge its Federal customers the full cost of supplying their needs. There is no way of presently determining whether such needs can be satisfied more economically by Federal agency use of existing commercial distribution systems. The Commission recommended that GSA-type wholesale operations continue only where they can be shown to be more cost effective than commercial systems. I note from the GAO report that the recent executive branch proposal on this recommendation deferred the submission of implementing actions until 6 months after a policy position is established. This means another 2- or 3-year delay on this important recommendation since legislation will be required to fully implement it. I believe that legislation on this matter should be considered early in the next session of Congress.

I will be in contact with OMB on behalf of our Subcommittee on Federal Procurement to urge more executive branch attention to these and other high priority procurement reforms which include as well—

A single governmentwide coordinated system of procurement regulations;

Timely private sector participation in the regulatory process;

Acquisition of professional services; and

Acquisition of major systems.

In addition to monitoring executive branch action on each of the 149 Commission recommendations as of July 1, 1974, GAO applied a test of responsiveness to 79 final or near-final executive branch actions. It found that action on 32 of the recommendations was either nonresponsive or only partially responsive because of, first, insufficient rationale for modifications or rejections; second, unsupported claims that recommendations were already being implemented; or third, inadequate implementation plans.

For example, GAO found the proposed executive branch action nonresponsive on 12 recommendations concerned with the acquisition of major systems. While the executive branch is proposing acceptance of these recommendations, its response included a series of negating reservations, restrictions, modifications, and qualifications and unsupported claims that they were already being implemented. I have had a recent exchange of correspondence with the Department of Defense—DOD—lead agency for the interagency study of these recommendations. The Department's current position is that it will develop implementation for these recommendations. Our subcommittee hopes to be able to work with the Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committees through future hearings to consider legislation and executive branch implementation in this important area which involves such a large part of the annual defense budget.

To resolve the individual problem areas disclosed in the recent GAO report and to improve overall effectiveness of implementing actions, the Comptroller General directed a series of recommendations to the Director of OMB. The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 requires that a response be submitted by OMB to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and Government Operations within 60 days.

Each of the 42 problem areas, as well as the various degrees of executive branch responsiveness and the specific recommendations of the Comptroller General, are individually identified in chapter 5 of the GAO report. I ask unanimous consent that this chapter, together with chapter 3 and the Comptroller General's letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C.

Hon. CHET HOLIFIELD,
Chairman, Committee on Government Operations, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In accordance with your request, we are continuing to monitor the executive branch response to the recommendations of the Commission on Government Procurement. This fourth in a series of reports summarizes as of July 1, 1974, (1) status of the 149 Commission recommendations (2) extent to which the recommendations have been accepted, modified or rejected, (3) implementing actions initiated and completed, and (4) executive branch responsiveness to the recommendations.

Executive branch progress has been significant in the past 6 months. Overall status of the 149 Commission recommendations is (1) executive branch positions established —40 recommendations, (2) proposed positions under consideration at executive branch level—83 recommendations, and (3) interagency task group efforts still in progress—26 recommendations. Of the 40 positions established to date, the executive branch has adopted 32, modified 5, and rejected 3 of the recommendations.

We evaluated the responsiveness of executive branch final or near-final actions on 79 of the Commission recommendations and found them to be partially responsive or nonresponsive in 32 instances because of:

Insufficient rationale for modifications.

Unsupported statements that the recommendations were already being implemented.

Inadequate implementation plans to accomplish recommendation objectives.

On the executive branch near-final actions, we recognize revision is still possible, and thus the degree of responsiveness shown in this report may change. Chapter 5 contains information on responsiveness and other individual problem areas, together with our recommendations for corrective measures.

The executive branch is now entering the crucial implementation phase. A number of problems are emerging, including question of responsiveness. The report contains recommendations to the Director, Office of Management and Budget, to insure:

Sufficient staff support to handle the implementation "bulge."

Establishment of relative priorities and completion dates for implementing actions.

Evaluation and approval of the effectiveness of proposed implementing actions.

Development of a legislative priority program for coordination with appropriate congressional committees.

At July 1, 1974, the executive branch had begun implementation action on 25 Commission recommendations and had completed implementation of 3 others. The Congress itself has initiated legislation on 33 other Commission recommendations. Legislation introduced by you and Senator Chiles to create an Office of Federal Procurement Policy is nearing enactment. Much remains to be done on other legislation.

As stated in our last report, we believe a coordinated legislative approach in the Congress will help immeasurably to expedite consideration of needed Government-wide legislation and enhance the likelihood of favorable action. The Senate has taken a major step in this direction with the establishment of its Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Federal Procurement. This Subcommittee is coordinating with other Committees and is holding joint hearings on matters of mutual interest.

As you requested, we are sending copies of this report to the Senate Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Federal Procurement; other congressional committees interested in procurement matters; Director, Office of Management and Budget; Administrator of General Services; heads of the 14 lead agencies involved in the executive branch program; and each member who served on the Commission on Government Procurement.

Sincerely yours,

ELMER B. STAATS,
Comptroller General of the United States.

CHAPTER 3—STATUS OF CONGRESSIONAL LEGISLATION

The Commission found that the present statutory foundation for procurement policy "is a welter of disparate and confusing restrictions and of grants of limited authority to avoid the restrictions." It attributed the problem in part to weak policy leadership in the executive branch and in part to the fact that the Congress had never focused its attention on the overall procurement process.

The Commission, in pointing out that statutes provide the foundation for the whole framework of Government procurement, identified more than 4,000 procurement-related statutes. Statutes most often including procurement laws were those creating individual agencies, authorizing individual programs, appropriating funds for agency programs, and providing for methods of procurement and contract award procedures.

Two of these statutes, enacted by the Congress some 25 years ago, are fundamental to the procurement process in that they established methods of procurement and award procedures for Federal agencies. One, the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, is applicable to Department of Defense agencies, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and the Coast Guard. The other, the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, is applicable to civilian agencies, including the Atomic Energy Commission. The Procurement Commission noted that, although both DOD and NASA are governed by the 1947 act, each relies on its separate organic act or on separate statutory provisions to issue separate and, often inconsistent, procurement regulations. AEC generally has followed the Federal Procurement Regulations (FPRs) issued by GSA under the 1949 act but, in a few cases, has decided to adopt more liberal regulations under the broader statutory authority of its organic act. The Tennessee Valley Authority has exercised its own organic act authority rather than follow the FPRs. The Commission found that many statutes, including the two basic procurement acts, were outmoded and that the whole body of procurement law included many inconsistent and redundant provisions.

Commission legislative recommendations call for modernizing and consolidating the

two basic procurement statutes, enacting new legislation in several important areas, and repeating obsolete or redundant laws.

The Senate responded by establishing, in July 1973, the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Federal Procurement under its Committee on Government Operations. The Subcommittee is coordinating with other committees and holding joint hearings in areas of mutual interest. The House currently has not established such a focal point, legislative jurisdiction being split among several committees, such as Government Operations, Judiciary, Armed Services, and Small Business.

As of July 1, 1974, Members of Congress have introduced bills responding to 33 of the 64 Commission recommendations requiring or indicating preferences for legislative action. Table 1 summarizes the status of legislative action on these Commission-related bills.

TABLE 1

Bill No.	Introduced	By	Committee referred to	Purpose	Commission recommendation [1]	Status
S. 1414	March 1973	Chiles	Senate Government Operations.	To improve executive branch budgeting and programing and strengthen congressional control.	C-2, 5	Reported out of committee; partially incorporated in congressional budget reform act signed by the President July 1974.
H.R. 9059 superseded by H.R. 15233.	June 1973	Holifield, Horton.	House Government Operations.	To create OFPP	A-1	Hearings held 1973; reported out of committee June 1974; passed House July 1974.
H.R. 9060	June 1973	Holifield, Horton.	House Government Operations.	To clarify distinction between contract and grant-type assistance transactions.	F-1	No action.
H.R. 9061	June 1973	Holifield, Horton.	House Judiciary	To modernize and consolidate basic procurement statutes.	A-2-9; E-1, 4; G-21-24; J-2.	No action.
H.R. 9062	June 1973	Holifield, Horton.	House Judiciary	To establish integrated system for contract legal remedies.	G-2-12	No action.
S. 2510	October 1973	Chiles, Roth	Senate Government Operations.	To create OFPP	A-1	Passed Senate March 1974; sent to House.
S. 2785	December 1973	Percy	Senate Government Operations.	To authorize multiyear leasing of automated data processing equipment.	D-13	Hearings held; approved by subcommittee May 1974.
S. 3311	April 1974	Chiles, Roth	Senate Government Operations.	To raise ceiling for use of simplified small purpose procedures from $2,500 to $10,000.	A-7	Passed Senate June 1974; sent to House.
H.R. 14494	April 1974	Holifield, Horton	House Government Operations.	To raise ceiling for use of simplified small purchase procedures to $10,000.	A-7	Hearings held; reported out of committee June 1974; passed House July 1974.
S. 3514	May 1974	Chiles, Roth, et al.	Senate Government Operations.	To clarify distinction between contract and grant-type assistance transactions; authorize feasibility study of policy guidance for Federal assistance programs.	F-1, 2	Hearings in progress.
S. 3610	June 1974	Hathaway	Senate Judiciary	To establish regional small claims boards	G-4	No action.

[1] See ch. 5 schedules for identity of these Commission recommendations.

Senate bill 1414, the first one introduced, seeks to organize the Federal budget according to (1) primary national needs, (3) key program steps, taken from the framework described in the Commission report for acquisition of major systems.[1] The Senate Government Operations Committee favorably reported out this bill but initial Senate action was to incorporate only some provisions as amendments to the budget reform bill (H.R. 7130), now signed into law.

As discussed in chapter 2, Senate bill 2510, the legislation to create OFPP, passed the Senate in March 1974. The House Government Operations Committee reported out its version in June 1974 and the bill passed the House in July.

House bill 9060, introduced last year to distinguish between contract and grant-type assistance transactions, has not been acted upon to date. Senate bill 3514, introduced in May 1974, combines the purpose of the House bill with another Commission recommendation for a feasibility study of developing policy guidance for Federal assistance programs. Hearings on this bill began in late June before the Senate Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Federal Procurement.

House bills 9061 and 9062, introduced last year to modernize and consolidate basic procurement statutes and to establish an integrated system of legal remedies, were referred to the House Judiciary Committee. No action on these bills has occurred or is contemplated during the remainder of this session. Bill 9061, the proposed new procurement statute, has suffered from a House committee jurisdictional conflict. The two existing basic procurement statutes are under the separate cognizance of the Armed Services and Government Operations Committees; but the Judiciary Committee has been assigned legislative responsibility. The Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Federal Procurement expects to introduce a Senate version of a new procurement statute this summer.

[1] See Vol. 2, pt. C, "Acquisition of Major Systems," particularly recommendations C-2 and C-5.

This Senate Ad Hoc Subcommittee has also taken action on bills to authorize multiyear leasing of automated data processing equipment and to raise the ceiling for simplified small purchase procedures from $2,500 to $10,000. The small purchase bill passed the Senate in June 1974 and a House version passed in July.

* * * * *

CHAPTER 5—EXECUTIVE BRANCH PROGRESS, STATUS, RESPONSIVENESS

Table 2 shows the extent to which executive branch positions have been established on Commission recommendations since our last report.

TABLE 2.—POSITIONS ESTABLISHED

	Number of recommendations	
	At Jan. 1, 1974	At July 1, 1974
Positions in process at lead agency task group level (see table 3 for status)	70	26
Positions in process at executive branch review and coordination level (see table 4 for status)	78	83
Positions established (see table 5 for implementation status)	1	40
Total	149	149

As shown, the majority of the interagency task group efforts are now completed and many of their proposed positions are in process at the executive branch review and coordination level. Executive branch positions have been established on 40 of the recommendations, or about 27 percent.

Positions in process at lead agency task group level

Our last report showed that all task groups had scheduled submissions of their proposed positions by the end of June 1974. Table 3 shows the number still in process and their stages of development at July 1, 1974.

Table 3—Task group stage of development, July 1, 1974

	Number of recommendations
First draft not completed	10
First draft completed	2
Awaiting response from participating agencies	7
Processing submission or resubmission	3
Preparing implementation	4
Total	26
Target for submission by:	
July 1974	9
August 1974	3
September 1974	5
November 1974	1
January 1975	2
Not established	6
Total	26

About half these 26 remaining task group efforts have gone beyond the first draft stage; some are awaiting responses from participating agencies. Target dates given to us by the task groups indicate that more than half the submissions will be made to the GSA Office of Procurement Management during the next 3 months. First drafts have not been completed for 10 of the recommendations and target dates have not yet been established for 6 of them. The schedules at the end of this chapter (1) identify recommendations having task group efforts still in progress, (2) show new target dates or absence of target dates, (3) discuss problem areas warranting attention and (4) include GAO recommendations directed to OMB to resolve these problems (see Commission recommendations A-22 through A-26, A-44, and A-46).

Positions in process at executive branch level

The executive branch level currently has proposed positions on 83 recommendations under review and coordination. Table 4 shows their stages of completion at July 1, 1974.

TABLE 4.—*Executive branch level stage of completion, July 1, 1974*

	Number of recommendations
Positions in GSA Office of Procurement Management	2
Positions out for official comment by:	
Agency heads	31
Private sector	1
Agency heads and private sector	4
Official comments on positions under consideration	20
Positions referred to OMB for final resolution	25
Total	83

As indicated above, most interagency task groups' positions submitted to the executive branch level are either out for official agency and/or private sector comments or the comments are under consideration. When analysis of official agency comments indicate a concensus on the task group position, it is usually adopted as an executive branch position in a meeting between GSA and its Interagency Procurement Policy Advisory Group. Otherwise, if an agency dissents on a significant issue, or if a major policy matter is involved, the position is normally referred to OMB for final resolution. The schedules at the end of this chapter identify the Commission recommendations in each category shown in table 4; the proposed executive branch position on each; and, if referred to OMB, the reasons why. The schedules also include discussions of problem areas in three instances and recommended corrective measures addressed to OMB (see Commission recommendations A-18, A-43, and A-48).

Positions established

Final executive branch positions have been established on 40 recommendations, of which the executive branch has adopted 32, modified 5, and rejected 3. The schedules at the end of this chapter identify these recommendations and if modified or rejected the reasons why.

Implementation status

After executive branch positions are established, implementation actions are initiated. Frequently, this involves drafting legislation for submission to the Congress, a Federal Management Circular, or coordinated Federal and Armed Service Procurement Regulations. Table 5 shows the status at July 1, 1974, of implementation actions on the 37 recommendations adopted either as proposed by the Commission or as modified by the executive branch.

TABLE 5.—*Status of implementation actions, July 1, 1974*

	Number of recommendations
Action not yet initiated	5
Action initiated by the:	
Executive branch	25
The Congress [1]	4
Implementation completed	3
Total	37

[1] See ch. 3 for total legislation initiated by the Congress (which includes Commission recommendations on which executive branch positions have not as yet been established).

Schedules at the end of this chapter identify these recommendations and the type of implementation planned or initiated. They include GAO recommendations where implementation actions are believed to be inadequate to accomplish objectives of Commission recommendations.

Responsiveness to recommendations

The executive branch approach is to consider Commission recommendations as a baseline for improving the Federal Government Procurement process. In individual cases, alternative solutions or modifications to the recommendations may be offered. The key to our evaluation was to determine whether a considered and positive response had been made to the problems identified in the Commission report, using the following criteria.

Clarity of executive position in accepting, modifying, or rejecting Commission recommendations.

Accuracy of decision-supporting material, including interpretations of recommendations and underlying data.

Completeness and objectivity of discussion of issues.

Convincingness of rationale and other material supporting executive branch positions.

Adequacy of proposed implementation for accomplishing the objectives of Commission recommendations.

We evaluated the responsiveness of 79 executive branch positions and related implementation plans that had been established as of July 1, 1974, or that had progressed sufficiently to permit such evaluation.

On those positions not fully established, all steps through obtaining official agency coordination (see step 6 in chart 1) had usually been completed and the executive branch direction or concensus was clear. It is still possible, however, for the executive branch to change its indicated direction in these cases.

In making the evaluations, we found the GSA staff analyses of task group submissions and official agency comments to be of great assistance. The analyses were well prepared and indicative of the skill and knowledge of the analysts. They summarized clearly and concisely the (1) task group position and extent to which it changed the Commission's recommendation, (2) official views of the agencies solicited, (3) problems and issues involved in reaching an executive branch position or implementing it, and (4) significant matters to be resolved by the Interagency Procurement Policy Advisory Group or by OMB.

Table 6 summarizes the results of our evaluation of executive branch responsiveness to Commission recommendations.

TABLE 6.—*Extent of responsiveness*

	Number of recommendations
Positions considered responsive	47
Positions considered partially responsive	14
Positions considered nonresponsive	18
Total	79

Of the recommendations reviewed, we found 32 to be either partially responsive or nonresponsive. The reasons can be classified generally into three categories.

1. Insufficient rationale advanced for recommendation modification (A-36, C-3, C-4, C-6, D-7, E-1, E-2, E-3).[2]

2. Unsupported statements that Commission recommendations were already being implemented (A-49, B-6, C-1 through C-12).

3. Proposed implementation inadequate to accomplish recommendation objective (A-11, A-27, A-38, B-1 through 4, E-4, F-2, G-14, G-16, H-3, J-6).

Two of the recommendations cited above (G-14 and G-16) involve the role of GAO in the bid protest area. Despite longstanding discussions on the implementation of these recommendations, GAO and the executive branch have not been able to reach complete agreement. Progress has been made and a current effort is underway to reconcile the remaining differences.

The schedules at the end of this chapter, showing policy positions and implementing actions on Commission recommendations, cover in detail the degree of executive branch responsiveness and the individual problem areas. They also include GAO recommendations directed to OMB to resolve cases of partial responsiveness and nonresponsiveness.

Recommendations to the Director, OMB [3]

In addition to the recommendations previously referred to in this chapter for actions on individual Commission recommendations, our review disclosed some matters of a general nature which we believe warrant OMB's attention.

The implementation phase of the executive branch response is the most critical one, and problems have emerged on some of the recommendations, as identified in GAO comments in the schedules. We have noted also that an implementation "bulge" has impacted the FPR and ASPR Committees as a result of the increasing number of executive branch positions now emerging. These committees are not staffed to handle this additional workload.

We therefore recommend that the Director of OMB

Insure that appropriate staff support is provided to the implementing agencies and

Provide for evaluating the effectiveness of implementation actions to be issued on adopted Commission recommendations and for final OMB approval of each.

Recommendations in prior report

Our report of January 31, 1974, observed that completing a program of this nature, size, and complexity is likely to require, at the present pace, at least several years of effort. We recommended that the executive branch develop an overall plan which would establish relative priorities and completion dates for final actions on Commission recommendations. From this plan we believed a legislative program could also be established and coordinated with interested congressional committees. Suggested criteria in that report for establishing relative priorities and agency comments on our prior recommendations follow.

1. We suggested that the highest priorities would be assigned to those recommendations which provide a framework for setting procurement policy and a Government-wide regulatory system. These are:

Establishing a focal point in the executive branch for procurement policy leadership. The executive branch is now responding to legislation in this area.

Modernizing and consolidating existing procurement statutes to provide a forward looking and common statutory base for procurement policy. GSA has referred to OMB a marked up version of House bill 9061 based on an analysis of executive agency comments. The Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Federal Procurement is currently preparing to introduce a Senate version.

Establishing a single Government-wide coordinated system of procurement regulations. The interagency task group report on this recommendation has been remanded for further work. Both this recommendation and the one directed to achieving more timely private sector participation in the regulatory-making process could benefit at this time from a higher priority effort.

2. We suggested the next highest priorities be assigned to those recommendations meeting the criterion of greater significance, judged by such factors as the proportion of procurement dollars and number of transactions involved. Recommendations which obviously qualify under this criterion are those that would make fundamental changes in the manner of acquiring major systems, commercial products, and professional services.

[2] C-3, C-4, and C-6 are also included under category 2.

[3] GAO intends that the Office of Federal Procurement Policy carry out these recommendations as well as the ones referred to earlier in this chapter, when pending legislation to create this Office is enacted. This legislation has passed both the Senate and House.

Official agency comments have been obtained on the major system task group report but there are serious problems with the proposed executive branch implementation (see C-1 through C-12 in the schedules).

The interagency task group report on the principle commercial product recommendation (D-6) has just been submitted to GSA and must be processed through the various executive branch review and coordination stages.

Regulatory treatment of the implementing action on professional services has been recently initiated. It requires substantial development by the implementing agencies.

We believe that each of the above areas will have a significant impact on the Government's acquisition process, both in dollars and number of transactions, and that higher priority treatment would be beneficial.

3. We suggested a third criterion involving the requirement for legislation. We believe that the protracted time and level of consideration needed to develop a policy position, enact legislation, and issue regulatory guidance dictate a higher level of effort and thus a priority assignment. At this time the combined efforts of the Congress and the executive branch have resulted in introducing bills in the House and/or Senate on about half the Commission recommendations involving legislation. Much remains to be done to complete the legislative process on many of these bills (see ch. 3). Placing relative priorities on executive branch responses to the legislation already introduced and on the remaining legislation to be introduced would help to accelerate the legislation program.

Comments on our prior recommendations were furnished by the GSA Deputy Administrator. He supported the objectives of the recommendations and said that by the end of June 1974 the executive branch will have had enough experience with the widely different implementing media for the various recommendations to be able to make sound projections of eventual completion dates for many of them. With respect to legislation, he supported the need for coordination with appropriate committees and he said dates could be projected for at least the submission of legislative proposals.

We therefore recommend that the Director of OMB insure (1) establishment of relative priorities and completion dates for final implementing actions on Commission recommendations and (2) development of a legislative program for coordination with appropriate committees of the Congress.

THE 1975 PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Mr. HATFIELD. Mr. President, I call attention to a statement by President Ford issued on August 29, 1974, when he signed into law the 1975 public works appropriations bill, H.R. 15155. As the ranking Republican on this subcommittee, I naturally was pleased the bill was approved, for I know the President was under pressure from some advisers to veto the bill, because of what those advisers saw as inflationary factors contained in the bill, even though it was some $21 million under the administration request.

My purpose in calling this to my colleagues' attention is to praise the spirit of cooperation shown by the White House in the period leading up to this decision. Several Members of Congress were notified that the President and his advisers were concerned with the cost of some sections of this bill, and some accommodation was sought. That is, Congress was notified before the fact, and asked if through cooperation, a compromise could be found.

Members of this body will form their own opinions on the content of the message by the President when he signed the bill. On behalf of myself, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, however, I want to express my appreciation for this spirit of mutual understanding and cooperation shown by White House and Office of Management and Budget officials with whom I discussed this matter. I hope this spirit continues.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this message from the President when he signed this bill into law be printed in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

I have signed H.R. 15155, a public works appropriations bill for fiscal year 1975 providing funds for water and power development, the Atomic Energy Commission, and related agencies and commissions.

The bill raises for one of the first times the question of how well the executive and legislative branches can cooperate in carrying out the new Congressional Budget Act of 1974. Under that act, a President who signs an appropriations bill but wishes to avoid spending all of the funds may either seek a recision of appropriations or seek a deferral. In either case, the President's action requires the concurrence of the Congress.

This public works bill is troublesome because it would increase the 1975 outlays by $80 million above the budget and would commit us to major outlay increases in future years. I am strongly opposed to those increases because they would intensify our number one problem—inflation.

Nonetheless, I also recognize that this bill is the product of much hard work and deliberation and contains funds for many worthy projects. A veto would commit us to the time-consuming process of reformulating a public works appropriations bill at a time when our energies should be focused on more pressing matters.

After discussions with Congressional leaders, I have therefore decided to sign this bill with the hope and expectation that under the budget act, the Congress will work in cooperation with the executive branch to defer for one full year the expenditure of that amount of appropriated funds which would contribute excessively to inflationary governmental spending.

I am totally committed to close cooperation between the Congress and the Executive, and I know that this spirit will continue to prevail as we work together to halt the inflationary spiral.

GENERAL HAIG SHOULD NOT BE RECALLED TO ACTIVE DUTY

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, I would strenuously oppose the recall to active duty of retired Gen. Alexander Haig. Articles in the Washington Post and New York Times indicate that the administration has floated a trial balloon to see if there is opposition to the recall of General Haig as Supreme Allied Commander of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and U.S. troops in Europe.

I hope there would be significant opposition to this move. Returning Alexander Haig to active-duty status would send a clear signal throughout the military officer corps that politics pays off—and in a big way.

Every young aggressive officer would feel rightly that the door to success opens through the political process. If Alexander Haig could go from a colonel to a four-star general in 4 years and be rewarded for his political service to former President Nixon with the highest military post in Europe, then military officers may be tempted to line up with one political party or another.

The politicizing of the U.S. military would be one of the most dangerous developments in domestic politics in our generation.

General Haig is a fine officer, committed to his country, and loyal to his obligations. But the plain fact is that we have no idea what role he played at the White House—what political favors he owes or has given, what part he played in the Watergate coverup.

He may be completely untainted or he may have been involved in events not yet unfolded. We simply do not know.

General Haig left his Army post to serve in a political capacity. He knew the difficulty of the choice and yet readily took it. Under no circumstances should we now be allowed to reverse that decision and carry on as if nothing had happened in the interim.

In no other case of recalling an officer has the officer been intimately involved in national and party politics, the running of the White House machinery, and service during the greatest scandal the Nation has ever known.

I will oppose any attempt to appoint General Haig to any military position requiring the advise and consent of the Senate. The separation of politics and military service is a basic safeguard of American democracy.

It distinguishes the United States from Latin American countries where generals move in and out of politics and engage in unconstitutional activities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the articles from the Washington Post and the New York Times be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 14, 1974]

HAIG'S RETURN TO ARMY DUTY IS EXPECTED

(By Michael Getler)

There are growing indications that Alexander M. Haig Jr. will soon leave his post as White House Staff Chief and be recalled to active military duty by President Ford, according to government sources.

Senior government officials believe the most likely spot for the former four-stage general to resume his military career would be as commander of one of the main U.S. military commands, or as an eventual replacement for Army Gen. Andrew J. Goodpaster as the NATO Supreme commander.

Haig has had a meteoric military career rising from a colonel when he first went to work as deputy to Henry A. Kissinger, on the White House National Security Council staff in 1969, to a four-star general and Army chief of staff in early 1973.

Then, when the Watergate scandal started breaking openly around President Nixon, he asked Haig to become the White House chief of staff, replacing H. R. (Bob) Haldeman, who had resigned. Haig gave up his Army career to do so.

The President and the Secretary of the Army each has the authority to recall retired officers back into service. In 1962, President Kennedy recalled the former Army Chief of Staff, Gen. Maxwell Taylor, to active duty and later appointed him chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Haig's potential resumption of his military career has been rumored for a number of days. But such a move is sensitive within the Army, especially because he is viewed by many officers as having been far more involved with politics than is sound practice for military leaders. Thus, the likelihood is that rather than have Haig come back directly to the Army staff, a position in one of the major outside commands is more pallatable, at least for a new start. Haig's political and diplomatic experience make the NATO post seem most likely to most observers.

Some of Mr. Ford's political advisers, while having great respect for Haig, have also been suggesting to the President that the former general was too closely identified with the Nixon presidency, and that it would be best to let him go back to the military.

White House press secretary J. F. terHorst, through an aide, would not comment on continuing reports of Haig's pending departure from the White House. The spokesman reiterated only what has been said earlier, namely that President Ford had asked Haig to remain in his current post indefinitely.

Government sources also say Haig has had offers from private industry with six-figure salaries mentioned.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 4, 1974]

FORD IS EXPECTED TO NAME GENERAL HAIG NATO COMMANDER

(By David Binder)

WASHINGTON, September 3.—Gen. Alexander M. Haig, Jr., chief of the White House staff, is expected to be appointed supreme commander of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and of United States forces in Europe by President Ford, two authoritative Administration officials said today.

To take the post he will be recalled to active duty as a four-star Army general, a status from which he retired in August, 1973, three months after he replaced H. R. Haldeman as President Nixon's top White House aide, the officials said.

The White House said through a spokesman that it could not comment on the report. Another high Administration official said that President Ford was exploring several options concerning General Haig and that he wanted him to stay on for a while. This official said that the decision was not imminent. But the NATO post was the most likely one for General Haig, he added.

WOULD SUCCEED GOODPASTER

General Haig, who will be 50 years old in December, would succeed Gen. Andrew J. Goodpaster, 59. President Nixon named General Goodpaster supreme allied commander in Europe in March, 1969. The commander has the double function of overseeing the 15-member Atlantic defense community and the more than 300,000 United States servicemen stationed in Europe.

The officials who disclosed Mr. Ford's intention to shift General Haig said that they did not know when an official White House announcement would be made or even why the move was being contemplated.

Nor was it possible to learn immediately what factors determined the expected shift: Whether it was President Ford's wish to reshape the White House operation by eliminating the major holdovers from the Nixon Administration or General Haig's wish to return to a purely military job.

A White House official said he believed that it was primarily General Haig's desire to return to military duty that had prompted the exploration of new job opportunities for him.

In any case, the NATO post would provide a comfortable way for Mr. Ford to respond to some demands that General Haig, who was so intimately associated with President Nixon during the last 15 months of the Watergate scandal, be removed from the White House.

Last Aug. 14, only five days after he was sworn in, President Ford said through his press secretary, J. F. terHorst, that he had asked General Haig to stay as chief of the White House staff "for the duration," and Mr. terHorst added that Mr. Ford had requested General Haig to remain "indefinitely."

Last week General Haig said in a telephone interview that Mr. Ford had asked him "three times to stay" at his White House post.

One of two officials who confirmed the plan to appoint General Haig to the military post in Brussels said today that "President Ford has the highest regard for Al."

AIDE TO KISSINGER

In 1969, General Haig joined the Nixon Administration as military adviser to Henry A. Kissinger, who was then assistant to the President for national security affairs. Two years later, General Haig was appointed vice chief of staff of the Army. He held that post until his current White House appointment on May 4, 1973.

During his last tour of Army duty General Haig made no secret of his desire to rise to higher military posts and he had his eye on the chairmanship of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. That post is currently filled by Gen. George S. Brown of the Air Force.

A Pentagon spokesman said that General Haig would have been eligible for the Joint Chiefs job, had he stayed in the Army, despite his relatively young age.

It appeared that the Ford Administration had already begun the delicate process of sounding out United States allies in NATO about the acceptability of General Haig as supreme commander. The first word of such moves came yesterday from a diplomatic source in Western Europe.

Asked how their governments might respond to the appointment of General Haig, two Western European Ambassadors said today they thought it would not be well-received because of his identification in European minds with Mr. Nixon's Watergate troubles and his downfall.

Soundings also have to be made in the Department of Defense with Secretary James R. Schlesinger, the Joint Chiefs and others concerned with NATO, a Pentagon spokesman said. In addition, General Haig would also have to receive Senate approval for the post, he said.

If he accepted the appointment General Haig would take a pay cut. His White House job pays him $42,500 a year. The NATO chief gets the base pay for a full general, which is $36,000. But the supreme commander receives generous allowances and quarters from the organization.

In returning to active duty General Haig would probably also become eligible for a larger share of his Army pension, a Pentagon spokesman said. On resignation from the Army a year ago his $24,000-a-year pension was cut in half.

FEDERAL RESTRICTIONS ON STATE LOTTERIES

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I read with considerable dismay the remarks last week of Attorney General Saxbe regarding possible prosecution against State lotteries. This was just the latest in a long series of Federal actions that have attempted to thwart the operation of State lotteries, and I believe the time has come to put an end to this unwarranted Federal interference.

Since 1964, when New Hampshire became the first State in the Nation to adopt a sweepstakes to raise revenue, more than $18 million has been distributed to local school districts in my State. The sweepstakes has been a source of much-needed revenue for our educational system, and has been a model of honest administration and operation. In the last decade, 12 other States throughout the Nation have put lotteries into operation, and I predict that the number will continue to grow.

But the public acceptance of State-run lotteries has been nearly outweighed by meddlesome Federal regulations—laws that were originally designed to attack only illegal forms of gambling. Thus, sales of State lottery tickets are in some instances restricted, the use of the mails for promotional or sales purposes is prohibited, and advertising is not allowed on radio or television. The States literally have to run a gauntlet of anachronistic Federal laws in order to keep up the daily operation of their lotteries.

Mr. President, a lot more will be said on this subject in the coming weeks, and the arguments for removing all Federal restrictions on State-run lotteries will be made clear and compelling. I look forward to swift congressional action in this area, and will do everything I can to aid in the process.

CREDIT UNIONS GROW

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, a recent article in the Wall Street Journal is one of the best primers on credit unions that I have ever seen.

The piece spells out the history, nature, and size of the credit union movement succinctly.

For that reason, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Aug. 19, 1974]

CREDIT UNIONS GAIN IN MEMBERS, MONEY, MAKE PLANS TO EXPAND THEIR ACTIVITIES

(By James Carberry)

In beautiful downtown Burbank, Calif., there's a credit union that's getting ready to play the horses. It doesn't expect to make a killing at the track, however. The Arabian Horse Federal Credit Union plans to make loans to people who need cash to buy horses and for various equestrian-related purposes.

Its sponsor is the International Arabian Horse Association, whose 15,000 members own and ride horses as a hobby. A horse can cost $1,000 or more, a fairly sizable investment; so the credit union was founded recently to make horse ownership possible for the "little guy," says Walter Bagot, an association official and an Indianapolis advertising executive. Because "it's managed by horsemen, it will lend a sympathetic ear to borrowers," he says.

The implication is that borrowers can get a better deal from a credit union than from a bank, finance company or other lender. A lot of borrowers evidently think so, because credit unions are emerging as strong competitors in the giant consumer-loan market. According to the Federal Reserve Board, they now hold about 13.4% of the $145.8 billion in consumer credit outstanding (which includes loans for household or other personal expenditures but excludes real estate loans). In 1960, they held 9% of the con-

sumer credit outstanding; and in 1950, only 4%.

BAVARIAN FARMERS' SAVINGS

The first credit union was founded in mid-19th Century Europe, when some Bavarian farmers pooled their savings and made loans to neighbors at rates lower than those charged by commercial lenders. Since then, credit unions have virtually encompassed the globe. Membership in the 23,000 U.S. credit unions numbers about 28 million; it is expected to grow at a rate of about one million a year.

A credit union is owned by its depositors, who hold shares in proportion to their savings, usually one share for each $5 on deposit. Dividends are paid regularly, at annual rates of 5% to 7% of the amount of deposit, which is somewhat less than the rates paid on bank savings accounts. Deposits in federally chartered credit unions, which are about half the credit unions in the country, are insured up to $20,000 per account; federal share insurance also covers deposits in about 16% of the state-chartered credit unions. Federally chartered credit unions are regulated by the National Credit Union Administration, a federal agency; the others are regulated by state agencies.

Credit-union borrowers are charged rates comparable to, and sometimes less than, those levied by other lenders. For example, a Federal Reserve study found that in the first quarter of this year, both credit unions and banks were charging an annual average interest rate of 10.5% on new-car loans.

PAYROLL DEDUCTION, LIFE INSURANCE

Credit unions attributed their growth partly to their ability to provide services generally unavailable from competitors. Payroll withholding, a convenient way of saving in which part of the worker's pay is automatically deposited, is usually available to members of credit unions organized to serve employes of a company or government unit. So is free credit life insurance, which provides for payment of the loan balance in the event of the borrower's death; many banks charge for such insurance. As nonprofit institutions, credit unions distribute some of their surplus cash to depositors and borrowers (most members are both). In 1973, about one of every six paid loan interest refunds of up to 20%; that meant, for example, that borrowers who last year paid $500 in interest got up to $100 refunded.

A lot of borrowers come to credit unions because they can't get a loan elsewhere, credit union officials say. Sometimes they have unusual reasons for wanting help. Several years ago, a financially distressed Californian borrowed from his credit union so he could pay a drunk-driving fine; if he hadn't come up with the cash, he would have gone to jail for six months, leaving his family without support.

The year-old Feminist Federal Credit Union in Detroit has among its 900 members "married women who couldn't get credit in their own names, and widows and divorcees who couldn't get credit at all," says Joanne Parrent, an official of the credit union. Its borrowers include a woman who opened a restaurant, another who started a small art studio, and the Detroit Women's Symphony, which needed a loan to expand its concert season.

In Massachusetts, the Half-Way Houses Federal Credit Union provides financial help for parolees and probationers refused credit elsewhere; in San Francisco, a credit union provides the same service for ex-drug addicts. And in about 200 low-income neighborhoods around the country, credit unions have been organized as alternatives to finance companies, which charge much higher interest rates, according to the Credit Union National Association, a trade group.

PRAISE AND SHORTCOMINGS

Such operations warm the hearts of credit-union advocates. "I have said many times that next to the church, credit unions do the greatest good for people of any institution," says Rep. Wright Patman, chairman of the House Banking and Currency Committee.

Be that as it may, credit unions have their limitations. While they do offer some service, they don't offer a lot of others, such as checking accounts and credit cards. But they are beginnig to move in that direction, for they are awash in cash and must find new ways of putting it to work.

Credit unions hold about $26 billion in savings deposits, or only about 4% of total personal savings deposits in the U.S.; but their rate of growth is among the fastest of any savings institution. It's estimated that their savings this year will grow by $3.5 billion to $4 billion, compared with a $3.2 billion increase in 1973. But this year their automobile-loan volume, which accounts for a third of their total loan volume, has declined sharply as more consumers buy smaller, less expensive cars, or simply hang on to their old cars a lot longer. As a result, credit unions presently have about $3 billion in "highly liquid assets" available for lending, says Jay Becklin, an economist with the Credit Union National Association, a trade group. And he has a suggestion: "Because of inflation, people are spending more of their disposable income for food, fuel and other consumables. Credit unions must get into financing those purchases."

CONVENIENCE IN BAYTOWN

One that is already doing this is the Exxon Baytown Credit Union, whose 18,000 members are employes of an Exxon refinery at Baytown, Texas, and their families. The credit union provides qualified members notes that can be used like personal checks. The notes represent a line of credit of up to $5,000. Members also can use the credit union's credit card, which is honored by most of the merchants in the community of $45,000.

"Before, members had to come in and make an application for a loan when they wanted to buy school supplies, clothing and other goods on credit," says J. H. Thomas, manager of the credit union. "Now, they don't; and it's obvious a lot more convenient."

Credit unions also are introducing new services they hope will attract new members—and potential new borrowers. Rhode Island about two years ago became the first (and is still the only) state to permit credit unions to offer checking accounts, and six credit unions there now do so in cooperation with a bank. In Washington, D.C., the U.S. State Department Federal Credit Union opened 24-hour automated teller windows in three offices at scattered locations where many of its members work. Using special identification cards, members can make withdrawals against their credit-union savings accounts, or cash checks drawn on their banks.

MOVING INTO HOUSING

With more cash in the kitty, credit unions are plowing some of it into loans of larger amounts and longer maturities. Many recently have begun to make home-mortgage loans, and some have participated in real-estate ventures. The Michigan Credit Union League's housing foundation provided some funds for acquisition of land near Detroit where two housing projects were developed by the Michigan State Housing Authority. "A lot of our members are in the middle-income group ($6,000 to $19,000 a year); they can't qualify for a federal housing subsidy, and don't earn enough to afford most conventional housing," says a league official. "These houses are priced within their means." (About half the houses in the projects are owned by league members).

Historically, credit unions have kept a low profile, waiting for prospective members to walk into their offices and join up. But some have gone out to meet the competition head-on. In Framingham, Mass., the Suburban Credit Union, which is open to anyone who lives in the Framingham area, regularly places advertisements in local media saying it offers a 6% savings passbook rate, higher than that paid by banks. The credit union says this has contributed to a surge in members.

Credit unions also are trying to broaden their membership base. By law, a credit union's members must share a "common bond"; traditionally, that bond has been one of employment—in the same industry or profession, or, more frequently, in the same factory or office. But regulatory authorities, in considering applications for new credit-union charters, in recent years have accepted a looser interpretation of this requirement. The "common bond" joining members of the Wisconsin State Central Credit Union, for example, is that they live in the state. Three years ago, the Wisconsin legislature authorized credit unions there to open branches; State Central has opened four, and expects to open two or three a year, which could eventually give it a statewide network and a strong competitive position.

Like banks and thrift institutions, credit unions now have a central source of capital, the U.S. Central Credit Union, which was chartered recently in Kansas. Designed to prevent liquidity crises, the Central will funnel funds through 10 regional credit unions to cash-hungry local credit unions. Its funds will come from contributions from each credit union. (A bill to create a federal agency that would have done essentially the same thing died in a Congressional committee.)

Because credit unions are exempt from payment of federal income taxes, many of their competitors feel they have an unfair advantage. "If they are going to enter new areas of financial services, and operate more like banks, why should they be entitled to an exemption?" asks one banker.

Credit-union officials are divided on the question. Wilfred S. MacKinnon, president of the Texas Credit Union League, argues that "credit unions should be allowed to enter any type of service they can. And if they make money at it, they should pay taxes. But these are really two issues, and they should be considered separately."

So far, credit unions only have a toehold in markets dominated by the banks and other giant competitors. But many credit-union officials feel they may have no choice but to plunge right in. "They must provide services that are needed, that their competitors are providing, or they'll die," says Walter Polner, former economist with the Credit Union National Association and now a private consultant.

TRIBUTES TO FORMER SENATOR KARL MUNDT

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. President, since I did not know Senator Karl Mundt, the man whom I succeeded in the Senate, I have asked two of his closest friends to prepare eulogies to be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Fred C. Christopherson who was, for many years, the editor of the Sioux Falls Argus Leader, now retired, and Henry J. Schmitt, the present editor and publisher of the Aberdeen American News, at my request sent memorial tributes for one of their oldest friends. I ask unanimous consent that their statements be printed in the RECORD.

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

COMMENT ABOUT THE LATE SENATOR KARL E. MUNDT

(By Fred C. Christopherson, retired editor of the Sioux Falls Argus-Leader)

Karl Mundt was my friend. He was also the friend of all South Dakotans. In a broad sense, he was the friend of all Americans and all of the peoples of the world.

He did much for South Dakota specifically in programs to improve the state income and to promote a better life. But all of these activities, important though they are, are overshadowed by his massive contribution to world understanding and to world communication.

World War II flared shortly after Mundt was elected to Congress. He was in a position to survey at first hand the devastating impact of the conflict. He saw it in the ceremonies in Washington. He saw it in London when he was there in 1944 and the German bombs were being dropped on that city by the first guided missiles.

All of this intensified his determination to do what he could to promote peace. As a war correspondent, I visited with him in my room at the Savoy Hotel in London. While we talked, bombs were exploding. "If people really understood each other and their problems," he told me, "terrible wars like this could be avoided."

My recollection of this is vivid because he spoke with so much emphasis and deep concern. So it was that he went forward thereafter to utilize his many talents and broad influence to get people to talk together. He worked quietly toward this goal, often letting others take the lead in order to accomplish his objective of world communication.

Out of his efforts came many tangible developments—the Voice of America, a special impetus to the United States Information Agency, UNESCO and the exchange of students among nations and innumerable visitations among the leaders of thought in the United States and other countries. It is entirely possible that much of former President Richard Nixon's forward thrusts in the international field stemmed at least in part from his close association with Mundt in their Congressional days.

Yes, Karl Mundt accomplished much in his long career. He took a primary part in developing the massive Missouri River Development program and countless other worth while projects. But if history records rightly his claim to fame, he should be recognized foremost as a prince of peace and one of the world's leaders in the endeavor to eliminate the horrible scourge of war. For this, he richly deserves a place in the greatest of the world's halls of fame. Surely his constructive achievements warrant his nomination for the Nobel peace prize.

[From the Aberdeen American News, Aug. 18, 1974]

KARL MUNDT'S GREAT INFLUENCE

The death of former Sen. Karl Mundt Friday caused sadness among his many friends in South Dakota. A severe stroke he suffered in 1969 had saddened them also. It was that crippling illness that brought to an end five years ago the political career of the man who had served longer in Congress than any other person from this state.

Sen. Mundt was a skilled practitioner in the science of government. This made possible his long tenure of office and permitted him to become a dominant influence in Republican politics in his native state.

The stroke that removed him from the political arena in 1969 was a contributing factor to the fall of the South Dakota Republican party which in 1970 lost the governorship and two U.S. representatives to the Democratic party. (There were other contributing factors including the retirement of incumbent representatives, Ben Reifel and E. Y. Berry.)

The only South Dakotan to be elected to the Senate for four terms Mr. Mundt, through anti-communist activities and prominence in the hearings involving Wisconsin's late Sen. Joseph McCarthy and the U.S. Army, had become his state's best known citizen in the Capital and in the nation.

Sen. Mundt yielded that distinction when George McGovern, at that time the junior senator, became a candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination and in due time the nominee.

Unfortunately South Dakota and the nation were deprived of his services at a time when Sen. Mundt would have had his greatest influence in government. As fellow members of the House of Representatives in the 1940s Mr. Mundt and young Richard Nixon who was later to become President of the United States, were teamed in an effort to expose communist infiltration in the United States. They remained close friends.

Had illness not stilled him, Sen. Mundt could have been in a position to give Mr. Nixon the type of advice that could have avoided the buildup of the inexperienced, power-hungry staff which accompanied the former President to his downfall.

However, during his active years most of which were as a member of the minority party in the national government, he made constructive contributions to the United States and to South Dakota.

Sen. Mundt was respected and appreciated by many.

NEW ENGLAND FARMING

Mr. BROOKE. Mr. President, New England is known for many things these days, but I suspect that farming would not be listed among them. This is too bad. For farming has been an essential livelihood to New England and New Englanders throughout our rich history.

Unfortunately, recent times—like our winters—have been rough on the New England farmer. Caught between the rising costs of essential goods and the enormous pressures from large developers, farmers throughout the region are finding it increasingly difficult to survive.

In last month's Country Journal, Malcolm Cowley speaks eloquently to the problems confronting our farmers in an article entitled "Is There Still Hope for Farming in New England?" Happily, the conclusion at which he arrives is that there is indeed hope. But he maintains that this hope is for the future while the short-term outlook is nothing but bleak.

The reason for the distressing short-term forecast is simply that increased prices for essential farming needs—machinery, feed, fertilizer, fuel, and so forth—pressure farmers from one side, while relentless developers pressure them from the other. Clearly relief is in order and Mr. Cowley puts forth some interesting proposals. At stake is not simply the survival of a way of life in New England; at stake is the survival of New England itself. For anyone who has ever spent time in our lovely region knows that its very essence lies in its beauty. And its beauty, for the most part, lies in its gently rolling hills, its fertile valleys, and its acres of open expanse—that is, its farmland.

This farmland must be protected. And the best way to protect it is to keep the farmer on it, managing it, and caring for it. For the farmer is, as Mr. Robert Kunz of the Connecticut Conservation Association aptly put it—

The keeper of these lands. He is the steward . . . As long as he remains, these resources remain. When he is gone, all too often these irreplaceable natural entities are buried.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Cowley's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

IS THERE STILL HOPE FOR FARMING IN NEW ENGLAND?

(By Malcolm Cowley)

Memories first, before we try to summon up the future. Hope is to be found there, I believe, but it depends partly on the world situation (food, fuel) and partly on national, state, and local policies regarding the use of land. We can raise our voices about those policies; indeed, we had better do so without delay. Meanwhile it is a wry pleasure to think about the fairly recent past of what used to be a Connecticut farming town.

When I first came to Sherman more than forty years ago, it was reported by the census as having 330 people and something like 100 farms; I forget the exact number. Most of the farms didn't deserve the name; they were simply fields and a house where an old couple subsisted with the help of a cow, a flock of chickens, and usually a team of superannuated horses. In the valley north of the Center, though, were rich tobacco and dairy farms. The hills were grassy there and dotted with cattle to their rounded tops. On the valley floor were big white houses, red barns, and silos like baronial donjons standing guard over luxuriant fields of corn, alfalfa, and tobacco. Driving past them on a winding dirt road was like exploring Arcadia.

I remember how marginal farms, mostly in the South End, were abandoned as old couples died off or moved to Danbury. I remember when the last field of tobacco was planted during World War II; that year the crop couldn't be sold because the tobacco warehouse had closed. I remember how dairy farmers complained of not being able to earn a decent living and how one after another sold off his herd. More and more houses were built for people who had jobs in Danbury or did freelance work in New York. The town was becoming residential, and it was also becoming forested as trees crept down from the hillsides and at places crossed the valley. There were no Arcadian vistas any more.

Sherman is still a good town, more determined than most to preserve its rural character, but today it has only three dairy farms. Three other dairymen sold off their herds last spring. Among those herds the best was that of my friend and neighbor Kenneth Edmonds, who, incidentally, had been taking care of my only field. He paid rent for it too: a truckload of manure each fall. I don't know what will happen to the field after Ken stops mowing it, but there was no use pleading with him. Ken was tired; he had been milking cows twice a day, seven days a week, for fifty years. Now he is looking forward to his first vacation.

What is happening in Sherman had already happened in most of the state, and most of New England. Connecticut now has fewer than 4,000 working farms—not half so many as in 1960—and the number includes part-time operations, as well as little factories cranking out eggs or broilers from a production line. Dairying, however, has been the chief agricultural activity, and the state now has only 900 dairy farms, with the total falling by more than ten per cent each year. Rhode Island has 700 farms of all types, not many of which send milk to market. The state agricultural college recently sold off its prize bulls, as if to mark the end of an era. In Massachusetts Governor Francis W. Sargent has established an Emergency Commis-

sion on Food. He said at a news conference last September, "We must reverse a thirty-year trend which has resulted in the virtual disappearance of food production in this state."

One can hardly blame the farmers for going out of business. They are capable men, for the most part, but they are faced with more problems than a genius should be asked to solve. Manpower is often the most urgent problem. The farmers are growing old—fifty-eight is their average age in Connecticut—and they need help with the chores. Help is almost impossible to find, except at a price the farmer is unable to pay. "The younger generation just doesn't want to be tied up for seven days a week," Ken Edmonds says. "They don't want those hours staring them in the face every day."

Another problem is the high cost of machinery, fuel, feed, fertilizer, baler twine—in fact, of everything the farmer has to buy. Except for roughage, most of which comes out of his own silo, almost all his supplies are shipped in from other parts of the country, at very high freight rates. How much he pays for the supplies depends on the open market (and to some extent on the big midwestern processors, with their notions of what the traffic will bear). The selling price of milk at the farm is something else again: it is fixed by the government and seldom rises as fast as the cost of feed and fertilizer. From 1968 to 1972, gross farm income in Connecticut rose by $6.5 million, while net farm income was falling by $12.2 million. In 1973 net income was further reduced by a fantastic increase in the cost of supplies.

Property taxes are a less serious problem in Connecticut than in some of the other New England states. By the terms of Public Act 490, passed in 1963, a farmer can ask to have his land assessed at its "use value," generally much lower than its value as commercial real estate. The law has reduced tax assessments on farmland by an average of something like sixty-five per cent. On the other hand, there has been no reduction in state or federal inheritance taxes. The state tax is high in Connecticut, and it is levied on the same estimate of net worth as the federal tax. When a farmer dies, the Feds move in to value his land at the inflated price that a developer might pay for it. The farmer's heirs might wish to stay on the land, but instead they have to sell it off as the only way to find money for the tax collectors.

Inflated land values are perhaps the greatest present threat to agriculture in New England. The threat is all the greater for a special reason, namely, that the best farmland, fairly level and well drained, is also the best for residential and commercial development. It used to be the marginal farms that were abandoned; now more and more, as population spreads, it is the richest farms that are taken over. How can a young dairyman—granted that there are still a few of these—compete with a real-estate syndicate eager to invest foreign money? How can he afford to pasture cows on land that will cost him from $1,000 to as much as $10,000 an acre?

In the South and the Middle West, older men with capital still buy land for the income it will yield from crops or cattle, but the present yield in New England is too low in relation to land values for anything but tax-loss farming (and not much of that). In Connecticut, for example, the last 900 dairymen are working seven days a week for an average return of 3.9 per cent on the market value of their land, stock, and equipment. They could sell off everything, pay a capital-gains tax, invest the remaining proceeds in bonds or certificates of deposit, and—to judge by the financial pages—they could earn much more than their present farm incomes by living in idleness.

So once again, what are the prospects for a revival of farming in New England? I still think that the long-term prospects are good, owing to worldwide shortages of food and also to the fact that western and southern farmers are now facing many of the same problems (besides such problems of their own as drought in the High Plains and deteriorating cropland). But the short-term prospects are bleak, and even our distant hopes might be foreclosed. That is, our New England farmland might be lost forever unless steps are promptly taken to help the remaining farmers stay in business and encourage younger men to take their places.

The first step might be a joint resolution presented for adoption by the various state legislatures. It might read something like this: *Resolved that the preservation of open farming ad grazing land is to the best interests of the people of* [Connecticut, Vermont, etc.] *and is an effort deserving the aid and encouragement of the state government.*

What good, you might ask, would a resolution do? At the very least it would lead to wider discussion of an urgent problem. If the resolution is adopted after many arguments have been heard, it will provide a reasoned basis for various measures that must be taken if farming in New England is to be maintained at anywhere near its present level, not to speak of its being revived or extended. Some of the measures will interfere with the plans of land speculators, while others will cost the states money. New Englanders, like Scotsmen, always want to know why public money should be spent.

And why should it be spent in an effort to preserve farmland? Why should we continue trying to compete with western agribusiness? Why shouldn't we resign ourselves to importing all our food from other parts of the country: milk from Wisconsin, potatoes from Idaho, lettuce from Arizona, and apples from the state of Washington? Or again, why should we mourn—as most of us do—when one farmer after another is forced by age and economics to abandon his fields and let them grow up into scrubby woodland? Or when he sells them to a developer with plans for still another residential suburb, a vacation community, an industrial park, or a supershopping center under acres of asphalt?

Here I won't repeat the ecological answer: that this populated region needs meadows and streams, woods and wetlands, a diversity of open spaces to depollute the air and maintain a supply of drinkable water. "The farmer is the keeper of these lands," says a thoughtful paper recently issued by the Connecticut Conservation Association.[1] "He is the steward of the land. As long as he remains, these resources remain. When he is gone, all too often these irreplaceable natural entities are buried."

Yes, the ecological answer is true and reasonable, every word of it, but my own feeling for New England goes beyond reason into the darker realm of love and aversion. I love the countryside as it was—and as it is today in scattered areas like the Upper Connecticut Valley, the Lamoille Valley, or the Harlem Valley across the state line in New York. I hate to live in the midst of neglected fields, which seem to reproach me; I even hate to drive through miles of scrubland crossed at intervals by stone fences. A deprived and resentful landscape seems to be closing in on me. When the road comes out into open farmland, I feel a sense of relief, as if I were drawing a free breath after years in prison. "Isn't this fine, for a change," I say in mantalk, while my wife uses the forbidden word: "Yes, it's beautiful."

Beauty in itself isn't enough to persuade a state legislator that he should vote for an appropriation, but beauty in New England has an economic value. Almost the whole region has found that tourists are an important source of revenue. The better the region looks, the more tourists will be attracted, not to mention vacationers and permanent residents (for whom there is room enough, if their new communities don't gobble up the farmland). The more farms are preserved, the more pastures are reclaimed, the better (more beautiful) the region will look, and—as most legislators already realize—the more it will comfortably yield in state and local taxes.

That is by no means the only economic argument for a revival of agriculture. Every farmed or grazed or gardened acre produces something that adds to the wealth of the community—and the statement is true even when the famer is losing money. If he makes it instead, much of the money goes into improving the farm or the neighborhood. Think of the big white handsome clapboard houses and the brick houses, weathered pink, that dot the New England countryside or cluster in villages. Except in coastal areas, most of those houses grew out of the soil, either directly or indirectly—directly, if they were built with money from corn, tobacco, cattle, Merino sheep, or Morgan horses; indirectly, if they were built by merchants or bankers who prospered from dealing with local farmers. Now that so many of the big houses have to be propped up with New York or Boston money, they seem to me a little less substantial.

Don't make subjective judgments," I tell myself. "Don't say anything that isn't realistic." Well, here are a few realistic statements.

Every good field abandoned is a loss to the community. Henceforth the field produces nothing, though in thirty years it might yield a meager crop of firewood or pulpwood. If it becomes part of a residential development, this in turn produces nothing (except from a few backyard gardens, rather more of these in 1974 than in 1973). Essentially the new residents are here in their role as consumers, and almost everything they consume is trucked in from a distance. Even their incomes are imported from the larger towns where they work in offices or factories. The new residents are pleasant people and they make a contribution to the community by showing good will and public spirit, but what they contribute in taxes is seldom enough to pay for what they demand in services (new schools, sewers, paved highways kept free from snow, and everything else that a suburb expects). When a farming town in Connecticut goes residential, taxes on old-time property owners are very soon tripled or quadrupled, and they are forced to sell off their acreage.

Once again that isn't the whole story. Those farmed acres in New England once supported—in many areas they still support—a network of local industries and commercial enterprises. Depending on the type of farming, there are (or were) canneries, creameris, cheese factories (now surviving only in Vermont), carding mills (now a few in Maine), feed mills, slaughterhouses, tobacco warehouses, and woodworking plants willing to pay a farmer cash for a few wintercut logs. As farming dwindles in one area after another, those local enterprises vanish and the skills they encouraged are forgotten. The remaining farmers not only lose their local outlets but feel lonelier than ever after the Grange Hall becomes a franchised supermarket. There are personal tragedies involved. I think of E. A. Robinson's miller, the one who hanged himself after a last word to his wife:

"There are no millers any more,"
Was all that she had heard him say;
And he had lingered at the door
So long that it seemed yesterday.

"That is Robinson in a sentimental mood," I tell myself; but I remember that the private sentiment is connected with a blow to the public economy of our whole region.

The process has gone too far to be simply reversed. When or if farming is revived in

[1] For a copy of the White Paper on agriculture in Connecticut, to which I am greatly indebted, write to Robert F. Kunz, Director, Connecticut Conservation Association, Bridgewater, Connecticut 06752.

New England, it will have to be a different sort of farming, either more intensive, or on a broader scale. Meanwhile some practical steps can be taken to halt the decay, to put heart into the remaining farmers, and to keep the countryside open by restoring the pastures.

The white paper on Agriculture in Connecticut puts forward several measures that would help to keep farming alive in the state. Among these it lays most stress on the creation of "agricultural preserves" and on the purchase by the state of "development rights" to open land. Later I shall have something to say about that purchase. As for creating agricultural preserves, it is a practice started by California in 1965. It has been rather more successful in New York, where the enabling act was passed in 1971, and it is now being considered for adoption on a wider scale by New Jersey.

In New York such agricultural preserves, or districts, are initiated by the farmers themselves, who must agree, in each case, that 500 or more contiguous acres should be placed in the district. Their application is reviewed by the county government and discussed at one or more public hearings. If approved by both the county and the state, the district can be officially protected. Protection means briefly "No development," but it has other features as well. Local governments cannot restrict farming practices—such as spreading manure—beyond the requirements of health and safety. Public agencies that want to acquire land in an agricultural district must prove that other acceptable sites are not available. Public-service districts are restricted in their power to tax farmland for services (water, sewage, etc.) that farmers do not require. Also commercial farmers can request annual property-tax assessments based on the agricultural value of their land.

Each agreement runs for eight years, after which it must be reviewed to see whether the land it covers still meets the requirements for an agricultural district. So far, such districts comprise 1.5 million acres, or one-fifth of the best farmland in New York. Apparently the agreements have worked where adopted, and they have led to some glorious battles with public utilities and dam builders, notably in the rich Schoharie Valley. The Connecticut Conservation Association recommends a similar system of preserves for its own state, but with refinements embodied in the still-pending New Jersey plan. Since the system will reduce the tax basis of local governments, the CCA recommends that the towns be reimbursed for what they lose. The purchase of development rights would also cost money, and—rather than a bond issue to supply it—the CCA believes that it should come from a statewide tax of perhaps four mills on real-estate transfers.

The CCA also suggests other measures that would help to keep Connecticut farms in operation. Briefly they are: (1) subsidies to farmers who permit hunting, fishing, and picnicking on their land; (2) farm markets on state-owned land along highways or even in state parks; (3) college workshops for farmers on management and production techniques (but who would milk the cows while the farmer was attending the workshops?); (4) better training and placement programs for farm labor (and perhaps subsidies to make farm work more competitive with industry); (5) a low-interest revolving loan fund to assist in farm improvements; (6) lower taxes on farm buildings as well as land; (7) negotiating lower insurance costs; and (8) educational loans or grants-in-aid for students planning to be farmers. necticut, which is prosperous, thickly peo-

Most of those eight measures are directed toward solving the special problems of Conpled, and in immediate danger of losing all its farmland, besides most of its open space. In northern New England the state governments have less money that can be devoted to loans and subsidies. The remaining farms there are different, with fewer plowed fields, except in the Aroostook and the Lake Champlain Valley, and more of the land is in pasture. The immediate problem, the one that demands thought and subsidies, is how to keep the pastures open.

My friend the novelist Wallace Stegner, who lives on the West Coast but owns many northern Vermont acres, has some lively comments. "The horrid fact about New Hampshire," he says, "is that too many city people loved it too much, and hence bought chunks of it, and having no skill or time for farming, pronounced *famine*, they let it grow up to weeds and chokecherry and spruces and tough little cedars. In Vermont things haven't gone as far as in New Hampshire (I'm totally ignorant of Massachusetts and Connecticut), but they're going.

"We have discussed, in Greensboro, some alternatives: reforesting, which produces a fourth-rate wilderness"—[but not always, as I maintain in a forthcoming article for *Country Journal*] "cooperative mowing and plowing, which is hard to do in the face of Vermont individualism and recalcitrance; and hippy occupation, which takes care of a garden plot and not much more. No city feller can afford, by himself, the machinery it takes to keep a farm's hayfields and pastures open. He has to be there to do it with stock, because cattle and sheep won't eat maple seedlings and ash seedlings and so on after they're a year or two old, and neither will they eat ferns and junk and weeds after the first few weeks of the growing season. Result: leave stock out of a pasture or a woodlot for a year or two and there's no recovery—you have to plow or poison, and start over.

"My guess is that an association or cooperative of people determined to keep the pastoral (as opposed to the wilderness or the subdivided) character of New England would get substantial support—clutches of tractors and machinery here and there, clutches of hired hands who would plow up, harrow, disk, etc., and keep open those farms that have ceased to be farmed, and fallen into the hands of professors from Princeton, the Mafia, California speculators, Florida speculators, and local peasants determined to make a pile subdividing. Once the farms are opened, they can be kept open with grazing, as you suggest—either sheep or cattle, if they're managed right, and rotated among the fields properly, will do it."

I like Stegner's idea of landowners' cooperatives; the situation is desperate, and volunteer action would help immensely. But my own guess is that the cooperatives, if they were to thrive, would need state aid and encouragement, perhaps in the form of subsidies for reclaiming pastures. State road crews might be made available for mowing and brush cutting (of course at a fee to the landowner). Controlled burning is another suggestion. It is a very old practice in the Maine blueberry barrens, but elsewhere in New England it has never been widely adopted, I suppose for fear that the fires might spread. Why not have pasture fires that are supervised by the local fire department? Again there is the great question of fencing, which is indispensable on grazing land, but is also expensive. In some areas the old stone fences might be mended once again; they would still make good neighbors. For areas where they were never built, or would cost too much to repair with high-priced labor, might it be possible to invent or adapt some cheap form of portable fencing? I think about those miles of snow fencing that highway departments keep in storage: might they be rented out during the summer?

Then I remember England, where I saw sheep farmers driving from one pasture to another with truckloads of fence panels, which apparently they had made for themselves out of crossed saplings.

Those suggestions are made from the depths of my inexperience, and I hope that the various agricultural colleges will set themselves to finding better answers. Meanwhile I might quote again from Stegner's letter. "I have a friend," he says, "whom perhaps you know—Frol Rainey of the U. of Pennsylvania Archaeological Museum—who has installed forty or fifty sheep on his Greensboro farm, and hired a retired farmer to live in the farmhouse and look after them."

I do know Professor Rainey and know his farm as well; it is a fairly level hilltop and, until the milking herd had to be sold off, it was said to be the highest dairy farm in Vermont. Stegner continues, "It's not a paying proposition as yet, but there's substantial federal support, and with more acreage and a bigger flock, he might make it go." I hope he makes it go, and if he needs more acreage, he can probably rent it at a reasonable figure—not buy it—from neighbors eager to have their pastures kept open. With the present high cost of acreage, fairly large-scale farming on leased land has become a possible development in New England.

For the farmer such a practice has two obvious advantages: it enables him to broaden out his operation, and it greatly reduces his capital investment. For the landowner, leasing his land to an active farmer also has advantages (beyond such payments as he might receive, which would not and should not be large). It would maintain the value of his land and the attractiveness of the neighborhood. In states with laws like Connecticut's Public Act 490—New Hampshire has recently adopted a similar measure—it would permit him to apply for a lower tax assessment on his property.

When I gloom about the situation on walks through abandoned fields, it seems to me that the practice of leasing land for agriculture might be vastly extended. Associations of landowners—Wallace Stegner's suggestion—would have more acreage to offer than individuals. And what about the land trusts that are becoming more numerous in southern New England, to meet the threat that a whole town will be built or paved over? One such trust is active in Sherman. So far it has acquired only forest and scrub and swampland, but isn't cultivated farmland even more precious to the community? Some of the trusts have talked about venturing into this new field. Nature Conservancy, which I think is the only trust that operates on a national scale, has been offered about 1,800 acres of Connecticut land in Bridgewater and New Milford. George D. Pratt, Jr., who made the princely offer, is a lifelong conservationist who attached a condition to the gift. There are three farms on the land, and Pratt wants to have them kept in operation. So far Nature Conservancy has had no experience in farm management. Two of the farms are rented and hence present no serious problem, but the third, in New Milford, is the richest and most productive dairy farm in the neighborhood. Fortunately Pratt's experienced farm manager, Peter Petersen, has agreed to go along with the deal and to train a successor before he retires

Land trusts that will operate or lease out farms are only one of many possibilities. What about the broad tracts of New England that are owned by the states or by the federal government? Most of this land is utterly unsuited to agriculture and should be kept as wilderness or devoted to tree crops or recreation, but there are areas of richer soil whose use might be reconsidered. I think of interstate highways with their habit of seizing more land—often in fertile valleys—than is conceivably needed by present or future traffic. Some of the surplus land is mowed once a year by the road crews. Couldn't it be grazed or plowed by farmers, at no public expense, so long as nothing was built on it? Also I think of the Saratoga Battlefield across the Hudson, an expanse of 2,432 acres most

of which used to be farmland. It is a handsome park only part of which is visited by the public; the rest is woodland or meadows that are mowed—again once a year—by the National Park Service. If they were grazed instead, the magnificent view over the Hudson Valley would be preserved and the land would look more as it did when Johnny Burgoyne surrendered.

Returning to the private sector, what about ski resorts, a subject on which my ignorance is abysmal? I know, however, that trails and slopes have to be kept free of brush, and I presume that much of the work is done with defoliants such as the Army used in Vietnam. Sheep, however, are the ancient and still the best mowing machines for steep slopes. Mightn't sheep growers add to their incomes by contracting to do a sprout-removal job for resort operators? There are problems involved, but I should guess that most of these will be solved after we have lost most of our grazing land and after the rest of it becomes more precious to the region and the hungry world.

In the case of highly productive land in immediate danger of being taken over by jerry builders, some public agency—state, county, or town—might buy the land to keep it from going out of production. That bold step was first considered by Suffolk County, at the eastern end of Long Island. There the situation is deteriorating. Suffolk has been a very rich argricultural county, famous for potatoes, ducklings, and cauliflower, but its farmland is rapidly disappearing under suburban developments; very soon it will have vanished. Apparently Suffolk farmers have not made use of the New York law that permits the creation of agricultural reserves. The law offers many advantages, but not enough of them, in this case, to counterbalance the glittering offers of real-estate speculators.

Two years ago John V. N. Klein, the County Executive, came up with the proposal that Suffolk should float a bond issue big enough to pay for half its remaining agricultural land—that would be 30,000 acres—and then lease back the acres to operating farmers. The proposal was beautifully simple, and it attracted inquiries from twelve states that thought of adopting it. In New England it would be justified only in the case of highly productive acres—truck farms, for example, or the shade-grown-tobacco fields of the Hartford Basin, important to the economy of the state, but now being built over. Even in rich Suffolk County, it involved more money than the county legislature thought it could raise; the proposal had to be scaled down. In a later form it undertakes, as a beginning, to preserve 12,000 acres of agricultural land. Some of the acres would be bought outright, as in the original scheme, and leased back to farmers. More of them, however, would not change ownership; the county would simply buy "development rights" to keep them from being built upon or subdivided. Meanwhile the price of Suffolk land has continued to rise. Even development rights would now cost more than Klein's earlier figure of $45 million, a sum that the county legislature was willing to make available. Last spring he had to request an additional $15 million, with the request still pending.

The purchase of development rights by a public agency—if the rights are worth money and the agency can pay for them—is clearly of advantage to farmers who want to stay in business. It gives them fresh capital that can be used for stocking and improving the land. It reduces their tax assessments in states where they haven't the benefit of a law like Connecticut's Public Act 490. When a farmer dies, the Feds can't appraise his land at its development value, which has ceased to be part of his estate. His heirs have a smaller inheritance tax to pay and, if they wish, they can still be farmers.

Those are a few of the measures by which New England farms might be kept in operation, while waiting for an agricultural revival that is likely to come, but might otherwise come too late. Some of the measures had better be adopted promptly, if our region is not to become a wilderness hatched and spangled with housing developments. So far we have been waging a purely defensive struggle against the panzer divisions of invading bulldozers. We win victories here and there, but we are certain to lose the war unless we can assemble other forces, including an agricultural interest strong enough to undertake a counter-offensive against the spoilers.

FAIRNESS DOCTRINE: FAIR OR FOUL?

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Steve Knoll, writing in the August 31 issue of the New Republic, points out the Federal Communications Commission's fairness doctrine inhibits broadcast journalists from doing the kind of investigative work done by print journalists.

Mr. Knoll examines the fairness doctrine—I prefer to call it the "unfairness" doctrine—as the FCC applied it to a documentary of NBC, "Pensions: The Broken Promise."

There are several interesting aspects to this case, most of which Mr. Knoll notes.

First, the FCC and NBC are now in court over the application of the fairness doctrine to that documentary.

Next, the subject of private pension plans had never really been examined before in great detail by television. Thus, there were no easily recognizable persons or groups on the other side of the issue. There is some question, as Mr. Knoll reports on NBC's viewpoint, of whether a controversial issue really existed because pension abuses were real.

Third, and Mr. Knoll does not make this point, spokesmen for pension funds were given a chance to defend themselves, but did not choose to do so. The complaint, as Mr. Knoll notes, came from a third party.

Fourth, the program won an award for excellence the same day the FCC staff made a ruling in the case.

Fifth, the pension abuses cited in the program were the subject of legislation, which President Ford signed into law Monday with great attention.

Who knows, perhaps the NBC program helped pass the law.

Mr. Knoll equates the FCC's control over broadcasting with a sword of Damocles. Then he quotes Clay Whitehead, who has submitted his resignation as director of the White House Office of Telecommunications Policy, as saying:

> The value of the sword of Damocles is that it hangs, not that it drops.

Mr. Whitehead knew that very well. It was he who set off furor in late 1972 when he announced that legislation was being drafted to make local stations responsible for the content of network programing.

That, of course, has been the policy of the FCC. But the reaction was as if something entirely new had been advocated. Actually, the reaction was to the real meaning of Mr. Whitehead's announcement. It was seen for what it was: An attempt to intimidate broadcasters.

Mr. Whitehead pointed to the dangling sword.

The FCC's fairness doctrine sounds like it is a good thing. After all, it says that all sides of controversial issues of public importance should be broadcast. Any good journalist will do that without being told.

But being told carries with it the threat of losing one's license for failing to do so. The result, can be—and often is—the failure to broadcast programs that should be broadcast.

Had there been no NBC presentation about pensions, would the FCC have insisted there be such a program? Mr. Knoll says:

> It is inconceivable that the FCC would have insisted that one be produced.

But, for a moment, just think of the consequences should a governmental agency have the power to insist that television or radio broadcast any program on any subject. Would not that power be instantly recognized for what it would be: infringement on free speech. Potential dictatorship. Conceivably the end to political freedom.

Would anyone who is dedicated to our Constitution and to our way of life condone such governmental power?

I think not.

Yet, that is the sword that now hangs over American broadcasters. It is the fairness doctrine.

Not all that sounds good is good.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Knoll's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

FAIR OR FOUL?

(By Steve Knoll)

The success of old-fashioned print journalism in exposing Watergate and its associated scandals has shamed the network news establishment into allocating new funds, manpower and air time for investigative reporting. That's good news, but I wonder how much encouragement the networks will get from the Federal Communications Commission. I raise the question, having in mind what happened to an NBC News documentary entitled "Pensions: The Broken Promise," broadcast in September 1972. That program managed rather successfully to portray the inadequacies of many private pension plans, and it managed just as successfully to get NBC in trouble with the FCC, which wields the sword of Damocles known as licensing authority. (As Clay Whitehead, the departing director of the White House Office of Telecommunications Policy, once said in one of his more inspired moments, "The main value of the sword of Damocles is that it hangs, not that it drops.")

The FCC found merit in a complaint filed by Accuracy in Media—a nonprofit, self-appointed "media monitor" of predominantly right-wing complexion—that NBC had violated the Fairness Doctrine by pinpointing the defects of many private pension plans and not allocating sufficient time to those who feel that some other plans as currently administered are all right. The FCC did not dispute the truthfulness of the documentary's conclusion that on the whole the private pension situation is "deplorable." But the Fairness Doctrine has nothing to do

with truth; it simply requires that if a broadcaster presents one side of what is deemed "a controversial issue of public importance," he must—at the same time or at some other time—present the other side. There are many within the industry who feel that this seemingly innocuous requirement, when enforced by the government on a case-by-case and complaint-by-complaint basis, inhibits the networks from engaging in vigorous investigative reporting, or at least threatens to do so unless the requirement is modified (as it may be as a result of NBC's court appeal of the FCC ruling on "Pensions").

Unhappily for the Fairness Doctrine, the truth is not always, or even usually, equidistant from opposite poles. If it were, the requirements of the doctrine might not be so menacing to tought investigative reporting by TV. Jay McMullen of CBS, an outstanding news producer, once observed that in an investigative documentary, one doesn't merely report that X says blue and Y says green: "You nail down what it really is, and you know when you do that, you will be attacked." The question becomes, "What is the climate in which you'll be attacked? Is it a climate that favors investigative journalism or not? Is it a climate in which various groups are looking for an excuse to throttle you?"

The FCC ordered NBC to balance what it considered the one-sided presentation of "Pensions" with a broadcast of opposing views. Now this requirement could have been met without too much difficulty by giving the Accuracy in Media people some time on the "Today" show. After all, why shouldn't NBC "balance" its documentary? The answer is, first of all, that by so doing NBC would implicity admit a defect in the original presentation where—in its opinion and that of many others—no such defect existed (the program won a prestigious Peabody award for exemplary investigative journalism on the same day the FCC staff ruling was issued). Moreover, it would be establishing a precedent by which hard-hitting documentaries would have to be "balanced" by other programming material that could contradict their conclusions.

It would indeed be useful for television to develop the equivalent of a "letters to the editor" department where airing of other views on "Pensions" might be appropriate. But note that the FCC did not rule that "Pensions: The Broken Promise" was biased, only that it was one-sided (admittedly an elusive distinction). NBC in effect argues that the abuses documented were real, that there is no "other side" to them, hence the program's subject was not a "controversial issue" that should trigger the Fairness Doctrine. The FCC maintains that the program embraced the entire private pension system along with proposed legislation to regulate it, and therefore the Fairness Doctrine requirement of "rough balance" does apply.

Traditionally the FCC has not been strict in applying "rough balance," so why pick on "Pensions"? The answer, in essence, is that NBC did something unusual—it broadcast an investigative report on a subject that had not previously received significant coverage on television, and had the gumption to tell the FCC it had no specific plans to cover the subject again except, in the journalistic vernacular, "as developments warrant." While the Fairness Doctrine does not call for self-cancelling balance within a single program, in effect it does just that when the program reflects a broadcasters' *total* coverage of the "controversial issue of public importance."

Thus, in practical application, the doctrine applies with particular force to documentaries that explore issues previously unexplored, as opposed to documentaries on "soft" (non-controversial) subjects or well-trod themes. If the FCC "Pensions" ruling is upheld, it is almost inconceivable that NBC (and other networks) will continue producing strong documentaries that come to conclusions, dumping the balancing material in the "Today" show or its equivalent. The requirement for "balance" will be met in the original broadcast ("on-the-one-hand-and-on-the-other-hand"), and television journalism's adversary thrust will be further blunted. In reviewing the constitutionality of the FCC decision, the US Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit will in effect decide whether television news is merely an even-handed conveyor of the views of others, a sounding board for partisans and advocates on every side of an issue, or whether it can also do probing journalism in the tradition of the printed media.

Government-administered "fairness" has already forced the network's corporate lawyer to assume a role in the formulation—and review—of editorial judgments he is not qualified to make, and in most cases, does not want to make. It has also fostered sublimal restraints in the minds of producers and reporters anxious to earn the approbation of their superiors. NBC News senior executive producer Reuven Frank speaks candidly of "fairness filler," material inserted in television news simply to satisfy management's sense of what will satisfy the federal standard of "rough balance." Similarly, the National News Council has noted "a tendency of network news shows to frequently place favorable and unfavorable stories about a given subject in [juxtaposition] even though the stories may not be of equal importance."

It has been argued that broadcasting, as a government-licensed press, can't and shouldn't enjoy the same First Amendment protection that is given to its print cousins. But the Communications Act was never intended to supplant the First Amendment; indeed, it includes a specific prohibition against FCC censorship, though the force of that prohibition has been eroded by FCC regulation of news content and second-guessing of editorial decisions. It is perfectly possible to retain a public interest scheme of broadcast regulation, preserving the government's role as a watchdog against monopolistic practices, while respecting "no trespass" signs at the door of the TV-radio newsroom.

In the landmark *Red Lion* decision of 1969, the Supreme Court affirmed the constitutionality of the Fairness Doctrine, specifically upholding the commission's rules on personal attack and political editorializing. The Court held that "differences in the characteristics of news media justify differences in the First Amendment standards applied to them." The scarcity of spectrum space for broadcasting was stressed as the rationale for the Fairness Doctrine and kindred obligations unique to broadcasting. The high court declared, "It is the right of the viewers and listeners, not the right of the broadcasters, which is paramount."

The *Red Lion* case chosen by broadcasters to test the constitutionality of the Fairness Doctrine must have been selected by a masochist in their ranks. A Red Lion, Pennsylvania radio station had broadcast a vehement attack on journalist Fred J. Cook by a right-wing preacher, the Rev. Billy James Hargis, and denied Cook free time to reply. Cook complained to the FCC, and the issue was joined. Any decent man's sympathies would be with Cook. But, that isn't the point: it was on the application of the personal attack rule in Cook's case—*not*, for example, on FCC editorial judgments on documentary content—that the constitutionality of the entire Fairness Doctrine came to stand or fall. In the end, it stood. But was it the final word from the courts on the matter? I hope not.

The 1969 decision did have an escape clause: ". . . if experience with the administration of these doctrines indicates that they have the net effect of reducing rather than enhancing the volume and quality of coverage, there will be time enough to reconsider the constitutional implications." The high tribunal considered such baleful results unlikely, "since if present licensees should suddenly prove timorous, the commission is not powerless to insist that they give adequate and fair attention to public issues."

Yet if NBC had never done a documentary on private pension plans, it is inconceivable that the FCC would have insisted that one be produced. In the summer of 1972, when the White House was dismissing Watergate as a "third-rate burglary attempt," could the FCC realistically have been expected to get on the backs of the broadcasters to dig deeper? An agency of government is not a suitable instrument to prod the media into vigilant scrutiny of official wrongdoing. Neither can it push them to expose failings in the private sector.

Although the FCC recently expanded its "Fairness and Political Broadcasting" bureaucracy to handle the mounting volume of complaints, prospects today for a "rollback" of the doctrine do seem a little bit brighter. Two years ago, when the U.S. Court of Appeals in Washington upheld FCC action against radio station WXUR, Media, Pennsylvania, Chief Judge David Bazelon delivered a ringing dissent, taking apart the Fairness Doctrine and suggesting that "more freedom for the individual broadcaster" might "enhance, rather than retard, the public's right to a marketplace of ideas." Another member of the same court was meanwhile developing second thoughts about the doctrine, with broadcasting's laggard performance on Watergate as the catalyst. Judge J. Skelly Wright asserted, "Our experience with the First Amendment has confirmed that the people's right to know—the *informing* function of the First Amendment—is its primary function."

Two members of the Supreme Court have expressed misgivings about *Red Lion*. Justice William O. Douglas, who hadn't participated in the 1969 decision, states flatly that "the Fairness Doctrine has no place in our First Amendment regime." Justice Potter Stewart, who supported *Red Lion*, now reveals he did so "with considerable doubt," and that his views in fact "closely approach those of Justice Douglas."

Dean Burch left his post as FCC chairman earlier this year after repeatedly expressing perplexity about the constitutional basis for the doctrine. And John Pettit, who as FCC general counsel defended the agency's "Pensions" ruling before the court of appeals, is on record with the view that "perhaps Justice Douglas is right" in placing broadcasters on the same First Amendment footing as print.

The FCC's present chairman, Richard E. Wiley, continues to defend applications of the doctrine on a case-by-case basis. In Wiley's view, any eventual reforms "must not preclude commission review—and perhaps even reversal—of the licensee's judgment where warranted."

The First Amendment contains the unambiguous and sweeping injunction, "Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of . . . the press." Today broadcast journalists wait anxiously as Congress begins to ponder whether to unmake laws that do just that, and the courts move toward decisions that will define the parameters and possibilities of investigative reporting on the air. If in the end the FCC is rebuffed, NBC will have accomplished far more than the spotlighting of inequities in pension plans by undertaking its documentary.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? There being no further morning business, the period of time for morning business has now expired.

ENERGY TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ACT OF 1974

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of H.R. 8193, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 8193) to require that a percentage of United States oil imports be carried in United States-flag vessels.

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

That this Act may be cited as the "Energy Transportation Security Act of 1974".

SEC. 2. Section 901(b)(1) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 is amended by inserting after the words "to the extent such vessels are available", the following: "at the range of ports nearest the point where such equipment, materials, or commodities are manufactured or produced".

SEC. 3. Section 901 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (46 U.S.C. 1241), is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d)(1) The Secretary of Commerce shall take such steps as are necessary to assure that a quantity equal to not less than 20 per centum of the gross tonnage of all oil transported on ocean vessels (whether transported directly from the original point of production or indirectly from such point to and from any intermediate points used for storage, refining, processing, packaging, unloading, or reloading of oil) for import into the United States shall be transported on privately owned United States-flag commercial vessels (to the extent that such vessels are available at fair and reasonable rates for such vessels), and to insure fair and reasonable participation of such vessels in such transportation from all geographical areas in which such oil is produced or refined or both. With respect to any period beginning after June 30, 1975, the quantity of such oil required to be transported on privately owned United States-flag commercial vessels shall be equal to not less than 25 per centum of the gross tonnage of all oil transported on ocean vessels for import into the United States, and for any period beginning after June 30, 1977, such quantity shall be equal to not less than 30 per centum of such gross tonnage: *Provided*, That (1) the Secretary of Commerce finds and determines 6 months prior thereto, in the exercise of his sole discretion, that the tonnage of privately owned United States-flag commercial vessels, including vessels on order and scheduled to be ready for commercial service by such date, will be adequate to carry such quantity; and (2) in the event that such tonnage is not found to be adequate to carry such quantity, there shall be carried on such vessels the basic 20 per centum requirement together with any excess over such requirement, but not to exceed the applicable per centum requirement, for which such Secretary finds that adequate tonnage will be available.

"(2) The Secretary of Commerce may by rule establish a system of reasonable classification of persons and imports subject to the provisions of this subsection, and such Secretary shall treat all persons in the same such classification in substantially the same manner. If any person alleges (A) that he has been incorrectly classified under any such rule; (B) that there is no reasonable basis in fact for any such classification; or (C) that as a consequence of any agency action, he is or may be treated substantially differently from any other person in the same classification, such person may request, and, upon a reasonable showing, obtain, a hearing in accordance with section 554 of title 5, United States Code. Upon an agency decision, such person may request judicial review in the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia. The scope of such review shall be governed by section 706 of title 5, United States Code.

"(3) The Secretary of Commerce is authorized to grant credits toward the fulfillment of the requirements of paragraph (1) of this subsection in the case of oil transported by privately owned United States-flag commercial vessels, over 100,000 deadweight tons, between foreign ports until such time as an oil discharge facility, capable of discharging fully laden vessels of over 200,000 deadweight tons, is in operation on any coast of the United States: Provided, That the Secretary of Commerce shall take all reasonable steps to assure that the authority provided in this paragraph not encourage, directly or indirectly, the construction, operation, or maintenance of a fleet of privately owned United States-flag commercial vessels different in numbers, types, or sizes than the fleet that would otherwise result.

"(4) As used in this subsection—

"(A) 'oil' means crude oil and the following products refined or derived from crude oil: unfinished fuels, gasoline, kerosene, aviation fuels, naphtha, cracking stocks, distillate heating oil, diesel oil, and residual oils:

"(B) 'privately owned United States-flag commercial vessels' are vessels of United States registry (or if at any time documented under the laws of any foreign nation, then documented under the laws of the United States for not less than three previous years), built in the United States which are not more than 20 years old or which have been reconstructed and are not beyond their economic lives (as determined by the Secretary of Commerce), and with respect to which the owner or lessee thereof has entered into a capital construction fund agreement with such Secretary pursuant to which such vessel shall be replaced at the end of its 20 years life, or at the end of its extended economic life in case of reconstruction, and such agreement includes a mandatory deposit schedule to finance such replacement: *Provided*, That any such vessel in excess of 20,000 deadweight tons, the construction of which is contracted for after December 31, 1974, or the delivery of which is made after December 31, 1978, shall be constructed and operated using the best available pollution prevention technology, and shall be equipped with a segregated ballast capacity determined approprate by the Secretary of Transportation which shall be achieved in part by fitting, throughout the cargo length, a double bottom of a minimum height of one-fifteenth of the beam or such other appropriate height as determined by the Secretary of Transportation; and

"(C) 'United States' means any of the several States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

"(5) Each department, agency, or other instrumentality of the United States which is affected by any obligation imposed under this subsection, and any officer or employee thereof, shall take all appropriate action to assure compliance with such obligation and with regulations which shall be issued by the Secretary of Commerce to implement and enforce the provisions of this subsection. Each citizen of the United States and each person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States shall comply with such obligations and any applicable regulations isued by such Secretary under this subsection.

"(6) The Secretary of Commerce shall review, evaluate, and report annually to the Congress and the President on the implementation of the provisions of this subsection and the effectiveness of such provisions. Each such report shall include, but not be limited to, a study of (1) the adequacy and availability of construction and reconstruction facilities in the United States for the vessels needed to meet the provisions of paragraph (1) of this subsection, and (2) the reasonableness of the prices charged and delivery dates for the construction and reconstruction of such vessels."

SEC. 4. The provisions of this Act shall not apply to any refiner whose total refinery capacity (including the refinery capacity of any person who controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with such refiner) does not exceed 30,000 barrels per day: Provided, That the total quantity of such oil imported by or for such refiner does not in any year exceed the rated refining capacity of such refiner.

SEC. 5. License fees payable pursuant to Presidential proclamation for imports of crude oil imported into the United States shall be reduced by 15 cents per barrel for a period of 5 years from the date of enactment of this Act if the Secretary of the Treasury determines—

(a) such crude oil is transported by privately owned United States-flag commercial vessels; and

(b) the amount resulting from the nonpayment of such license fees is passed on to the ultimate consumers of such crude oil in whatever form it is when ultimately consumed.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that members of the staff of the Committee on Commerce be permitted to be present on the floor during debate on this legislation.

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

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we may have two Members——

Mr. LONG. That includes all Members, minority as well as majority.

I also ask unanimous consent that Mr. Robert Best of the staff of the Committee on Finance be permitted the privileges of the floor.

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

QUORUM CALL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum, and I have been informed this will be a live quorum. This is, of course, without the Senator losing his right to the floor.

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

The second assistant legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

[No. 379 Leg.]

Abourezk	Griffin	Proxmire
Aiken	Haskell	Sparkman
Allen	Inouye	Stafford
Byrd, Harry F., Jr.	Long	Stennis
Byrd, Robert C.	Mansfield	Talmadge
Cotton	Metzenbaum	
	Montoya	

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. A quorum is not present.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from West Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After some delay, the following Senators entered the Chamber and answered to their names:

Bartlett	Hatfield	Nelson
Beall	Helms	Nunn
Bennett	Huddleston	Pastore
Bible	Hughes	Randolph
Cannon	Jackson	Ribicoff
Case	Javits	Scott, William L.
Chiles	Johnston	Stevens
Clark	Mathias	Symington
Domenici	McClellan	Thurmond
Dominick	McGovern	Weicker
Eagleton	McIntyre	Williams
Gravel	Mondale	

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), the Senator from Maine (Mr. MUSKIE), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PELL), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON), and the Senator from California (Mr. TUNNEY) are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT) are absent on official business.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BROCK), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), the Senator from New York (Mr. BUCKLEY), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE), the Senators from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN and Mr. GOLDWATER), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. MCCLURE), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. PACKWOOD), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH), the Senators from Pennsylvania (Mr. HUGH SCOTT and Mr. SCHWEIKER), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT), the Senator from Texas (Mr. TOWER), and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG) are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) are absent on official business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK). A quorum is present.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that without prejudice to my rights to the floor I may yield briefly to the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. STENNIS).

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

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I certainly appreciate the courtesy of the Senator from Louisiana. I shall use only a minute and a half.

GEN. CREIGHTON ABRAMS

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, along with many thousands of his admirers, I mourn the passing of Gen. Creighton Abrams. He was a highly exceptional and outstanding military officer in many ways. At his confirmation hearings on his nomination for Chief of Staff of the Army I remarked to him that I thought of him as a fine field officer with "mud on his boots." He took my expression as a compliment, and that is the way I intended it, in that he was an Army man, at home and at his best out with the troops and even in the smoke of battle.

General Abrams came to the office of Chief of Staff of the Army following the dubious assignment he had had for a military man, of winding down the war. Some of the talk in the corridors then was that he should not be appointed Chief of Staff because he would be under the handicap of having an unpopular war associated with his name, and therefore other leadership would be more appropriate.

His record of achievements as Army Chief of Staff totally refuted all of this talk. He met the demanding and crucial situation that the Army was in when he became Chief with a fine knowledge and understanding of the problem, and with the determination and ability to find solutions and apply them. All in all, he was one of the very best Chiefs of Staff of the Army that we have had. His accomplishments as Chief were varied and many.

In response to my question as to whether or not he thought the Volunteer Forces system would work, being the realist that he was, he pointedly said, "We must make it work." As usual, he used few words with much meaning.

As far as I know, he never gave a press conference, he never appeared on a television program, and he gave out press releases only when the demands of the situation required it. He left all these things to others and stayed busy making a truly great soldier, which will also serve as a fine example to others.

I am thankful for his career, for his contributions to the Nation and to the U.S. Army.

As a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I feel also that I am speaking for the committee when I pay him this tribute and also when I extend to his wonderful wife and his six fine sons and daughters my utmost sympathy and condolences in their earthly loss.

May God rest his wonderful soul.

Mr. President recently I made a short speech to the Cadet Corps at the Military Academy at West Point on the subject "The American Military Uniform." The late General Abrams personified in every major respect the meaning and the traditions of the American military uniform. I ask unanimous consent that a copy of these remarks be included in the RECORD at this point.

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

THE MILITARY UNIFORM

Members of the Cadet Corps, members of the Cadet Wing, and Friends of the Academy:

It is a privilege to be here and to address you for a few minutes on the Parade Grounds at West Point.

First, I want you to know that you have many backers and much solid support within the membership of the United States Senate. There are many of us there who consistently give solid support to you and others who wear the American military uniform.

Among my splendid experiences here today was the briefing by two of your worthy and outstanding members of the Cadet Corps regarding your Cadet administered Honor Code and the Honor System. I was most favorably impressed as well as greatly encouraged. Make that Honor Code a part of your very being while you are here. Thereafter, whatever path you follow, make this Code a part of you forever.

I hope that each one of you will have the privilege, and that you will accept that privilege, of wearing the American military uniform for a permanent career. First, an active military career is a highly honorable profession. Further, military strength has been essential for our security during our Nation's entire history, and it will continue to be essential far beyond our time. You will have honor, action and reward in a military career.

From the moment our national independence was declared, the man in the military uniform has been on the front lines, winning our independence and maintaining the security and safety of our people. As a whole, he has always operated at a high level of integrity and personal honor. This is as it should be; he will continue to do so.

In my official work in Washington, individual military officers come and go, but the uniform stays on. It is the American military uniform that I honor because it symbolizes a great profession of honor and integrity.

As you prepare here, may you prepare well. As you assume further and broader duties, may this preparation here, the support of a great nation, and the help of a Divine Power sustain you and our country as we face our future and its problems unafraid.

TRIBUTE TO GEN. CREIGHTON ABRAMS, CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. ARMY

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, today a distinguished soldier, Gen. Creighton W. Abrams, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army, passed away at Walter Reed Army

Hospital here in Washington. He succumbed at 12:35 a.m. from complications as a result of the removal of a cancerous lung last June. General Abrams' death represents a distinct loss to the Army and the Nation. I extend to his widow and family my heartfelt sympathy.

When a man reaches the pinnacle of his profession he leaves a mark. In the case of General Abrams, although he had served as Chief of Staff for less than 2 years—since October 12, 1972—he did leave for the Army a sense of direction which deserves to be followed.

This legacy directly relates to his character as being a soldier's soldier. He was closely identified with the infantry footslogger, the man in the lower ranks who has to win and hold ground by which victories are measured. While air power, and often sea power, are critical to victories in war the ultimate measure is who holds what land. It was the man who had the dirty job of taking and holding land that General Abrams was most closely identified.

In the short span of less than 2 years, General Abrams set for the Army new directions which deserve to be continued. Briefly, these directions involved a general reorganization in January of 1973 followed by higher levels of readiness and a shifting of forces from support to combat missions.

He came to the Army's top job after serving as U.S. Commander in Vietnam from July 1968 to the end of the war in early 1972. During this time he supervised the Nixon military initiatives into Cambodia and Laos, and urged the increased use of seapower and airpower which were instrumental in bringing U.S. involvement in that war to a close.

After the successful mining of Haiphong and bombing of Hanoi, U.S. withdrawal was possible because of the Vietnamization program which had molded our allies there into an effective fighting force. In all of these policies General Abrams had an important role.

Upon returning to the United States as Chief of Staff for the Army, General Abrams found the 13 Army divisions in various states of unpreparedness. He immediately implemented a program which resulted in his reporting to the Congress earlier this year that 12 of our 13 divisions were combat ready.

However, his brief tenure may well be significant more for the programs he initiated than those he completed.

Perhaps the most public attention was given to his aggressive reduction of headquarters spaces throughout the world. Under his leadership the Army closed or consolidated numerous headquarters in the United States and overseas. He sharply reduced his own headquarters staff in the Pentagon and this set the tone, as President Ford has done, of leading by example.

He was a strong advocate of Army aviation as represented by the Army's exploitation in South Vietnam of the transport and attack helicopter. Shortly after becoming Chief of Staff he told the Army Aviation Association of America that the helicopter provided an essential element of the success of ground forces in Vietnam.

In the current year General Abrams became a strong spokesman for maintaining Army strength at 785,000. He noted the continued reduction of Army strength since Vietnam to a point where manning had reached the levels of the early 1950's. His plea to Congress was to allow stability and with it would come higher readiness and better personnel management.

Tied to his pleas to maintain Army manning at 785,000 was a plan to rearrange Army organization in a way to increase our combat divisions from 13 to 16. General Abrams believed this could be done within the 785,000 strength by reducing headquarters and shifting emphasis from support to combat forces.

A key element of his plan was to integrate reserve and guard forces into the regular divisions. This policy makes use of our reserve and guard in a meaningful way and is economical because of the fact that they cost only a fraction of the sum needed for active forces.

In summary I would venture the opinion that General Abrams made contributions of great substance in a very brief time as the Army's Chief. In less than 2 years he had initiated many worthwhile ideas. It is my hope that his successor will go forward with many of these sensible efforts to make the Army hard and lean.

Mr. President, in closing I ask unanimous consent that a brief biography of General Abrams be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

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

GEN. CREIGHTON W. ABRAMS, CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. ARMY

Creighton Williams Abrams was born in Springfield, Massachusetts, September 15, 1914. He graduated from Agawam High School, Agawam, Massachusetts, in 1932, from the U.S. Military Academy in 1936, and was commissioned a Second Lieutenant in the U.S. Cavalry.

General Abrams' first four years in the Army were spent as a troop officer in the 1st Cavalry Division. In 1940 he joined the 1st Armored Division, and in 1941 joined the newly-formed 4th Armored Division. As a member of the 4th Armored Division from its activation in 1941 until V-E Day in 1945, General Abrams took part as a battalion or combat command commander in every campaign the Division fought.

Following V-E Day, General Abrams was assigned to the War Department General Staff. Assignments at the Armored School and attendance at the Command and General Staff College followed, and in 1949 he assumed command of the 63d Tank Battalion of the 1st Infantry Division and later the 2d Armored Cavalry Regiment.

After graduating from the Army War College, he was assigned to Korea, where he served in several key staff positions. Returning to the States in 1955, he served as Chief of Staff of the Armored Center at Fort Knox.

In 1956 General Abrams was promoted to Brigadier General and assigned to the Department of the Army General Staff as the Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff for Reserve Components.

General Abrams returned to Europe in 1959 as Assistant Division Commander of the 3d Armored Division. In June 1960 he was promoted to Major General and assumed command of the 3d Armored Division in October 1960. Returning to Washington in May 1962, he became the Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Military Operations for Civil Affairs. After filling several important Staff positions in Washington, he became Commanding General of V Corps in Germany 15 July 1963 and was promoted to Lieutenant General 1 August 1963.

General Abrams was promoted to the rank of General 4 September 1964 and on the same date was sworn in as Vice Chief of Staff, U.S. Army. General Abrams became the Deputy Commander, U.S. Military Assistance Command, Vietnam, 6 April 1967 and assumed command of the Assistance Command in July 1968. On 12 October 1972 General Abrams became the twenty-sixth Chief of Staff of the United States Army.

General Abrams has been awarded the Distinguished Service Cross with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Defense Distinguished Service Medal, the Distinguished Service Medal with three Oak Leaf Clusters, the Silver Star Medal with Oak Leaf Cluster, the Bronze Star Medal with Valor Device, and numerous other U.S. and foreign decorations.

CREIGHTON ABRAMS—A SOLDIER'S SOLDIER

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, I was saddened this morning when I heard of the untimely death of Gen. Creighton W. Abrams, Chief of Staff of the U.S. Army.

I did not have the privilege of knowing him personally—away from his duties in uniform. But, I did get a measure of the man when I saw him in the field in Vietnam during my visit there in 1970. I was impressed by his dignity and coolness in the holocaust that was Vietnam at that time.

I also had a chance to see him when he appeared before the Senate Armed Services Committee to speak in behalf of Army needs and Army programs. In the veritable sea of uniforms, faces and voices that flows before the committee each year, his stood out. His voice, unlike some, was not loud, not overbearing, not pompous, not righteous, not indignant, not demanding. No. His voice was quiet. His thoughts were personal and candid. He spoke modestly but with force and meaning.

I will not attempt to recite his long list of honors. This will be done by others and, I am certain, with eloquence. Instead, I will let him speak for himself. And this is the best tribute that any man can receive. On April 10, 1973, when General Abrams appeared before the committee, I asked him the following question:

General Abrams, historically, the esprit de corps of the Marines—remember, I am an old Army man—has in the minds of the American people set them somewhat above the level of the three services in their reputation for discipline, toughness, combat readiness, and outstanding performance. On the other hand, the other services are sometimes criticized for being too permissive and overreacting to their respective military manpower problems. What are your views on this?

His answer, and I quote it in full, was as follows:

First of all, I agree with your description of the image of the U.S. Marine Corps. That is also the view that I have. Historically that has been the position that they have occupied in the minds of the American people and the officialdom of the American Government. Furthermore, I think it is well earned, and justified.

With respect to the Army, the Army is, I think, somewhat of a different thing. Historically the Army has required tremendous expansion in time of war. Back to as far as I can go in my own experience, World War II—I belonged to the 1st Cavalry Division, I joined in 1936, and it was all horses and mules—the Army was 168,000 total, including the Air Corps, which was then part of the Army. And it went to 8 million before World War II was over.

A similar, although not as drastic an expansion was made when we had to go and fight in Korea, and a similar thing happened when it came time to go and fight in Vietnam.

What happened in each of those times was that vast numbers of citizens were called to the colors by the draft—at least for those three wars that was what happened—and it became necessary to train and create an officer corps and a noncommissioned officer corps in the shortest possible time. Their experience level was low.

Let me give a personal example. When I was a second lieutenant my wife had to go home. She was the oldest child and her father passed away. I was down at Fort Bliss. The plane ticket was $125, and that was a month's salary. I went down to Paso del Norte Hotel in El Paso, walked up to the deskman, and gave him a check for $125. I said, "I don't have the money in the bank, but I need the money."

The man at the desk counted out the $125. I was a second lieutenant. Then I purchased the plane ticket and my wife went home.

At the end of World War II, I had gone up to West Point to make a speech. I flew up there in an airplane with one of the instructors at Fort Knox, who was a pilot, and we got weathered in. I had plenty of money with me, but we stayed there 5 days. Then I just had to get back to Fort Knox, because I had classes to meet. I was a teacher there.

There was no flying. The weather wasn't clear. I bought a train ticket at West Point, and I got on the train down there at the West Point station.

We went down to the Pennsylvania Station in New York and I went up to check my ticket for Louisville at the ticket counter, and the man said "there is no such train."

"Well," I said, "could you let me have another ticket?"

So he goes to make out another ticket—I have forgotten what it cost, $58 or something like that—and he wouldn't substitute. He said the ticket I had was no good, although I had paid for it. "It is very simple," he said, "just turn it in when you get home and they will refund your money."

And I said, "I don't have money for another ticket."

I went across the street to the Pennsylvania Hotel to cash a check. I was in uniform. I was a colonel, but I couldn't cash it.

I did have enough money to pay for the ticket, but I didn't have any money for meals.

When I got to Louisville, I gave the porter a silver dollar which I had carried all during the war.

That is what happens, and the American people sensed the change. And we have been through that, at least in my experience, now three times. Now we have to get back that status with the American people. That is what we are in the process of trying to do now, get the status of integrity, honesty, and character in our officer corps. And it applies to all grades, from general to second lieutenant, no grades are exempt, including the noncommissioned officers. That is what now has to be rebuilt, and we have to do that.

Mr. President, the Nation will miss General Abrams for his leadership, for his lifetime dedication to the Army, and to the common soldier. I regret that I did not have the time to have known him better.

ENERGY TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ACT OF 1974

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8193) to require that a percentage of U.S. oil imports be carried on U.S.-flag vessels.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota may not be able to be with us tomorrow to present an amendment that he wishes to offer, and I would like to accommodate the Senator. He can offer his amendment at this time. I do not oppose it. I do not believe that the Senate will oppose it.

First, I would like to ask consent that Wayne Thevenot, Doug Svendson of my staff, and Bert Rosen of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee staff, be permitted to remain on the floor while the bill is being debated.

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

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may yield to the Senator from Minnesota for the offering of his amendment.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1837

Mr. MONDALE. I thank the distinguished floor manager for his courtesy in permitting me to call up my amendment in this fashion. It is a matter of grave importance to those of us who serve States along the Great Lakes, whose ports are now in desperate circumstances.

I have worked on this amendment with the staff of the distinguished floor manager, and with the staff of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. GRIFFIN) who served as a cosponsor; this amendment is supported, in addition, by Senator PROXMIRE, Senator HART, Senator HUGH SCOTT, my colleague, Senator HUMPHREY, Senator NELSON, Senator STEVENSON, Senator BAYH, Senator HARTKE, and Senator TAFT.

Mr. President, on behalf of these Senators, I call up my amendment No. 1837 and ask that its reading be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered; and, without objection, the amendment will be printed in the RECORD.

The amendment is as follows:

Section 809 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. 1213), is amended to read as follows: "Contracts under this chapter shall be entered into so as to equitably serve, insofar as possible, the foreign-trade requirements of the Atlantic, Gulf, Great Lakes, and Pacific ports of the United States. In order to assure equitable treatment for such range of ports referred to in the preceding sentence, not less than 10 per centum of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available for the foreign-trade requirements of the United States pursuant to this Act or any law authorizing funds for the purposes of such Act shall be allocated for the foreign-trade requirements of each such port range. Furthermore, in awarding contracts under this chapter, preference shall be given to persons who are citizens of the United States and who have the support, financial and otherwise, of the domestic communities primarily interested.".

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, this amendment amends section 809 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 by inserting after the words "the foreign-trade requirements of the Atlantic, Gulf, Great Lakes, and Pacific ports," the following sentence:

In order to assure equitable treatment for such range of ports referred to in the preceding sentence, not less than 10 per centum of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available for the foreign-trade requirements of the United States pursuant to this Act or any law authorizing funds for the purposes of such Act shall be allocated for the foreign-trade requirements of each such port range.

Mr. President, in 1970 when we made some very important improvements in the Merchant Marine Act for the first time, we added the Great Lakes range of ports officially as the fourth seacoast of the United States.

Under the Merchant Marine Act, this range of ports was then to be considered an essential route of trade for the United States in foreign commerce, and was to be promoted and maintained in the interest of the United States. Regrettably, since that time, not a single U.S. flagship has sailed the Great Lakes; not a single dime of maritime subsidy has gone either for construction differential or operating differential subsidies.

The result is that many ports, including my own port in Duluth-Superior, and throughout the Great Lakes, have been turned into virtually deserted areas. I think this is an atrocious policy for the United States, as well as being very, very unfair to our area. Hundreds of longshoremen, seamen, and pilots have lost their jobs.

These ports have been responsible for millions of dollars worth of commerce upon which these communities depend. That commerce has disappeared.

For this reason, we are asking that this amendment be adopted, which sets aside a minimum of 10 percent of the construction and operating subsidies for each of the four great seacoasts.

Mr. President, this will, in my opinion, force the Maritime Administration to undertake a long and overdue look at establishing a balanced four-seacoast strategy.

Mr. President, I have discussed my amendment with representatives of the International Longshoremen Association, the AFL–CIO, and the National Farmers Union. They have assured me of their full and enthusiastic support.

We are very hopeful that this amendment will be adopted. I think once adopted, it will be a strengthening feature for the transportation system of this country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have an article from the January issue of the Maritime magazine printed in the RECORD.

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

GREAT LAKES FLEET

The United States Great Lakes fleet is rapidly approaching total obsolescence. Approximately 45 percent of that fleet is more than half a century old; less than 30 new bulk carriers and tankers have been added to this service since 1950, and not a single one since 1961. Since 1955, our Great Lakes fleet has declined by more than 130 vessels, representing nearly 1 million deadweight tons. The result: The loss of almost 5,000 shipboard jobs.

The opening of the St. Lawrence Seaway a decade ago, making the Great Lakes our "fourth seacoast" by enabling oceangoing vessels to carry cargoes to and from the heartland of the American continent, was supposed to stimulate American-flag shipping. It has not done so. It has been a boon for foreign-flag shipping instead.

To correct these deficiencies, we propose:

(1) The extension to Great Lakes operators of the same right to establish tax-deferred construction reserve funds being sought for the entire deep-sea fleet.

(2) The earmarking of a portion of ship construction subsidies for replacement of the Great Lakes fleet and specifically for deepsea ships which will service this area.

(3) The earmarking of a portion of ship operating subsidies for vessels which will make voyages into and out of the Great Lakes. The purpose of operating subsidies is to help American-flag vessel compete with foreign-flag vessels. Certainly the situation on the Great Lakes, where foreign-flag shipping is overpowering U.S.-flag operations, also poses a competitive threat which must be overcome.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I hope that the Senate agrees to this amendment. I believe it is meritorious. It seeks to provide some needed help to the Great Lakes. I hope that the amendment can achieve its objective. I believe the general purpose of it is to say, if we can persuade America-flag ships to sail on the Great Lakes, they would have their share of the operating subsidy differential. I believe that is what we are talking about.

Mr. MONDALE. It is also for the purpose of nudging the Maritime Administration and to seek to persuade shipping companies through the availability of these construction and operating subsidies to use the Great Lakes. Those subsidies are essential, as we all know, if we are going to have shipping under U.S. flags with U.S. conditions, pay, and the rest.

There has to be a differential paid. Otherwise, it is just not economically feasible for U.S.-flag ships to use this range of ports.

Mr. LONG. I support the amendment, Mr. President, and I hope it will be accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I did not object until the distinguished Senator from Louisiana sought to have this amendment offered, and also wanted to retain the floor. I did not think that he intended to amend this bill without giving anyone else a chance to express themselves on the amendment.

I would ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to offer comments on the amendment, with the understanding that it will not deprive the Senator from Louisiana of the floor.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield long enough for me to ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 3473?

Mr. COTTON. If I have the floor, I yield.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE AND USIA APPROPRIATIONS AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1974

Mr. SPARKMAN. On behalf of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations who could not be here today, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on S. 3473, with amendments thereto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3473) to authorize appropriations for the Department of State and the U.S. Information Agency, and for other purposes, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Department of State and United States Information Agency Appropriations Authorization Act of 1974".

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE

SEC. 2. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated for the Department of State for the fiscal year 1975, to carry out the authorities, functions, duties, and responsibilities in the conduct of the foreign affairs of the United States, including trade negotiations, and other purposes authorized by law, the following amounts:

(1) for the "Administration of Foreign Affairs", $360,785,000, of which $250,000 are authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of providing protection for the representatives of the United States to the United Nations appointed by the President under section 2 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, including Delegates and Alternate Delegates to any session of the General Assembly of the United Nations;

(2) for "International Organizations and Conferences", $229,604,000;

(3) for "International Commissions", $17,832,000;

(4) for "Educational Exchange", $75,000,000; and

(5) for "Migration and Refugee Assistance", $9,470,000.

(b) In addition to amounts authorized by subsection (a) of this section, there are authorized to be appropriated for the Department of State for the fiscal year 1975 not to exceed $11,500,000 for increases in salary, pay, retirement, or other employee benefits authorized by law.

(c) In addition to amounts otherwise authorized, there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of State for the fiscal year 1975 not to exceed $40,000,000 to carry out the provisions of section 101(b) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act of 1972, relating to Russian refugee assistance.

(d) Appropriations made under subsections (a) and (b) of this section are authorized to remain available until expended.

DEATH GRATUITIES FOR CERTAIN FOREIGN SERVICE PERSONNEL

SEC. 3. The Act entitled "An Act to provide certain basic authority for the Department of State", approved August 1, 1956 (70 Stat. 890), is amended by inserting immediately before section 15 (22 U.S.C. 2680) the following new section:

"SEC. 14. (a) Subject to the provisions of this section and under such regulations as the Secretary of State may prescribe, the Secretary is authorized to provide for payment of a gratuity to the surviving dependents of any Foreign Service employee who dies as a result of injuries sustained in the performance of duty outside the United States in an amount equal to one year's salary at the time of death. Appropriations for this purpose are authorized to be made to the account for salaries and expenses of the employing agency. Any death gratuity payment made under this section shall be held to have been a gift and shall be in addition to any other benefit payable from any source.

"(b) A death gratuity payment shall be made under this section only if the survivor entitled to payment under subsection (c) is entitled to elect monthly compensation under section 8133 of title 5, United States Code, because the death resulted from an injury (excluding a disease proximately caused by the employment) sustained in the performance of duty, without regard to whether such survivor elects to waive compensation under such section 8133.

"(c) A death gratuity payment under this section shall be made as follows:

"(1) First, to the widow or widower.

"(2) Second, to the child, or children in equal shares, if there is no widow or widower.

"(3) Third, to the dependent parent, or dependent parents in equal shares, if there is no widow, widower, or child.

If there is no survivor entitled to payment under this subsection, no payment shall be made.

"(d) As used in this section—

"(1) the term 'Foreign Service employee' means a chief of mission, Foreign Service officer, Foreign Service information officer, Foreign Service Reserve officer of limited or unlimited tenure, or a Foreign Service staff officer or employee;

"(2) each of the terms 'widow', 'widower', 'child', and 'parent' shall have the same meaning given each such term by section 8101 of title 5, United States Code.

"(3) the term 'United States' means the several States and the District of Columbia.

"(e) The provisions of this section shall apply with respect to deaths occurring on and after January 1, 1973.".

LIMITATION ON PAYMENTS

SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated funds for payment prior to January 1, 1975, of United States expenses of membership in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, the International Civil Aviation Organization, and the World Health Organization notwithstanding that such payments are in excess of 25 per centum of the total annual assessment of such organizations.

PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. 5. No part of any funds appropriated under this Act shall be used to make any payment to the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability Fund to meet any unfunded liability of such fund created by the inclusion of officers and employees of the Agency for International Development in the Foreign Service Retirement and Disability System.

AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY

SEC. 6. (a) There are authorized to be appropriated for the United States Information Agency for fiscal year 1975, to carry out international informational activities and programs under the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948, the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961, and Reorganization Plan

Numbered 8 of 1953, and other purposes authorized by law, the following amounts:

(1) $228,368,000 for "Salaries and Expenses" and "Salaries and Expenses (special foreign currency program)," except that so much of such amount as may be appropriated for "Salaries and Expenses (special foreign currency program)" may be appropriated without fiscal year limitation;

(2) $6,770,000 for "Special international exhibitions"; and

(3) $4,400,000 for "Acquisition and construction of radio facilities".

Amounts appropriated under paragraphs (2) and (3) of this subsection are authorized to remain available until expended.

(b) In addition to amounts authorized by subsection (a) of this section, there are authorized to be appropriated without fiscal year limitation for the United States Information Agency for the fiscal year 1975 not to exceed $4,200,000 for increase in salary, pay, retirement, or other employee benefits authorized by law.

ANNUAL UNITED STATES INFORMATION AGENCY REPORTS TO CONGRESS

SEC. 7. Section 1008 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (22 U.S.C. 1439) is amended to read as follows:

"REPORTS TO CONGRESS

"SEC. 1008. The Secretary shall submit to the Congress annual reports of expenditures made and activities carried on under authority of this Act, inclusive of appraisals and measurements, where feasible, as to the effectiveness of the several programs in each country where conducted.".

PRIOR AUTHORIZATION BY CONGRESS

SEC. 8. Section 701 of the United States Information and Educational Exchange Act of 1948 (22 U.S.C. 1476) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(e) The provisions of this section shall not apply to, or affect in any manner, permanent appropriations, trust funds, and other similar accounts administered by the United States Information Agency as authorized by law.".

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House on S. 3473, ask for a conference thereon, and that conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. MANSFIELD, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. CASE conferees on the part of the Senate.

REREFERRAL OF S. 1134 TO THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield; on behalf of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), the chairman of our committee, I ask that S. 1134 be rereferred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. This bill would set up a system of licensing for mining minerals from the deep sea bed. It was reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on August 21. It is identical to the bill which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs jointly in the 92d Congress.

We have a letter from Senator JACKSON agreeing to the rereferral.

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

Mr. SPARKMAN. I thank the Chair.

ENERGY TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ACT OF 1974

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8193) to require that a percentage of U.S. oil imports be carried on U.S.-flag vessels.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I sympathize entirely with the purpose of the Senator from Minnesota. But, I would observe that passage through the seaway to the Great Lakes at certain times of the year is not possible, and that there is some limitation on the size of ships that can go in the seaway to the Great Lakes. And, in 1970 when we considered the Merchant Marine Act, there were some who did not want to give them the fair deal of being included with the Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific ports of the United States and put the Great Lakes on the same basis. I was not one of those. I was very glad to support the Great Lakes because of the investment we made in the seaway, and with the desire to do everything reasonably possible to promote traffic in the Great Lakes and their ports which they were entitled to.

But, now after obtaining in 1970 what some term a special privilege, although I did not consider it as such, I think we ought to understand thoroughly just what this amendment offered by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota concerns. He has offered it with the best of motives. In my book, the best of motives is to take care of your constituents.

But, the effect of this amendment is to earmark appropriations. If there were other members of the Committee on Appropriations on the floor, or if the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations the distinguished Senator from Arkansas, were on the floor, I think they would have something to say right away.

This amendment provides in pertinent part the following:

Not less than 10 percent of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available for the foreign-trade requirements of the United States pursuant to this act or any law authorizing funds for the purposes of such act shall be allocated for the foreign trade requirements of each such port range.

Thus, we will bypass the Appropriations Committee, and earmark at least 10 percent of such funds. I now do see other members of the Appropriations Committee are in the Chamber. The idea of allocating funds to be appropriated that, right off, 10 percent of whatever funds the Appropriations Committees recommend and Congress adopts have to go to the Atlantic, Gulf, Great Lakes, and Pacific ports, to me, is inconceivable. In the first place, I do not favor it.

Second, the distinguished Senator from Michigan (Mr. GRIFFIN) has already had adopted in the substitute reported by the Commerce Committee a provision intended to protect and to promote Great Lakes' traffic.

This particular bill concerns oil and petroleum products. It deals with tankers. To be sure—and I would be less than honest if I did not add this—one of my objections to it, not the chief one, but one of my objections to this bill, is the fact that this is an unwise precedent. In the past, we have required a preference for the shipment in American bottoms of merchandise which either was owned by the Government or was financed by the Government. In other words, the preference applied to Public Law 480 agricultural products, and so forth.

If this bill is passed, it will proceed to set a precedent which, in the opinion of this Senator, will open up all kinds of restrictions on all kinds of privately-owned cargoes.

Except for section 2, this bill, as it now stands, has to do only with oil and with tankers. Any tankers that are constructed as a result of this bill will be very large because of the economics. And, no tanker of such size could possibly ever get into the Great Lakes. As a matter of fact, it is my understanding—and I am sure that one of the distinguished Senators will immediately correct me if I am wrong—that the size of a vessel that can navigate the seaway into the Great Lakes is limited to approximately 25,000 deadweight tons.

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

Mr. COTTON. I yield.

Mr. LONG. Permit me to offer my explanation about this parliamentary situation.

I will not ask for an immediate vote on this amendment, if the Senator feels that this matter deserves further consideration. I would be happy to agree that we would not vote on it for the next several hours, if the Senator so desired. I did not anticipate that there would be objection to this particular amendment.

There is a Great Lakes amendment on the bill—one, I might say, that I am not happy about, by the way. The more I hear about it, the less I agree with it. It was offered by Mr. GRIFFIN.

Mr. COTTON. That is one point on which we are in accord.

Mr. LONG. But this particular amendment, in my judgment, is one which would help the Great Lakes States and one which I believe, if we give it careful consideration, we will agree is only fair.

Basically, what I understand the amendment to mean is this: Where there is very great difficulty at this moment in prevailing upon American-flag ships in foreign commerce to sail on the Great Lakes, this amendment, in effect, would say that in the event that those on the Great Lakes can persuade American-flag ships to sail to the Great Lakes ports, that sum of money—in this case 10 percent—of the money available for ship construction and operating differential would be available to those ships that could be prevailed upon, hopefully, to trade in Great Lakes ports.

Mr. COTTON. But, the Senator is not only talking about tankers.

Mr. LONG. No. We are just talking about ships, period.

Mr. COTTON. Yes.

Mr. LONG. Insofar as this amendment is not strictly germane to the original purpose of the bill, I would point out that the same is true of the Griffin amendment, which has already been attached to the bill by the committee. As between the two amendments, I think that this is a better approach and would have less objection from those of us who

hail from other parts of the Nation than would the Griffin amendment.

If the Senator prefers that we not vote on this matter at this time, I will not press it at this point. I would be happy to wait until the Senator has had a chance to discuss it with others and to give it more consideration.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

I think it is only fair that we lay our cards on the table about what the Senator from New Hampshire will seek to do. I understand that at some point we will vote on the committee amendment, which really constitutes a new text, which was substituted for the bill that came to the committee from the House. It is my understanding that if this substitute committee amendment, as it may adopted, then that is it; but if not, then we can consider further amendments, including that of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, to the House-passed bill. But, I expect that the Senator from Louisiana probably has the votes to adopt the substitute.

It is the position of the Senator from New Hampshire—and I think I can say that it is also the position of a number of Senators—that the House bill, bad as it is, it is not as bad as that reported by our Commerce Committee, and I say "bad" because my opposition, frankly, is parochial, because what it does to New England is something fearful to contemplate. Thus, I cannot become too excited about earmarking funds to help the Great Lakes in a bill that already discriminates against and crucifies the Northeast—not only New England, but the entire Northeast region.

Therefore, I shall do everything in my power to prevent the adoption of the committee amendment, because the House bill, bad as it is and discriminatory as it is, is infinitely less dangerous than the version reported by our Commerce Committee, in the opinion of the Senator from New Hampshire.

If, by any chance, we prevail in preventing the adoption of the committee amendment, as I understand it, other amendments will be in order. Is my understanding correct?

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, the parliamentary situation, as far as I understand it at this moment, is that the committee amendments will be voted on after amendments to the committee amendments have been voted upon. In other words, after amendments to the committee amendments have been voted on, we would vote on the committee amendments.

At that point, I suppose, the bill would no longer be subject to amendment. But I have not really given a great deal of thought to the parliamentary situation, my thought being that as usually on legislation, it is just a matter of trying to accommodate ourselves to the will of the Senate.

The Senator knows as well as I do, from his long years of service, very fine and creditable service, to this body, that one can always find a way to vote on what one wants to offer, one way or another, even if one has to offer a substitute for the bill or a motion to recommit, or do it in some other fashion.

This particular amendment is one that I would hope that, when we have had a chance to study it, the Senate will agree is meritorious, that it does help the Great Lakes, and that it really offers no real threat to the rest of us, because it seeks to achieve only what we had hoped would be the case for the Great Lakes from the very beginning—that is, that ships would sail on it and that some of those ships would be American ships.

I assure the Senator that anything he wants to have voted on, we shall accord him an opportunity to offer his amendment and have it voted on, either as an amendment to the committee amendment or as an amendment to the bill, however he wants to do it. I certainly want the Senator to have his rights protected. I do not think that anyone is seeking not to do that in this instance.

Mr. COTTON. I want to make sure that I do understand this. It is true I have been here a long time, but I do not profess to be an authority on the procedure of the Senate.

The Senator from Louisiana considers what I have been referring to technically as the committee amendment, as the substitute to the bill that was referred to our Commerce Committee, and he feels that it should be——

Mr. LONG. As far as the Senator from Louisiana is concerned, I do not know whether the Parliamentarian considers this an amendment in the nature of a substitute or a mere committee amendment. In my judgment, it is a distinction without a difference, because it achieves the same result.

Mr. COTTON. If the Senator will forgive me, this so-called committee amendment strikes out of the bill that was referred to the Commerce Committee everything after the enacting clause and proceeds to substitute a new bill. This committee amendment is in the nature of a substitute now.

I would like, in order to clarify this, to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. COTTON. My inquiry is this: is the material to be inserted after striking out all after the enacting clause of the House bill in the nature of committee amendments, or is it a substitute offered by the committee?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that it is a single committee amendment in the nature of a substitute and, once amended, it is no longer subject to amendment.

Mr. COTTON. So that all amendments that anyone may have must be offered before the vote comes on the substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COTTON. And there can be no other substitute offered as a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian informs the Chair that the committee amendment is amendable in two degrees, and two more amendments in the nature of substitutes could be offered.

Mr. COTTON. I am sorry, but I could not hear the first part of what the Chair stated. Would he kindly repeat it?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is considered original text for the purpose of amendment, and thus is open to amendment in two more degrees.

Mr. COTTON. In two more degrees?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. And two more substitutes would be in order.

Mr. COTTON. In regard to any amendment that is offered to this substitute, then, may an amendment to the amendment be offered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, that being the situation, unless one wishes to gamble on the whole substitute being rejected, all amendments have to be offered prior to the vote on the substitute, and in view of that fact, I do not feel justified in asking that the vote on the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota be delayed to some further day. But, if there are sufficient Senators here, since I do oppose this amendment I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is not a sufficient second.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, in view of the fact that there are not sufficient Senators present to order the yeas and nays at this time, I should like to address myself to the bill itself, and then, in due course, we can vote on the amendment later on today. I shall be happy to protect the Senator with regard to the yeas and nays and ask for them when we have enough Senators present.

Mr. COTTON. In other words, the Senator from Minnesota will withdraw his amendment for the time being?

Mr. LONG. No; what I had in mind is that I would hope that we would simply let the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota remain the pending amendment, his amendment to the committee amendment, and that I might simply have the opportunity to address myself to the bill itself, and that others who care to speak on the amendment or the bill would have the same privilege thereafter. Then, in due course, when the Senate gets around to voting on the matter, I shall be happy to accommodate the Senator and protect his right for the yeas and nays on the Mondale amendment. So it is the pending amendment.

I do not see any reason why we should displace it. I personally would like to discuss the bill itself for a while, and others may be so disposed. In due course, we shall get around to voting on the amendment and anything else.

Mr. COTTON. If the Senator would permit me at this time I wish to propound one question to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. COTTON. In his amendment on page 2, lines 6 and 7, I find the words, "who have the support, financial and otherwise, of the domestic communities primarily interested."

My question is, Does this mean that the existing streamship companies will not be eligible, for example, for such aid?

Mr. MONDALE. I will respond to the Senator from New Hampshire as follows: This amendment is designed to require the Merchant Marine Administration to allocate a minimum of 10 percent of its differential construction and operating subsidies—a minimum of 10 percent—to each of the four great seacoasts, one of which is the Great Lakes, which has not heretofore received a single dime under the subsidy program.

In awarding such contracts to the range of ports within each of the seacoasts, the Administration shall give preference to persons who are citizens of the United States—in other words, U.S. citizens seeking such subsidies, and especially those who have demonstrated support from the communities primarily interested in these ports.

In other words, where a U.S. citizen applies for these subsidies, and has substantial support in the communities or in a community involved, that would be an additional factor to be considered by the Administrator in the awarding of a subsidy.

There is a technical error in my amendment, and I modify it to provide that at the beginning of the amendment a reference will be made to a new section, section 6. I failed, due to a drafting error, to provide for an additional section beginning on page 9, line 18.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is so modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

On page 9, line 18, insert the following new section:

SEC. 6. Section 809 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 U.S.C. 1213), is amended to read as follows: "Contracts under this chapter shall be entered into so as to equitably serve, insofar as possible, the foreign-trade requirements of the Atlantic, Gulf, Great Lakes, and Pacific ports of the United States. In order to assure equitable treatment for such range of ports referred to in the preceding sentence, not less than 10 per centum of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available for the foreign-trade requirements of the United States pursuant to this Act or any law authorizing funds for the purposes of such Act shall be allocated for the foreign-trade requirements of each such port range. Furthermore, in awarding contracts under this chapter, preference shall be given to persons who are citizens of the United States and who have the support, financial and otherwise, of the domestic communities primarily interested.".

Mr. COTTON. I think the Senator's amendment is still ambiguous, but I understand the Senator from Louisiana will see to it that we have an opportunity to discuss the amendment later, and have a rollcall vote.

Mr. LONG. Yes. I was informed by the assistant majority leader that he hoped the vote on this amendment, if it was to be a rollcall, could occur sometime after 3:30, because there were Senators on their way back who hoped to be present.

Mr. President, I would like now to address myself briefly to the committee amendment, or the bill itself. The Senate is considering what I believe to be a very vital proposal. As amended, the bill would improve our national security posture by requiring that oil transported into the United States be transported on American-flag vessels. Specifically, it would require 20 percent of American oil imports be transported on privately owned U.S.-flag vessels, to the extent that such vessels are available at fair and reasonable rates.

This reserved share would increase to 25 percent after June 30, 1974, and to 30 percent after June 30, 1977, provided that the Secretary of Commerce makes the determination that sufficient U.S. tonnage exists to carry the increased amount.

This legislation was introduced as S. 2089 by the chairman of the Committee on Commerce (Mr. MAGNUSON) and the Senator from Maryland (Mr. BEALL) on June 27, 1973. It was identical to H.R. 8193, introduced in May of this year by Representative LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Subsequently, Senators JACKSON and MATHIAS joined as cosponsors of S. 2089, while 226 Members of the House of Representatives introduced or cosponsored 46 bills identical to H.R. 8193.

In the period between October 1973 and March 1974, the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries Subcommittee on Merchant Marine had 15 days of public hearings on H.R. 8193, and it was favorably reported by the subcommittee and the full committee, and passed by the House of Representatives by a rollcall vote of 266 to 136.

This past May, the Senate Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on the Merchant Marine, of which I am proud to be chairman, held public hearings on S. 2089 and H.R. 8193 in which testimony was received from 15 witnesses, including officials from the Departments of State and Commerce, the Federal Energy Administration, a number of petroleum and shipping company and trade association representatives, economists, and labor union officials.

On June 26 and 27, the full committee considered H.R. 8193.

The committee feels that the bill as reported is much stronger than the 1972 bill and the House-passed bill. For example, what little remained of the argument that the bill would result in increased costs to the consumer has been mooted because of an amendment waiving a portion of the oil import license fee for crude oil imports transported on U.S. tankers, and requiring the savings from the waiver to be passed on to the ultimate oil consumer. Other committee improvements include a requirement that a portion of profits be reinvested in new vessels and a requirement that new vessels incorporate the best available pollution prevention technology, including segregated ballast capacity and double bottoms, so as to protect our marine environment.

On June 27, the Senate Commerce Committee, by a vote of 14 to 2, with 2 abstentions, reported favorably H.R. 8193, with an amendment.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I might yield at this time, without losing my right to the floor, to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator first yield briefly to me?

Mr. LONG. To make a brief statement, with the understanding that his statement will appear prior to my statement in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that for one moment?

Mr. LONG. I withhold it.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator from Louisiana, as chairman of our Committee's Subcommittee on Merchant Marine held the hearings on this bill. In those hearings, was testimony given in regard to deleting from the House bill the right of the President and Congress to waive the bill's provisions in case of an emergency?

Mr. LONG. No, there is no testimony on that. I may offer an amendment myself to provide some of the type of flexibility that that amendment would provide during the course of the consideration of this measure. I shall discuss that as the debate goes along with the Senator from New Hampshire and others.

Mr. COTTON. Was there testimony in the hearings presided over by my friend from Louisiana regarding the provision applicable to the House bill to allow foreign-flag vessels to transfer to the U.S. flag and qualify for cargo preference after a 3-year period? Was that subject discussed at all?

Mr. LONG. No. The House bill, I think, permitted that. There was no testimony on that aspect of it.

Mr. COTTON. Was there any testimony on the so-called Great Lakes amendment?

Mr. LONG. No, there was no testimony on that.

Mr. COTTON. Was there testimony on the double-bottom requirement?

Mr. LONG. No; there was not. But the committee, in connection with other legislation, has looked rather extensively into the pollution problem and into this matter of double bottoms, and the committee felt that it had adequate knowledge from its own records in other hearings and other legislation.

Mr. COTTON. I was present, and I know the committee wrote it in the pending bill.

Mr. LONG. Yes.

Mr. COTTON. All I wanted to know was had there been any testimony on it?

Mr. LONG. Not in connection with this particular bill. But, as the Senator, I am sure, knows, the committee had received a lot of testimony on that subject in connection with other legislation, so that we can make available to the Senator a lot of information on that subject which, I believe, both he and other Members pretty well know, to begin with.

As the Senator so well knows, the transportation of oil is one of the principal factors of pollution of the high seas, and we are concerned about that just, as I am sure, the Senator is.

Mr. COTTON. I am not insinuating that there is anything wrong about the committee's action, and I am not questioning that. I just wanted to establish the fact that there was no testimony on this provision during the committee's hearings on this bill.

Was there, in the hearings this year before the Senator's subcommittee, discussion of a license fee waiver for crude oil?

Mr. LONG. No; there was not.

Mr. COTTON. Those are all the questions I desire to ask at the moment.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, what we tried to do in the course of this matter—and I will yield in just a minute—was to accommodate everybody who wanted to be heard. I do not know of anybody who is complaining.

Now, we had one particular day that we set aside to be sure that witnesses that the Senator from New Hampshire wanted to testify were heard.

I assume one reason why the so-called flexibility provision that the Senator discussed was not the subject of more testimony was that up to that point we had the feeling—and I would hope the Senator would listen to what I am about to say—one reason I believe there was very little testimony—in fact none, so far as I know—on the so-called flexibility provision that the Senator discusses is that up until the time this bill had been reported we had no reason to think that if we put that provision in that it would make those who opposed the bill favor it anyway, and that, in view of the fact that those who opposed the bill did not appear to be of a mind to be for it no matter what we did, as long as it was going to require us to move any more oil in American bottoms, there was no interest in receiving testimony at that point in support of that position.

I subsequently have come to view the matter somewhat differently because I, frankly, discussed this legislation with the President of the United States, and my impression is that the President would feel much better about this legislation if we had something in it that gave the President some additional discretion.

I look at that differently than I do when I have had no expression of interest from the White House to that effect.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, may I say that I am afraid the Senator from Louisiana is drawing a wrong inference from my questions, in the first place. The Senator knows he has no greater admirer in the Senate than the Senator from New Hampshire.

In the second place, I meant no criticism on the conduct of the hearings. I again thank the Senator for his courtesy for extending the hearings a day so that some of the people from New England who, I think, with reason feel they are being terribly discriminated against, could be heard.

I am not suggesting anything improper. But, I think it is fair to point out that these points were written in by the committee and had not been touched upon in the hearings this year on this bill.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, today the Senate considers what I believe is a vitally important legislative proposal—H.R. 8193 as amended which would regulate commerce and strengthen national security by requiring that a percentage of the oil imported into the United States be transported on U.S.-flag vessels.

Specifically, this legislation would require that 20 percent of American's oil imports be immediately transported on privately owned U.S.-flag vessels to the extent such vessels are available at fair and reasonable rates. This reserved share would increase to 25 percent after June 30, 1974, and to 30 percent after June 30, 1977, providing that the Secretary of Commerce makes a determination that sufficient U.S. tonnage exists to carry the increased amount.

This legislation was introduced as S. 2089 by Senators MAGNUSON, chariman of the Senate Commerce Committee, and BEALL, on June 27, 1973. It was identical to H.R. 8193, introduced in May of that year by Congresswoman LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Subsequently, Senators JACKSON and MATHIAS joined as cosponsors of S. 2089 while 266 members of the House introduced or cosponsored 46 bills identical to H.R. 8193.

In the period from October, 1973 through March, 1974, the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee held 15 days of extensive public hearings on this legislation. On May 8, 1974, H.R. 8193, which was favorably reported by the subcommittee and full committee, passed the House by a rollcall vote of 266 to 136.

This past May, the Senate Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Merchant Marine, of which I am chairman, held 4 days of public hearings, receiving testimony from 15 witnesses including those from the Departments of State and Commerce, the Federal Energy Administration, a number of petroleum and shipping companies and trade association representatives, economists, and labor union officials.

On June 26 and 27, the full committee considered H.R. 8193. At that time, many amendments, designed to strengthen the provisions of the House-passed bill were adopted, including amendments to waive a portion of the oil import license fee for crude oil imports transported on U.S. tankers and to require such savings be passed on to the ultimate oil consumer; to require that a portion of vessel profits be reinvested in new vessels; and to require that the vessels incorporate the best available pollution prevention technology, including segregated ballast capacity and double bottoms, so as to protect our marine environment.

On June 27, the Senate Commerce Committee, by a vote of 14–2, with 2 abstentions, favorably reported H.R. 8193, as amended.

I would like to take this time now to briefly outline both the reasons why the committee so acted and the benefits that will accrue to our Nation from this legislation's enactment.

NATIONAL SECURITY

The passage of H.R. 8193 as amended is essential if we are to guarantee that in a period of international crisis, our Nation has a sufficient number of U.S.-flag tankers to supply our Armed Forces and meet the needs of our basic domestic industries.

It is a fact recognized by Congress and naval defense experts that a strong, active civilian merchant marine is an essential part of our national defense. Through the vehicle of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, Congress took the positive step of in fact charging the privately-owned civilian merchant marine with the defense mission of serving as a "naval and military auxiliary in time of war or national emergency."

Yet today, there are virtually no U.S.-flag tankers regularly engaged in the carriage of our oil imports. Instead, these imports are carried on foreign-flag vessels, a practice which severely threatens our security by making us dependent on others for this vitally needed shipping service.

No one has to be reminded of the economic chaos created in the United States when the Arab oil exporting nations instituted their embargo against us. Because we had allowed ourselves to become dependent on foreign sources of oil, the cutoff of this oil resulted in the loss of thousands of jobs for Americans, in sharply escalating consumer prices, and in numerous other hardships for all Americans.

Contrary to what the experts had been saying for years, oil was used as a political weapon by the Arab world, and countries that were supposedly friendly to the United States acted against us. Saudi Arabia, for example, exerted such intense pressure on the four American oil companies operating in that country that they were forced to act in a manner inconsistent with the best interests of the United States by closing off to our military forces in Europe their usual supply of Saudi Arabian oil.

Unless we have the tanker capability under our own flag to carry our oil imports, those nations controlling the ships engaged in our trade could, by withdrawing those vessels, achieve the same results. Using U.S.-flag tankers would eliminate this threat to the military and economic security of the United States. By easing our dependency on foreign-flag shipping, we guarantee this Nation a tanker fleet capable of providing the United States with an uninterrupted flow of oil imports.

A U.S.-flag tanker fleet can give us the flexibility to transport oil from alternative sources if a military or political crisis forecloses our access to more traditional sources. Further, a U.S. flag tanker fleet will be manned by U.S. seamen with a long tradition of devotion to the United States and heroism in every hostile action since the Revolutionary War.

Furthermore, Mr. President, if we should be confronted with a cutoff of oil, as happened when the Arabs embargoed the United States and ordered companies not to deliver oil to the U.S. fleet in the Mediterranean, a ship under the American flag manned by American seamen can be ordered by this Government to go wherever we want it to go. In the case of American ships under the American flag there is no doubt about the right of this Congress or the U.S. Government when a boycott is imposed upon us to at least require that all that oil at sea, which would be pre-

sumed to be enough to keep us going several months while we make plans to adjust to a changed set of circumstances, that all of it, even that which might be destined somewhere else, be redirected to the United States.

So there are tremendous advantages to having U.S.-flag ships.

Contrary to what the opponents of this legislation would have us believe, only vessels flying the U.S. flag and manned by American seamen are under the control of the United States and can be relied upon to respond to our needs in any emergency.

The theory, advanced by these opponents that American-owned Liberian- and Panamanian-flag vessels are under the "effective control" of the United States is nothing more than a myth, totally unsupported by the facts.

This concept rests on the assumption that in time of war or national emergency, oil company owned Liberian- and Panamanian-flag vessels will be made available to the United States. The only assurance given is a contract the owners sign with the U.S. Government in return for war-risk insurance. This contract, however, is based solely on domestic law and has no standing in international maritime law.

The proponents of this theory overlook three crucial facts: First, the executive order issued last November by the President of Liberia—which prohibited all Liberian-flag vessels from participating in the carriage of arms to the Mideast—was a legal exercise of power under the principle of international law that provides that the nation of the vessel's flag, and not the vessel's owner, controls the vessel.

Second, the Department of Defense, in 1969 testimony before the House Appropriations Committee, admitted that—

> Based on experience during the Vietnam War, it may be concluded that in similar circumstances in the future, there will be some difficulty in finding foreign crews to sail ships under effective U.S. control into the war zone.

Finally, the Department of Commerce, in testimony last fall on this legislation before the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, pointed out that effective control vessels are committed to serving other nations and would therefore not be available to the United States in an emergency and that most effective control vessels are too large to enter U.S. ports.

In his testimony before the Commerce Committee, Under Secretary of Commerce John Tabor indicated that generally recognized principles of international law dictate that only the state of registry has the right to requisition and control vessels flying its own flag. He pointed out that there is an apparent conflict between U.S. domestic law and international practice concerning the "doctrine of effective control." He cited as an example of this the Liberian Government decree of November 3, 1973, forbidding vessels of its registry to carry military supplies to Israel.

The United States is running a real risk by depending on these foreign-flag vessels which are no more under the control of the United States than is foreign based oil. As long as the vessel does not fly the U.S. flag, the United States has no economic or legal control over it.

INTERNATIONAL TRADE

The committee also acted favorably upon this legislation in response to the growing international trend toward Government control, management, and participation in the field of international shipping.

At this time in world history, when nations on all corners of the globe are asserting their independence from others; when nations controlling all types of vitally needed raw materials are banding together to protect their economic interests, when the underdeveloped nations can succeed in imposing a code of conduct for liner trade that reserves a portion of the cargo for the trading nations' ships; one thing stands out: The United States, of all the major trading nations in the world, is reluctant to take the necessary steps to protect itself.

The United States, while becoming increasingly dependent on foreign sources of oil, has allowed itself to become almost totally dependent on others for the transport of our oil imports. Less than 5 percent of our oil imports are carried by U.S.-flag vessels, and no U.S.-flag vessels are regularly engaged in the carriage of oil to the United States.

While the tide of nationalism in ocean shipping is sweeping the world, the United States engages in outdated rhetoric. The same Arab nations that cut off our supply have formed the Arab Maritime Petroleum Transport Co. for the avowed purpose of carrying 40 percent of their oil exports on their ships. Our position in dealing with these nations will be strengthened if we have a national law reserving 30 percent for U.S.-flag ships, rather than the 5 percent which we now carry.

Despite this development; despite the fact that such countries as Japan, France, Spain, Venezuela, and Ecuador have either policies or laws reserving oil for their flag vessels, our Government clings to the argument that similar action by the United States would invite retaliation.

If the United States insists that some of the oil comes to the United States in American bottoms, because we are the buyer, that would give the foreigner the basis for arguing that some of that oil should also go into ships of the seller, the oil-producing countries.

Mr. President, that is one of the cleverest arguments that has ever been contrived during the period that this legislation has been under study. It was not prepared in time to tell it to the committee in the hearings, but in time to argue it in the cloakrooms or elsewhere, or with the White House liaison people buttonholing Senators.

Mr. President, anybody who is knowledgeable in this subject knows that any time those oil exporting countries want to do so, they can require that as much as 50 percent of all of that oil be shipped from their country in ships owned by them, for a very simple reason: It is their oil.

They can tell us just as they told us when they cut us off, that they would not sell us any, and then tell us what they told us when they quadrupled the price we had to pay: "You either buy it on our terms or you do not get any." And they are still doing it.

As a matter of fact, the oil companies will all tell you privately that they think their days are numbered over there; that it is just a matter of time before those nations nationalize the whole thing. The oil companies are hoping that when the Arab and other oil exporting countries do nationalize, that they will at least permit the American oil companies to provide some service, the transportation of the oil, or some refining of it, or to stay in the picture to some extent.

Everybody knows that a person is being completely deceitful to try to make someone think that those oil exporting countries do not have it completely within their power to require that a major percentage of that oil be carried in their bottoms any time they want to do so. They will do it whenever it suits their purposes.

One thing that is holding them back from doing that is the fact that if they proceed to buy the ships—and some of the ships cost $100 million apiece, the big supertankers—and they will not sell oil and they did when they boycotted the United States and would not sell us anything, then if the ships are not being used they are losing money.

So, to some extent, the fact that the oil exporting countries own a tanker fleet gives those of us who are purchasers of oil on the world market some leverage in making them come to terms with us. Short of that their tankers are useless and they are losing money on their investment of $100 million per ship.

That is one of the reasons that those countries will be somewhat slow about insisting that they transport the oil, especially when a nation like the United States indicates that it has some desire and some intention of becoming self-sufficient in oil one of these days.

That, Mr. President (Mr. HATHAWAY), like a lot of other arguments, that can be generated, in my judgment is completely specious. There is no doubt about it.

When they are ready to insist that some of that oil go in ships owned by those countries that have the power to insist upon it and make it stick, then it does not make any difference whether you like it or do not like it, or what the logic of your argument may be. You either do it or do without the oil, because nowadays we do not think in terms of gunboat diplomacy, where we hope to go in and capture some nation because they have something that they do not want to sell on our terms.

Mr. President, despite the fact that such countries as France, Japan, Spain, Venezuela, and Ecuador have other policies or laws reserving oil for their flag vessels, our Government clings to the argument that similar action might invite retaliation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table which has been prepared concerning this information be made a part of the RECORD at this point.

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

Carriage of foreign trade by tonnage (1970 figures):

	Percent
Soviet Union	56
Japan	47
Norway	43
France	38
Spain	37
United Kingdom	35
West Germany	29
Italy	23
United States	5

Mr. LONG. The United States only carried 5 percent of its oil. It is, however, a fact that no country, including the United States, and no American oil company retaliated against any other nation that has acted to assure a percentage of its oil trade for its flag vessels.

This committee and Congress must take the lead and act to put such groundless claims that have blocked the development of our merchant marine to permanent rest. It is time for Congress to place the United States on an equal footing with the rest of the world's maritime and trading nations.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION

H.R. 8193 as amended is also critical to our fight to preserve and protect our marine environment.

With the passage of the Ports and Waterways Safety Act of 1974, Congress regulated the U.S. merchant marine with the most advanced marine environmental protection law in the world. Besides imposing fines for all types of marine pollution, the law allows the Coast Guard to require new systems of shipboard pollution control, such as segregated ballast. None of the U.S. requirements are required by other maritime nations.

H.R. 8193 as amended goes ever further. It specifically requires that vessels built to carry oil under this legislation be constructed using the best available pollution control technology, including a segregated ballast-double bottom system. And, it sets a vessel age limitation of 20 years that will result in the utilization of new and efficient tonnage employing modern environmental safeguards.

As a result of these stringent environmental rules, the potential for catastrophic oil spills is significantly reduced for U.S.-flag tankers. Secretary of the Interior Rogers C. B. Morton commented on this point in a letter to Congress in April 1973. He said that if the United States does not receive its oil in U.S. tankers "that comply with U.S. requirements, oil will probably be imported on foreign-flag tankers that are built and operated to much lower standards."

COST BENEFITS

Every member of the committee, and I am sure every Senator, was keenly interested in the question of how this legislation would affect the consumers of oil and oil products. After careful deliberation, the committee concluded that there should not be any increase in the prices of oil attributed to the enactment of this bill.

Because of the lack of reliable information about the foreign subsidiaries of American corporations, the U.S. Government and the consumer do not know with any certainty how the transportation costs of our oil imports are arrived at, and whether they are justified. This legislation would correct this situation. The use of American-flag tankers affords protection to the consumer, because all information relevant to the cost of shipping on U.S. bottoms must be made available to the Secretary of Commerce. Unless the Secretary decides that the rate being charged by a U.S. tanker is fair and reasonable, the tanker would not be able to participate under this legislation.

Therefore, this legislation will provide the American people, for the first time, with the benefit of a cost monitoring system for tanker transportation which will insure that only justifiable and necessary costs are passed on to the consumer.

And, as I noted earlier, the amendment adopted by the committee allowing a waiver of part of the oil import license fee for crude imported on U.S.-flag vessels will guarantee a further cost benefit and savings to the American consumer.

I shall explain that briefly.

In our judgment, and certainly in the judgment of this Senator, the best estimate that was given to us on the cost of using American ships, American materials, and American seamen, as compared to the cost of building our ships abroad and manning them with labor out of Hong Kong or Singapore, would indicate that the Maritime Administration—after all, they deal in subsidies, in ship construction, in the cost of operating ships and they do not have an ax to grind so we would expect them to be unbiased—estimates that the cost of using American ships and American labor would be about $0.003 per gallon. If you multiply that by 40 gallons per barrel, that works out to be $0.12 per barrel for the oil entering in American ships. That is what we believe to be the highest estimate.

That is not the American Petroleum Institute's estimate, Mr. President. The API went before the House committee and came up with a figure which we believe was exaggerated, 15 to 1, a cost of $15 billion a year.

The American Petroleum Institute, generally dominated and controlled by the major oil companies of this Nation.

Having exaggerated 15 to 1, in my judgment, before the House committee, they concluded if you are going to exaggerate, you ought to do a big job, not a little job.

The API represents some of the largest companies in America and, therefore, can think big. So, having exaggerated to the tune of 15 to 1 on the House side, they came before the Senate committee and exaggerated 60 to 1 which, I must say, shows some forward movement of that organization.

They gave us a figure of $60 billion as the annual cost before the Senate committee.

Mr. President, I must congratulate the imagination of those people, that they would present that $60 billion figure. It shows that they are used to thinking in very, very big terms. If one should exaggerate, he should not be outdone. I do not know who they were trying to outdo, but the best proof that their estimate of $60 billion was wrong is presented to us and passed on in other figures which we will see.

The best proof that the API figure of $60 billion is wrong is the API's own witnesses before the House committee. They estimate only $15 billion there, which, of course, we think is 15 times too high as well.

Mr. President, if you look at the ingredients that go into arriving at the cost, in my judgment there is about a difference of $0.12 per barrel which would be about what I would think a fair and proper difference would be. That is about what the Maritime Administration estimated.

Presently, an import fee of 15½ cents a barrel is levied on foreign oil coming into this country. We propose in this bill, by a committee amendment, to say that we will waive the 15 cents of the import fee on oil coming into the United States in American bottoms. If anyone is concerned about the consumers using foreign oil, he ought to be very happy about that; because if it comes in American bottoms, it ought to be 3 cents a barrel cheaper rather than 12 cents a barrel more expensive to bring the oil in in American ships. It should result in a saving to the American consumer.

Insofar as these major oil companies are worried about the cost to the public—I do not think that so far they have convinced the public that they are worried about that—the major oil companies can have the assurance that they will have a reduction that will more than offset the increase in the cost—that is, a reduction in the import fee that would be charged.

That does not cause those who are opposing this bill to relent. When I say "those who are opposing the bill," I am not speaking of any Senator. I am speaking of the people who are really behind this, the people who are really determined, dug in, and dedicated to defeating this legislation. They all know who they are, and so do I. They are the multinational oil companies of the United States, the big 10.

I must say that I have many times supported these companies when I thought they were right about matters, and I have no apology for it. But I do find that when I support their position, I am usually given a shower bath of oil and go away with the feeling that there must be something wrong with the Senator from Louisiana, because he is supporting the oil companies even though he comes from an oil-producing State.

I note that the Washington Post does not take the same attitude when someone may happen to agree with their position in supporting the oil companies. For example, they say, speaking about the Senator from New Hampshire, that he has nothing on his side but the fact that he is right. In other words, there is nothing going for the opposition except righteousness. Well, among the angels, I suppose we will have to list the big 10 oil companies—Exxon, Texaco, Mobil, and the rest of them.

I suppose that on the side of the angels we will have to list the Chamber of Com-

merce of the United States. I understand how the position of the Chamber of Commerce is dictated. I can understand that, because I recall the days when Louisiana was suffering badly because of oil imports. We are a major oil producing State. I was fighting to try to save the domestic oil industry of this Nation, particularly that of Louisiana.

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

Mr. LONG. I shall yield in a moment.

The Chamber of Commerce would meet down in New Orleans and resolve that they were against any limitations on oil imports. From the Louisiana point of view, with the oil industry paying approximately 50 percent of the cost of supporting that State government, those oil imports were hurting the local economy greatly.

I understand how the Chamber of Commerce works. They appoint a committee on trade, and the people who indicate an interest in serving on the committee are those who work for multinational corporations. The oil companies have a great deal of influence among that group, as they are some of the most influential multinational corporations in the world. That group prepares a resolution, and the Chamber of Commerce proceeds to support the resolution supported by its trade committee.

So I can understand how the U.S. Chamber of Commerce can be persuaded to support the position of the major oil companies.

We ought to know who is who in this debate. It should be made clear that that does not express the position of 90 percent of the oil producers in the United States, if we are talking in terms of the number of producers. In other words, of the thousands of producers in this country, most of them could not care less whether or not this bill is passed. I think that most independents would state that since they have to deal with American labor in this country, they do not see any reason why Texaco, and Exxon should be spared having to do what we have to do in this country, and that is to learn to live with American labor.

ECONOMIC BENEFITS

As I mentioned earlier, recent international oil developments have played havoc with the American economy and dollar. I believe that the enactment of H.R. 8193 as amended and the resultant use of U.S.-flag tankers to carry a percentage of our oil imports would, on the other hand, be an energy-related economic plus for this country.

Using U.S.-flag instead of foreign-flag vessels would have a positive impact on our balance of payments. Depending on the distance the oil is carried, the dollar outflow for each barrel of imported oil could be reduced by as much as 20 percent. It has been estimated by various witnesses that at the 30 percent U.S.-flag penetration into the oil import shipping field, the contribution in terms of balance of payments over the life of the ships built to meet this goal would be approximately $11 billion.

Another significant economic benefit from H.R. 8193 as amended is its impact on domestic employment. This legislation would lead to the construction of a large number of new and efficient U.S.-flag tankers. These vessels, built in U.S. shipyards and manned by American crews, would produce thousands of additional job opportunities throughout the country on board ships, in shipyards and in service and supply industries. And, equally important, the construction and operation of U.S.-flag ships will mean that tax dollars will be generated for the U.S. Treasury.

Opponents of this legislation refer to 18th century literature in the minority report. I believe that we need to focus on 20th century, 1974 economic facts and national requirements. Others refer to this legislation and special interest groups. If strengthening our national security, improving our balance of payments, protecting our marine environment, providing employment opportunities to American men and women, and assuring our energy transportation capability are special interests, put me down for them.

I believe that enactment of H.R. 8193 and the resultant construction and use of a modern U.S. tanker capability are in the national interest and I urge my colleagues, as did the House of Representatives by a margin of 160 votes and the Senate Commerce Committee by an overwhelming vote of 14 to 2, to approve this measure. Its passage will strengthen our merchant marine and reduce our dangerous dependence on foreign-flag, foreign-manned tankers for the carriage of our oil imports.

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

Mr. LONG. I yield.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator referred to me personally. Otherwise, I would not interrupt him. I assume he does not want to yield

Mr. LONG. I do yield to the Senator.

Mr. COTTON. Then, let us go back four pages, where the Senator from Louisiana talked about the editorial in the Washington Post which speaks kindly of the Senator from New Hampshire. I can assure the Senator from Louisiana that he was no more shocked than I. I never expected to be referred to kindly in the Washington Post.

The Senator from Louisiana rather sarcastically indicated that we were not angels in opposing this bill, and that we were all tied up with the oil companies.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, if the Senator wants to arrive at that conclusion, he may draw any conclusion he wishes from what I say. I did not mean to suggest that. I have the highest admiration for the Senator.

All I said is that when we talk, as this editorial does, about the maritime lobby at work, we ought to keep in mind that the Seafarers' Union are not the only people in America who know what it is to hire a lobbyist.

In this case, I am aware that, from this Senator's point of view, the industrial power of this Nation that is opposing enactment of this law is headed by the major oil companies, and that accounts for 99 percent of it, in my opinion.

Mr. COTTON. I am not going to argue that point with the Senator. I do not give a hoot in hell what the oil companies want or do not want. And, I so stated at the very outset of my minority views in the committee report, accompanying H.R. 8193, at page 57.

So far as this Senator is concerned, he is interested in seeing that the people in the State of New Hampshire do not go cold this winter. He regards this bill as perhaps the worst blow to the consumer. We have all bowed down and worshipped the consumer. "Consumer" has become a magic word. If this bill is not an anticonsumer bill, there never has been such a bill introduced or considered.

No person representing any oil company has conferred with me, has talked with me, or has sought to influence my vote on this bill to the slightest degree. I am not interested in what the oil companies want. This Senator is not interested in either the unions or the oil companies. He is interested in defeating a bill that is going to make it more difficult and more costly for his own people in New England to keep warm this winter. I do not want any misunderstanding about that point.

I am not objecting to what the Senator has said. He is a great orator. He said he did not know that he was dealing with angels, and so forth. He may be dealing with angels or he may be dealing with devils. But, when he deals with me, he is dealing with somebody who is fighting for his own people, just as the Senator from Louisiana would fight to the death for Louisiana. Is that not right?

Mr. LONG. I did not challenge the motives of the Senator one iota. I would be happy to produce what I said for the record; because I have not—and if I have, I will apologize—suggested anything about what the Senator is doing in opposing this measure other than that he is a great Senator and is saying what the good Lord gives him the right to say.

Mr. COTTON. All the Senator did was call me an angel, and I cannot object to that. Nevertheless, the inference was there, not that I am representing the oil companies, but that the oil companies are the only people interested in opposing this bill.

Mr. LONG. Senator, there are some others, and I shall be glad to get around to some of those after a while, I suppose.

I think it is well to keep in mind that in my judgment—and I am not speaking about who took what position. Mr. President, I say to the Senator what I try to say about every Senator: we have an honest difference of opinion in these matters. I want to state my view, and I do not want to reflect on any Senator—because I think every Senator here is a fine man, worthy of representing his State, and I particularly include in that the Senator from New Hampshire.

But, Mr. President, when people start writing about these lobbies, I think it is well that we talk about them a little bit. The Seafarers' Union supports this bill. I am glad the Seafarers' Union supports this bill, because I think the bill is right, and I think they are a good union. If I could have only one union supporting me

in the State of Louisiana, I would pick the Seafarers' Union. Let me state that those people have some influence. I am happy to say so.

When the Washington Post writes that if one is supporting the side of the Seafarers' Union one must be a bad person, and then, if one is on the other side, there is nothing but right on that side, one is on the side of the angels, that necessarily includes the Nixon administration. The last time we had this battle, we had letters out here from every Cabinet officer that had any relevance whatsoever to this matter opposing this legislation, speaking for the Nixon administration.

I am happy to see that in this category, they would place the Nixon administration, every Cabinet member who had anything to do with it, John Mitchell, Maurice Stans, or anybody else who had something to do with the upholding of the position of the major oil companies are angels today. Maybe some other day they will be devils, but today they are angels. This includes the Nixon administration.

They might differ with the U.S. Chamber of Commerce from time to time, but not today. Today, they are angels. Nothing but right is on the side of those opposing this bill.

Mr. President, in my judgment, 99 percent of the business opposition to this, whether it is called the Chamber of Commerce or whether it is called by any other name, is from the large, multinational oil companies. I discussed this matter with those people. I have been accused, time and again, of being their spokesman out here. They know me; I know them. I do not blame them for wanting to keep what they have. But this is a last-ditch fight to keep something of capitalism that went out with Uncle Tom's cabin. That was the idea that a company could do business all over the world and if some poor soul so much as complained about the lousy food that was put before him, just dump him off at the first God-forsaken port that was passed and leave him there, and let him worry about how to get halfway around the world, back to where he came from.

They do not want to fool around with organized labor. They do not want to bother with organized labor, and they have made it clear to me, time and again, if not to other Senators, that the reason they are fighting this bill is that they do not want to be bothered with American labor, American labor unions in particular.

Mr. Paul Hall, testifying for the Seafarers Union, came before us, and he said he would offer those people a no-strike agreement—no strike, just negotiating; if we cannot come to terms, we will not go out on strike.

The oil companies said nothing doing. Nothing doing. They like it too well the way they have it. And why should they not? They can pick up these poor coolies out of Hong Kong, they can pick up South Americans out of Belem, Brazil, pick up some poor Pakistani or some poor Hindu out of India, and if those poor souls are dissatisfied for a moment, just dump them off at the first port they come to.

Mr. President, these companies are enjoying what Captain Bligh had before the mutiny on the Bounty. No wonder they want to hold onto this to the bitter end, if it can be done. But, Mr. President, some of them have seen the light a little bit. Gulf Oil which is supporting this bill indicated that they would like to talk to labor, consider labor's position, talk about it.

Here is Tenneco, one of the growing companies in the United States. They say they have thought about this matter.

Let me just read:

> As you know, Tenneco includes integrated oil operations and shipbuilding activities in its various businesses. We have studied this legislation carefully and after weighing all its aspects, we feel that a cargo preference approach to the revitalization of our maritime industry will substantially benefit the nation and the individual American consumer.

Let me say a little bit more about the oil companies while we are at it. I do not condemn them for this. I say they have a right to do it. But when we are talking about a lobby at work, we ought to recognize that the lobbying is on both sides.

We fought this battle some years ago, and lobbyists for the major oil companies thought that it was rather amusing that shipbuilding companies, like Avondale in Louisiana, could not express an interest and urge us to pass this bill, because it could do nothing but help bring more business to the shipbuilding industry. I found out subsequently why these people could not be found in support of the bill. They hoped that it would pass, but they could not be found supporting it or asking anybody to vote for it.

They had been informed in whatever way would be most appropriate by the major oil companies that if they hoped to fabricate those big rigs to drill off Louisiana and off Texas and in the Atlantic and in the North Sea and elsewhere, if they hoped to build those big rigs for use by the major oil companies, they had better not be found supporting this bill. So we heard nothing from them. One would have thought they would have been up here for this maritime lobby at work. But they were just as quiet as a tomb.

I am not aware that they are making any effort now, for the reason that they have to do business with these major oil companies. They hope to sell them rigs, they hope to sell them all sorts of equipment. So they would be very timid in the way they approach this matter for fear they might offend a very good customer, one whom they hope to trade with down through the years.

Mr. President, the cost of buying from foreigners all sorts of things that we ought to be producing for ourselves is absolutely destroying this Nation. The President of the United States talked about inflation, and I said something about it. It was just out of context, but I said that I was somewhat dismayed that he seemed to think in that speech that just by cutting Government spending, we could bring inflation under control. Just the other day I heard Mr. Leonard Woodcock say on one of the nationwide discussion programs on television something that I believe to be true, and I believe he stated that it can be documented. He said if we add the surplus that is being achieved today in State and local governments to the deficit that this Government is spending at the Federal level, it works out to an overall surplus for Government as a whole. Our deficit is sufficiently small, when all things are considered on a consolidated basis, that I think that would be correct. It is not Government spending that is the big culprit in this inflation that we are suffering. We can find some of the things that are some of the big culprits.

The situation that existed in oil when those oil-exporting countries banded together and made us pay four times the price for oil has a lot to do with it, because that had its effect all the way through the economy. The escalation clause in the labor contracts that say that when the cost of living goes up, the wage goes up with it—and some of the contracts say that the wage goes up more than the increase in the cost of living—those escalation clause contracts at least include the cost of the product, and that has something to do with it. It can help to make it worse once some of the other factors get out of line.

But, Mr. President, one of the biggest things that is adding to inflation today is the fact that we have abroad around 100 billion of U.S. dollars that we have no way of bringing home, that we have no way of redeeming; 100 billion surplus U.S. dollars that we cannot make good in gold or anything else.

Now, with all those U. S. dollars floating around the world that this country cannot make good, that just has to affect the commodity market. It has to affect the price of oil, the price of sugar, the price of copper, the price of manganese, the price of tin, the price of everything we are importing into this country, from electronics to automobiles. All of those things are affected by the fact that this Nation has been required to devalue its dollar again and again, and will be required to devalue again because we are failing to pay our own way, and we are buying so many goods and services from others that could just as well be produced here.

It is estimated that this bill, over the life of these ships that we would build, would improve our balance-of-payments situation by $11 billion, over the life of the ships. It would also provide a lot of good jobs for American seamen. And even more than that, a lot of good jobs for American workers in shipyards, steel mills, railroads, and elsewhere. For every seafaring job that we provide on one of these ships, there would be 10 jobs provided to men who would be working in the steel mills, men who would be manufacturing the equipment that goes aboard the ships, men who would be transporting the steel, the materials, and the machinery by rail, mostly, from the point of production to the point where the shipyard is. All of those jobs would be almost 10 times as many as the jobs of actually manning the ships themselves.

So there is tremendous economic benefit to this measure, that would help us to

make good and redeem some of these hundreds of billions of dollars that have gone abroad through buying all sorts of goods and services that we do not need here.

Mr. President, I shall wait with some interest to see how anyone is going to contend that we are increasing the cost to the consumer when, with an estimated cost increase of 12 cents per barrel, he is given a rebate of 15 cents on that same barrel of oil. It seems to me that the consumer gets a lot better price than he would otherwise, but there is this big issue of whether or not the big international oil companies—I suppose they were probably our first multinational companies to go abroad, thinking back, in the old days of Standard Oil of New Jersey, when it started out with oil for the lamps of China—can realize their cherished dream of hoping to retain at least this portion of the industry beyond the reach of American labor.

It just seems to some of us here that they ought to become acquainted with American labor. I have. Everyone in this body has. Any businessman inside the United States has. Any independent producer of oil has become acquainted with American labor. It seems to me it would do these people no harm to do so.

I am not impressed with the argument that $13,000 is too much to pay an American seaman. Those men work hard. They have to be on those ships 24 hours a day. They have to be on duty 7 days a week. They are gone for months at a time from their loved ones. You have an average crew of about 25 men manning a ship that would cost about $100 million. A quick calculation would indicate to me that that involves an investment of $4 million per worker on that ship, and with that kind of investment per worker, it seems to me that $13,000 is not out of line with what the oil companies would pay for the kind of technicians with the kind of skill that would be involved with a $4 million investment in machinery per worker. In addition $13,000 includes all the fringe benefit costs—health insurance, vacation time, and pension benefits. These men do not take home anywhere near $13,000.

It seems to me we want to continue the myth that we can keep right on buying goods and services from all over the world without ever making plans to pay for some of it.

Mr. President, we are looking at a trade bill which will be reported out of the Committee on Finance sometime within a month, I suppose, or maybe less. There is one thing about that trade bill that has upset me, just as every other trade measure has concerned me. That is that the Commerce Department and the State Department have tried to hang on to this fiction that we have a favorable balance of trade, when in fact we do not.

For example, they leave the freight off of the imports, even though almost every other modern nation on earth, and the International Monetary Fund, insist that you include the freight with the imports, because what you are paying for something obviously includes the cost of hauling it to you. But having left the freight off on the import side, they then proceed to pad the export side by adding to the export side all the giveaways like Public Law 480 and everything of that sort—it averages out to be about a $5 billion padding on the figures each year.

So, if you pick up the good news anouncements they put out every 3 months, their quarterly good news announcement, if it says we are running about a $1.5 billion unfavorable balance, I would add $5.5 billion to that, so that if they say a billion and a half, that means we are losing $7 billion. If they say we are breaking even, we are losing $5.5 billion.

I have finally succeeded in passing legislation to require that at least they give us this information in both fashions, so that we can judge for ourselves whether we want to keep our figures the way other nations keep theirs, or go along with this fraudulent myth that we are being paid for all the things we are giving away, and that it is not costing us anything to haul products into the United States, even though the purchase price includes the freight.

Make those two simple calculations, and here is what it shows: From 1966 to 1974, according to these good news announcements, during that 8-year period, they would have you believe we made a profit of $2.5 billion. Take out the giveaways, take out all the grain we gave to India and all these various other gifts we made to other countries, and put the freight we paid for with dollars on the bill for imports, as other countries do, and what do we find? We did not make $2.5 billion, we lost $38.9 billion during that 8-year period.

During that period, we went in the red by $78.8 billion. Half of it was in these trade accounts. It is matters like this that other nations do to keep from losing all that money. Here is our No. 1 culprit. It is not Government spending that is the No. 1 culprit in inflation. The No. 1 culprit is that our dollars abroad are not worth a tinker's dam.

If one has any doubt about it, go over there and start to buy merchandise. It does not begin to buy what it once did. The reason is we have been running a great big deficit. Part of it is our balance of trade and part of it is in our giveaway program.

Of course, we know when we put a plus on a lot of books, particularly in dual-entry systems, we have to put a minus somewhere else so that it works out to that extent somewhat as it does in the Public Law 480 program.

They put that down, on our trade figures, if we gave away $1 billion worth of grain to India this year, as a plus, as though we made $1 billion, when we gave $1 billion away without any hope of ever seeing any part of that come back. That goes down as a plus as though we made $1 billion profit, an occasion for celebration, one might say.

Now, they have got to charge it off against somebody, and who do they charge the $1 billion off to? They charge that to the poor old farmer on the theory that his product could not be sold. He had to call on the Government for help. The Government took it off his hands and gave it away—took it from him and gave it away—and that, therefore, we ought to charge this off against the farmer and make him agree to accept less in the future in what he could expect for his product because he is the man who lost the $1 billion.

So they charge it against the farmer, and then they charge it as a profit as though he made $1 billion profit in our trading figures when we gave away $1 billion in commodities.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a table showing our balance-of-trade figures for the years 1966 through 1974, with a summary that I have prepared for the years 1966 through 1974 appear in the RECORD at this point.

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

[In billions of dollars]

Year	Balance of trade: F.o.b. (plus foreign aid shipments)	Balance of trade: C.i.f. (minus foreign aid)	Balance of payments (liquidity)
1966	3.9	−.7	−2.2
1967	4.1	−.3	−4.7
1968	.9	−3.5	−1.6
1969	1.3	−2.9	−6.1
1970	2.7	−1.7	−4.7
1971	−2.1	−6.6	−22.7
1972	−6.4	−11.4	−14.7
1973	+1.7	−3.8	−7.9
1974 (1st half annual rate)	−3.6	[1] −8.0	−14.2
1966–74	+2.5	−38.9	−78.8

[1] Estimated.

Mr. LONG. So, Mr. President, it seems to me that we have here a measure that can strengthen the Nation, add to its security, and provide jobs and opportunity for the benefit of this economy and for the benefit of a great number of workers who are without those jobs today.

I do hope very much that the Senate will pass this bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to amendment No. 1837 of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE) as modified.

The Senator from Maryland.

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, I rise in support of H.R. 8193, the Energy Transportation Security Act of 1974 which, as the chairman of the committee has ably explained, would require that 20 percent of America's oil imports be immediately transported on privately owned U.S.-flag vessels to the extent they are available at fair and reasonable rates. This reserved share would increase to 25 percent after June 30, 1975, and to at least 30 percent after June 30, 1977—providing the Secretary of Commerce makes a determination that sufficient U.S. tonnage exists to carry these increased amounts.

I would like to begin my remarks by reviewing some recent events which, I think, make America's need for this legislation greater now than ever before.

During the past few years there has been an alarming and rapid change in the status of this Nation's energy supply and energy transportation capability. The petroleum supply for the people of the United States has been manipulated by Arab oil exporting countries as well as by some of our own oil companies. Prices of foreign oil have quadrupled

while supplies have been cut back. Motorists have been told when they may and may not buy gasoline and how much they can buy.

The oil shortage has had a very serious impact on our economy and some of our present inflation problems are attributed to the short supply of oil which has affected our productive capacity. We know from bitter experience the consequence of the energy shortage and we have now embarked on Project Independence to develop sufficient domestic supply. The fulfillment of the Project Independence goal, however, is a long way off. In the meantime, in addition to being dependent on others for the basic supply, we are also dependent on others for the means of transportation of that supply. It is very much in the national interest to develop an independence in transportation capability. There is no question that we are dangerously dependent on foreign flag, foreign crewed ships for almost exclusive carriage of our oil imports.

Enactment of this legislation would provide a significant and desirable step in reversing this potentially disastrous position in which we now find ourselves. It is legislation essential to the security of the United States. It is legislation which will provide thousands of jobs for American workers onboard ships, in shipyards, and in service industries. In addition, it will afford increased protection to our marine environment.

Mr. President, let me now elaborate on some of these key issues.

First, the matter of national security of the United States. It is a recognized fact that a strong, active civilian merchant marine is an essential element of our national defense picture. It is, therefore, the undeniable responsibility of Congress to assure the maintenance of a strong peacetime merchant marine which will be ready to serve in the event of a sudden outbreak of hostilities.

Currently, as the chairman has pointed out and, as has been pointed out in the committee report the number of U.S.-flag tankers is totally insufficient to supply our Armed Forces and meet the needs of our basic domestic industries in a period of international crisis. As of December 31, 1973, our U.S.-flag tanker fleet consisted of 320 vessels, totaling only 7.8 million deadweight tons—less than 4 percent of the world's total tonnage. Most of these ships are small, averaging only 32,600 deadweight tons. At present, the United States imports approximately 30 percent of its petroleum needs. Of these imports, only about 5 percent are carried on U.S.-flag vessels. In other words, we are dependent on foreign flag tankers for 95 percent of our oil imports.

We can no longer afford to place this Nation's security in the hands of our mythical "effective control fleet". This concept proposes that in times of crisis, the U.S.-owned fleet of tankers registered under the flags of Liberia and Panama will revert to U.S. control. The fallacy of this expectation is that it rests on the premise that the owner of the vessel is the one who controls the vessel. However, there is no factual basis for believing that these foreign flag, foreign manned tankers are any more under the control of the United States than is the foreign-based oil on which we are also dependent.

Mr. President, I have serious doubts as to whether our allies can be counted on to respond to our needs in times of national emergency. Recent events have indicated that countries controlling our oil supply may be willing to use their strategic advantage to make our effective control fleet worthless. Indeed, countries that offer "flags of convenience" need oil, too. It is certainly reasonable to assume, therefore, that in a period of tension, these nations may be forced to restrict the operations of vessels under their registry, subject to approval of the oil-producing nations.

Even more threatening, however, is the vulnerable position of the oil companies themselves. Without questioning the patriotism of the U.S. citizens who operate these companies from home offices in this country, it is to be expected that their corporate interests may not always coincide with the interest of our national security. Most recently, oil companies importing oil from Arab nations were ordered to embargo shipments to the United States, and to stop supplying our military forces in Europe. The Arabs caveated this order with a threat to cut off any oil major in violation of this embargo. Indeed, last fall some American multinational oil companies did, in fact, yield to this order of Saudi Arabia and withheld oil from America's military forces in Europe. However, supplies of oil destined for the American consumer were diverted to our Armed Forces, and immobilization of our servicemen was averted. However, that does not detract from the significance of this incident, for it was the U.S. consumer who bore the brunt of this unfortunate situation.

In a future crisis, these nations may demand not only a cutoff of oil to the United States, but also a denial of our effective control fleet. Given our present dependence on these vessels, the results could be disastrous. On the other hand, a healthy U.S.-flag tanker fleet could give us flexibility to transport oil from alternative sources if a military or political crisis forecloses our access to more traditional sources.

The passage of H.R. 8193 would guarantee growth of the American-flag tanker fleet. Under the Merchant Marine Act of 1970, the U.S. fleet has been able to make significant strides through ship construction and operating subsidy provisions of that act. However, the Merchant Marine Act of 1970 was not intended to be, and must not be considered as, the only solution to rebuilding our merchant marine. It has become all too apparent that the availability of cargo is essential to the survival and growth of the U.S. merchant marine fleet.

Mr. President, the chairman of the committee, I think, very adequately discussed the lack of inflationary impact of this legislation. I think there was testimony which showed quite conclusively that this legislation will not cause the price to American consumers to go up. As a matter of fact, he pointed out that under the legislation we are waiving 15 cents per barrel import fee that is charged when crude oil is brought into this country, and that fee is being waived if it is brought in in American bottoms, so that this has the effect of negating any inflationary impact or any impact that would be on the cost to the domestic consumers of the oil.

Mr. President, during recent weeks there have been many false rumors circulated about the inflationary impact of this legislation. It is my opinion, as well as the opinion of a majority of the Commerce Committee, that enactment of the Energy Transportation Security Act will bring about no increase in the prices of oil.

During the merchant marine hearings, the committee received a wide variety of estimates on the cost of this legislation to the consumer. Testimony ranged from an increase of 79 cents per barrel by oil companies opposing the bill to an economist's testimony estimating a cost savings of 68 cents per barrel. However, the Maritime Administration estimated the cost increase to be one-third of a cent per gallon for 1974. This figure is truly insignificant when compared to the high prices Americans are now paying at the gasoline pump. A major argument of those advocating inflationary impact is the high cost of building and operating U.S. ships. It is undeniable that it presently costs more to build and operate an American-flag ship than those under foreign registry. However, the U.S. inflation rate that will affect the construction and operation of U.S.-flag tankers is not nearly as high as that in other countries of the world. Consequently, the gap between costs of foreign-flag and U.S.-flag vessels will decrease over the years.

In addition, the oil companies based their cost estimate on the assumption that a captive noncompetitive market would be created for U.S.-flag vessels which could charge a captive market premium. I wish to stress on this point that there will be free entry and free competition among all U.S.-flag carriers, subject to reasonable rate limitations by the Secretary of Commerce. Moreover, H.R. 8193 would reserve only a maximum of 38 percent after 1977 of our oil imports for vessels of U.S. registry. Foreign-flag vessels would be available to carry the remainder.

Furthermore, a serious question exists as to the relationship of prices American consumers now pay for oil transportation and the cost of that transportation service. More specifically, we know that major oil companies have wholly owned foreign subsidiaries which in turn own the foreign-flag ships used to import the parent company's oil into the United States. We also know that presently the cost of shipping oil on U.S.-flag vessels may be slightly higher than on foreign-flag ships. However, there is a lack of evidence on whether the price American consumers pay for oil transportation on vessels owned by the oil companies actually reflects the lesser cost of constructing and operating tankers of foreign registry. No such evidence was offered at the merchant marine hearings on this bill. Consequently, cost figures are totally irrelevant to the consumer price impact of this bill in the absence of proof that cost savings will mean lower prices at fuel pumps in the United States.

This legislation will establish a cost monitoring system for transoceanic

freight rates. U.S.-flagships need only be used if their rates are fair and reasonable. To determine the fairness of transoceanic rates, the Secretary of Commerce must make periodic investigations of the actual cost of such shipping. For the first time, the American people will have the benefit of a cost monitoring system in tanker transportation which will insure that only justifiable and necessary costs of transportation are passed on to the consumer.

Finally, the Senate Commerce Committee has adopted an amendment which will allow a waiver of 15 cents per barrel of the oil import fee when crude oil is carried on U.S.-flag vessels—providing the cost savings are passed on to the ultimate consumer. This amendment will eliminate much of the cost advantage of importing oil on tankers of foreign registry by providing a cost cushion for U.S.-flag tankers.

In view of the above considerations, Mr. President, I firmly believe that the Energy Transportation Act of 1974 will not cause any significant increase in the price of petroleum products to American consumers.

Furthermore, let me make clear that I believe the Senate has a unique opportunity in H.R. 8193, to have our Nation's recent energy crisis result in more, rather than fewer jobs for America's workers. In recent months, we have all seen the economic and employment effects of the energy crisis as industries have retrenched and energy worries have deepened, leading to reduced employment throughout the Nation.

H.R. 8193, the Energy Transportation Security Act, gives us an initiative to begin to build up our employment, as a direct result of the lessons learned during the energy crisis. In effect, we will be profiting from that crisis. In the process, we will create a huge new source of employment in America's shipyards, and will provide employment for thousands of U.S. seamen who are now idle because of the lack of shipping opportunities aboard U.S.-flag vessels.

Now, to be perfectly candid, Mr. President, representing a state with one of the Nation's largest shipbuilding yards, I know full well the strong economic stimulus that a thriving, healthy shipyard can provide a whole region. The most recent example of this is the revival of Brooklyn Naval Yard as a civilian shipyard and the way it aided the Bedford-Stuyvesant section of Brooklyn.

Shipyards, which are basic industries to this Nation, have an employment multiplier effect on auxiliary and related industries because they employ a whole range of subcontractors, including electronics, steel, ship fittings, and related goods.

Thus, employment in U.S. shipyards benefits many industries. Commerce Department spokesmen have indicated that the program envisioned under H.R. 8193 will produce an additional 225,000 man-years of work in U.S. shipyards alone and almost three times this amount in allied industries. This means at least $4 billion in shipbuilding wages and more than $10 billion in related industries. This truly massive benefit from H.R. 8193 will help to overcome many of the negative effects which the energy crisis has had on U.S. employment.

The situation aboard ship will be equally beneficial to U.S. workers. Presently, thousands of shipyard workers are without work, due to the steady decline in the U.S. fleet and the continued foreign building of U.S. companies. Seagoing jobs are currently at their lowest point in modern history. The future remains bleak unless an assured source of cargo, such as H.R. 8193 would provide, can be obtained.

Passage of H.R. 8193 would produce over 5,000 new jobs aboard ship in the next decade. This would assure that valuable and trained American seamen, many of whom would have been lost to the industry, remain at sea and are available to aid the Nation in the event of national crises.

I would note that one reason the number of seamen's jobs continues to decline despite the impact of the 1970 act on shipbuilding, is that new U.S. vessels are much more productive than older vessels. For instance, the T.T. *Brooklyn*, America's first supertanker of 225,000 tons, has a crew of 27. On the other hand, a World War II T-2 tanker had a crew of from 37 to 45 and was much slower than the *Brooklyn*. Accordingly, we must build up the size of our U.S. fleet, for merely keeping it at its present level means diminishing employment as older vessels are phased out and more productive ones, with lower crew sizes, are phased in.

Mr. President, passage of H.R. 8193 would be an economic boost to the entire Nation, but to its workers in particular. The new shipbuilding, shipboard and allied industry jobs produced by H.R. 8193 will mean employment for literally thousands of Americans.

Moreover, there is growing concern in the United States to protect our waters, coastlines, and the sea life from the destruction of oil pollution. An additional, immeasurable benefit resulting from the enactment of the Energy Transportation Securities Act will be the increased protection afforded our marine environment.

For example, part of the normal ship tank cleaning operations already accounts for more than one-half of marine oil pollution problems. More specifically, after discharging its cargo at a refinery, a tanker must take sufficient sea water into her cargo tanks to insure proper propeller emersion and to provide suitable sea-keeping characteristics. This ballast water, as it is called, is put directly into the cargo tanks and mixes with oil that has remained in shallow puddles at the bottom of the tanks. This oily ballast is then pumped overboard before the tanker reloads with a fresh supply of oil. The resulting intentional oil pollution from this process is responsible for nearly 70 percent of marine oil pollution.

This legislation requires that U.S.-flag tankers be constructed and operated using the best available pollution prevention technology, including a segregated ballast system, which will significantly diminish this needless destruction of our marine environment. The United States now receives approximately 95 percent of its oil imports in foreign-flag ships which have not such strict environmental standards.

We not only risk our Nation's security by depending on those foreign-flag vessels, but at the same time are placing our Nation's shore and ocean environment in grave peril from low operating standards that are notorious aboard flag of convenience vessels. Studies by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, by the U.S. Department of Commerce, and by international shipping scholars have unanimously concluded that flag of convenience vessels are less safe than vessels of U.S. registry. Factors contributing to these undesirable safety standards are lax inspection regulations, the absence of any policing force, low-crew standards, and the fact that few, if any, of these vessels ever return to their country of registry, and thus avoid discipline for infractions of international safety conventions committed on the high seas. As a result, flag of convenience vessels—which today carry almost half of U.S. oil imports—have developed an appalling accident record that has included almost every large or costly petroleum shipping accident in recent years.

In contrast, the U.S. fleet is strictly controlled and maintained under Coast Guard supervision. If a U.S. crewman or officer is negligent or breaks the law, the U.S. Coast Guard steps in quickly to suspend or revoke his papers. If a U.S.-vessel pollutes, the Coast Guard can quickly levy fines against the U.S. operator. U.S.-flag vessels are manned by crews that are highly trained and stringently tested by the U.S. Coast Guard. Taken together, these factors make U.S.-flag tankers unquestionably among the most environmentally safe vessels in the world and we do not have the same protection when we are using so-called flag-of-convenience vessels.

In addition, this legislation excludes from its provisions U.S.-flag vessels older than 20 years or reconstructed vessels beyond their economic lives. Accordingly, tankers with deteriorating equipment and poor safeguards will be systematically replaced by U.S.-flag tankers containing the most modern and environmentally sound equipment available.

As a result, Mr. President, the enactment of H.R. 8193 would assure the citizens of our country that at least a percentage of our oil imports are being carried on tankers employing the strictest and safest manning and construction standards of any vessels in the world, and in a manner consistent with the overwhelming national desire to protect and preserve our Nation's marine environment.

Mr. President, this measure was overwhelmingly adopted by the House of Representatives. I now urge my colleagues to also give their overwhelming support to this legislation in order that our Nation may have: First, increased national security; second, more complete disclosure of oil transportation costs and how these costs are reflected in the price Americans pay for petroleum products; third, increased employment opportunities for U.S. shipbuilders and seamen, and fourth, an efficient, minimal pollution merchant marine fleet that will help

our Nation's shipping industry become one of the most modern and technologically advanced in the world.

Mr. COTTON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BEALL. Yes, I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. COTTON. First, I congratulate the Senator on a very able presentation, but I would wish to take exception to one statement the Senator just made which I may be subject to misinterpretation.

The Senator said that this measure was overwhelmingly approved in the House of Representatives. It was not, this measure that is before us. It was a bill of similar nature, but which did not go nearly as far as the measure we are now considering in the Senate.

Mr. BEALL. I agree with the Senator. I think better protection of national interests than does the bill passed by the House of Representatives.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Would the Senator yield?

Mr. BEALL. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. The pending question, as I understand it, is the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE) and there has been some discussion about when the vote may come on that. The yeas and nays, I understand, will be requested.

There is an order for a vote on a treaty at 3:30, and after consulting with the various interested parties I would ask unanimous consent that the vote on the Mondale amendment immediately follow the vote on the treaty coming at 3:30—that is in the form of a unanimous consent agreement.

Mr. COTTON. Reserving the right to object, is the Senator from Minnesota here?

Mr. GRIFFIN. He does not seem to be on the floor, but it has been discussed with him.

Mr. LONG. It was agreeable to him.

Mr. GRIFFIN. That we would make that unanimous consent.

Mr. COTTON. I do not like to set a precedent for any time limit whatsoever. But, it would seem to me that if we go ahead and vote on the treaty and then vote on his amendment, nobody will know what they are voting on.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, may I ask unanimous consent that after the vote on the treaty there be a limitation of 10 minutes, to be equally divided between the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE) and the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON) so that both sides can briefly explain the amendment?

Mr. COTTON. I think that perhaps 5 minutes is enough. But, I do not want this taken as a precedent.

Mr. LONG. I think if the Senators believe they will vote in 10 minutes that they will stay here, because they know by the time they get somewhere they will turn around and return.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I would agree with the Senator from Louisiana, that the purpose of this is to accommodate some of our colleagues who would like to know when these votes are coming, if at all possible.

Mr. COTTON. The Senator from Minnesota has important business which will take him out of town. I want to make it clear that I do not intend to agree for some time yet to a time limitation, but I will agree to one in this instance because the Senator from Minnesota does happen to be required to leave for an out-of-town appointment. I think we should have 5 minutes apiece so that the Senators would know roughly what it is all about.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I will modify my request accordingly.

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

The Senator from Hawaii is recognized.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I am pleased to rise in support of the legislation now before the Senate, the Energy Transportation Security Act, H.R. 8193, as amended by the Senate Commerce Committee.

Because of unalterable geographical circumstances, the people of Hawaii are uniquely dependent upon water carriers for moving the bulk of goods between our State and other land masses.

Hawaii, as an island State, noncontiguous to mainland United States, obviously does not enjoy a rail or highway system connecting it to the mainland. As a result, Mr. President, my State and the well-being of its people are almost entirely dependent on a lifeline of ships which travel along the 2,500 miles between Hawaii and west coast ports.

To add to our woes, Hawaii's total lack of mineral resources creates a particular reliance on a quality ocean transportation system, especially our oil tanker fleets.

It is for these reasons that I am especially interested in the legislation we are considering today. This legislation by requiring the use of U.S.-flag tankers for the carriage of a percentage of our Nation's oil imports, would further stimulate the construction of U.S. ships capable of serving our Nation's needs in any emergency.

This legislation will also guarantee to the people of Hawaii as well as to the citizens of the continental United States a secure and reliable oil import transportation system. If any nation or group of nations were to withdraw its tonnage from our trade, those areas of the country that depend heavily on oil imports—Hawaii and the east coast, especially—will suffer the most. Only the use of U.S.-flag tonnage will insure that ships will always be available to carry in vitally needed oil.

Equally important, Mr. President, this legislation will afford to the consumers dependent on oil imports the benefit of a cost monitoring system for tanker transportation. By requiring the Secretary of Commerce to determine fair and reasonable rates, the American people have some assurance that the U.S.-flag tankers participating under this legislation will be charging only necessary and justifiable costs.

As a representative of the State of Hawaii and as an American, I believe this legislation deserves the full attention of all those concerned with the security and economic well-being of our country.

I am convinced that if we attempt to accomplish the intent of this legislation entirely through subsidy as suggested by some opponents of H.R. 8193, the cost would be staggering and we could not be assured of achieving the success that H.R. 8193 would produce.

In addition, we have seen that subsidy alone would not provide the U.S. fleet with the steady supplies of cargo it needs to be assured of continuous employment for the future. Without these cargoes, the U.S. fleet will continue to experience periods of "boom and bust" in which U.S. shipping operators will never be certain whether they will be able to survive economically or not.

In the past, it has been evident that the giant multinational oil companies and others who control the cargo have been reluctant to charter U.S. flag vessels. Additionally, U.S. ships have been the last hired-first fired of the world shipping industry. And even when newer and more competitive vessels have come off the construction ways, the multinational oil companies have been reluctant to hire these vessels even at rates which are highly competitive with the existing world rate.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I feel it is essential that the Nation enact legislation which would allot to the U.S. fleet a significant share of the Nation's vital oil imports. In this way, my State and others which are also dependent on oil imports for a major portion of our energy supplies can be assured that not only will we obtain the benefits of a more dependable tanker fleet but also that we will be afforded the economic benefits of U.S. ships and crews which pay U.S. taxes and wages and which contribute to the Nation's balance of payments.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation in order that the entire Nation may enjoy the economic and security benefits of H.R. 8193, the Energy Transportation Security Act.

Mr. President, for the purpose of developing the legislative record on the measure before us, H.R. 8193, I wish to enter into a colloquy with the manager of the bill, the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

As I view the proposed bill and accompanying report, I judge that it is intended that the Secretary of Commerce have the broadest authority under the act. This I believe is necessary and good. I assume that in the exercise of his authority, he will seek advice from industry and labor in reaching his conclusions. There has been a suggestion that an advisory committee be established to give such aid to the Secretary. Rather than impose this on the Secretary by legislation, I believe he should recognize that Congress would expect him to seek such advice. I am sure he will agree with this.

I would also hope that in establishing the rules and regulations in each case, and most particularly for possible rate guidelines, that they would be published first for public comment before becoming final.

I would hope that the manager of the bill agrees with my remarks on the matter of the advisory committee.

Mr. LONG. Yes, I believe that the Senator's views are well taken, and I believe they are correct.

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, on my second matter, I wish to receive a re-

affirmation that it is the importer that has the obligation of complying with the quota requirements. I do recognize in some cases the importer and the carrier may well be the same. But more often than not, there will be different interests and I believe he will agree that it is virtually impossible for an independent carrier to know the quota obligations concerning the cargo he is carrying for a nonrelated importer. I am sure the Senator will concur.

Mr. LONG. Yes, I do, and I believe the committee report helps to make that clear.

Mr. INOUYE. Finally, I would like the RECORD to clearly indicate that there is nothing in this bill at this moment that would amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1970.

Mr. LONG. The Senator is correct.

Mr. INOUYE. I thank the Senator very much.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I wish to express my vigorous opposition to the passage of the pending bill, H.R. 8193. This proposed legislation is ill conceived, would be costly to the American consumer and taxpayer, and cannot accomplish its stated purpose.

In the 92d Congress the Senate considered a similar proposal in the form of an amendment to H.R. 13324, the maritime appropriation authorization bill. At that time, Mr. President, the Senate displayed its wisdom by rejecting that earlier proposal. However, there are even more compelling reasons for the Senate to reject the current proposal, H.R. 8193, and I would like to summarize briefly those which I believe are the most significant.

In my opinion, Mr. President, the most important policy issue to which the Senate should be alerted at the very outset is that if the pending bill is passed, we will embark upon a new and probably endless course by virtue of the precedent it would set in establishing statutory quotas on the carriage of privately owned commercial oil cargoes. Heretofore, such Federal cargo preference statutes have been limited to the carriage of Government-owned and Government-financed cargoes. Thus, with enactment of H.R. 8193 we would establish a strong precedent for extension of cargo preference to other commercial cargoes, such as exports of agricultural products, which are perhaps the most important exports we have and which are our greatest help in trying to maintain our balance-of-payments. It also could be used to set a precedent for the application of cargo preference to other raw materials for which the United States is dependent upon foreign sources.

Mr. President, I believe the following observation made in an editorial which appeared in the Journal of Commerce on January 29, 1973, is worth quoting in order to bring this issue squarely before the Members of the Senate:

> What we do fear is the probability that if this type of government incursion into the sphere of seaborne commerce got embedded in the law, it would not be the last of its kind. On the contrary, like the camel's head, it would be followed by more and wider interventions, some of which could be supported by arguments more plausible than any advanced in support of cargo preference laws for oil.
>
> We can visualize this crusade being pressed from one stage to another by the AFL–CIO Maritime Committee and its friends in Congress, each stage in turn being proclaimed as a small but necessary readjustment in past thinking, but one that will produce more work for shipyards and more jobs for American maritime labor.
>
> We find it hard to believe that the United States could venture very far in this direction before discovering that a very important sector of its free economy had disappeared altogether.

Mr. President, I would like to emphasize that the testimony in support of the proposed legislation serves to confirm the fear expressed in this editorial. For example, both the American Maritime Association and the National Maritime Union of America, AFL–CIO, during the hearings on the bill before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries clearly indicated that whatever justification exists for the extension of cargo preference to commercial cargoes of oil also exists for extending cargo preference to numerous other imports and exports.

Throughout the debate on H.R. 8193, Mr. President, there will be representations by both the proponents and the opponents with regard to the potential cost impact of this legislation on the American consumer and taxpayer. The Commerce Committee has received widely varying cost estimates. For example, the American Petroleum Institute has estimated that there would be an immediate cost increase of 79 cents per barrel rising to $1.44 per barrel by 1985, or a cumulative cost to the consumer of $60 billion during the next decade. The Federal Energy Administration has estimated that the cost to the consumer from this cargo preference legislation could approach $3 billion per year by 1980. The Maritime Administration of the Department of Commerce estimates that this legislation would result in an annual cost of $123 million by 1980 rising to $183 million by 1985. The Committee also received an estimate which projected a net benefit to the consumer ranging from 36 cents to 59 cents per barrel.

Perhaps the one statement that can be made with any certainty with regard to the issue of cost is that no one really knows the potential cost impact of H.R. 8193. Clearly, I doubt that the proponents of this legislation can give us any assurance whatsoever that there will be no cost impact if H.R. 8193 is enacted. As a matter of fact, in the report of the Committee on Commerce accompanying H.R. 13324 of the 92d Congress, which contained a similar cargo preference provision, the proponents noted the following:

> * * * Obviously, if that program [i.e., the mandatory oil import program] is eliminated at some future date, none of the foregoing analysis with respect to the lack of impact on American-flag carriage on consumer costs would remain true. *At that point, these additional costs would have an impact on consumer prices.* (Emphasis supplied.)

Mr. President, the mandatory oil import program is no longer in effect. Therefore, taking the proponents' earlier position at face value, there will, in fact, be a cost impact on consumer prices.

Further, Mr. President, the experience under the existing cargo preference statute applicable to the shipment of Government-owned and Government-financed agricultural commodities demonstrates the potential cost impact of H.R. 8193. In this connection, I invite the attention of my colleagues to the committee's printed hearings at page 582 and the response which I received from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture enclosing a computer printout, which is reproduced in the hearing record, showing the rates charged on such shipments during calendar years 1969 through 1973. Quoting from the Acting Secretary's letter:

> For fiscal year 1973, the average of all differentials paid under the Title I, Public Law 480 program was about $25 per ton and you will note in many cases that the differential amounted to *more than half the entire rate.* (Emphasis supplied.)

In short, Mr. President, there are potentially extremely serious cost consequences presented by H.R. 8193. The proponents may characterize such consequences in terms of only pennies per gallon. But, when those pennies are multiplied by the millions of barrels we will be importing, the cost to the consumer becomes apparent. In this connection, Virginia H. Knauer, Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs, in a letter to me dated June 7, noted in part the following:

> Some proponents of the legislation say that these increases are minimal and therefore bearable by consumers. I say that such a position is hostile to the interests of consumers. The increases—even by conservative estimates—will amount to literally millions of unnecessary dollars out of the pockets of American consumers every year. Moreover the cumulative effect of the assault of "minimal" price increases upon the consumer's buying power can be truly unsettling, as we are seeing at the present time.

Mr. President, the proponents of H.R. 8193 contend that cargo preference will provide our Nation with the security of having the necessary transport capability to carry needed oil to our country. However, as the Arab oil embargo clearly demonstrated, our real concern for assuring dependable energy supplies is to have secure energy sources. If the supply of foreign oil is interrupted at the foreign source, it will be of little avail to have several million deadweight tons of tanker vessels under American registry. This bill does nothing to make those foreign sources more secure. If anything, it jeopardizes existing foreign oil supply availability.

It jeopardizes foreign oil supply sources, Mr. President, because it invites retaliation. The moment we start insisting on a certain percentage, such as 20 percent and later 30 percent as proposed in H.R. 8193, and which shows that the proponents of this measure want to make its impact gradual, betraying a fear of this bill which they, themselves, either consciously or subconsciously, have in their minds, other nations will follow our lead. Thus, H.R. 8193 will jeopardize our foreign oil supply availability, and invite retaliation, especially by Arab countries which now are building their own shipping capacity.

As noted by Secretary of Commerce Dent in his letter to me dated July 22, this legislation would "provide an excuse for foreign countries to adopt similar discriminatory measures. Such actions could take the form of cargo preference damaging to other segments of the U.S. economy." The Arab Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries will be quick to discern that H.R. 8193 would create a nontariff trade barrier.

Retaliation by these countries would be extremely damaging to our national security from an energy standpoint. Also, it should be remembered that these Arab countries are interested in developing their own tanker capacity, and they have already placed orders for tanker construction. This measure can only encourage the adoption by the Arabs of similar measures applicable to their oil exports.

Further, Mr. President, as the Department of State pointed out in its testimony before our Subcommittee on Merchant Marine, enactment of H.R. 8193 would place the United States in violation of more than 30 treaties of friendship, commerce, and navigation—FCN treaties. These treaties obligate the United States to give treatment to flag vessels of our treaty partners equal to that which we give our own vessels with respect to carriage of commercial cargoes. Surely, U.S. violation of these treaties would encourage similar measures on the part of our treaty partners and other nations.

Remember that we have more than 30 such treaties with other nations, and the moment we enact this measure, we violate those treaties. Are we so dumb, or do we think that these other nations are so dumb that they will not realize what we have done? Then they, too, will disregard such treaties with us and assert their own preference. Accordingly, this bill is certain to bring retaliation and take cargoes out of American bottoms and jobs away from American seamen.

Mr. President, much is alleged concerning the employment opportunities to be provided American seamen through enactment of H.R. 8193. Nothing could be further from the truth. Based upon estimates made by the Department of Commerce, assuming realistic constraints on shipyards, H.R. 8193 would create some 2,200 incremental man-years of seafaring employment and 143,200 man-years of shipyard and support industry empolyment through 1980, at an estimated minimum cost of $800 million—nearly $1 billion. This brings about the absurd result of making the shipyards and support industries, which least need it, the biggest employment benefit recipients, and the seafarers—the sailors—who need it the most, the recipients of the smallest benefits.

Even without H.R. 8193, a shipbuilding manpower study conducted in March of this year for the Maritime Administration concludes that manpower requirements for skilled shipbuilding occupations will increase 8 to 12 percent per year through June 1975, and that a major impediment to planned expansion will be the limited availability of skilled personnel in several local labor markets.

As a matter of fact, our commercial shipyard industry now has a record peacetime backlog of orders valued at more than $6.5 billion, and in this booming commercial market, the Navy is having serious problems trying to prevail upon this industry to build naval vessels. H.R. 8193 will only serve to fan the flames of this boom at inflated costs which will be borne by the American taxpayer.

It was only 3 days ago that the Secretary of the Navy visited the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard in my State of New Hampshire. Ever since I have been in the Congress, from the years I was in the House and all through the 20 years in the Senate, I have been fighting to keep that shipyard operating. Secretary after Secretary of the Navy had decided to close it down because they thought they could get the work done cheaper and faster in private commercial yards.

But, I have maintained that we had to have some public yards to keep the private yards honest and to have them in time of need. Last week, the Secretary of the Navy visited the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard, which is running at peak, and he proceeded to tell them that we never needed it so badly as we need it now, and that there is no prospect of its being closed. He stated that it would be the saddest mistake we ever made if we closed it because there is such a backlog in the shipyards that build naval vessels of all kinds that the Department of the Navy is having extreme difficulty in getting the ships that it needs built. Now, that is highly significant. Also, if we start immediately a crash program to build more shipyard capacity—and I know that if my friend from Louisiana were here on the floor, he would differ with this because he says we ought to have more and more capacity—it will cost an exorbitant amount of money to build such excess capacity.

Now, in light of all of this, I cannot possibly think of anything more utterly senseless than to penalize the people who, at least in the northern part of this country, may be cold this winter. Passage of H.R. 8193 will penalize the consumer, the purchasers of heating oil and of gasoline. It will penalize the schoolhouses that must be heated. It will penalize the utilities that are furnishing power and light and have to have fuel. Yet, H.R. 8193 will benefit only a very few, while causing all this hardship. It is just inconceivable to this Senator that the Senate would even consider passage of such a disastrous piece of legislation, especially in light of our Nation's recent energy crisis.

My final principal reason for opposing H.R. 8193, Mr. President, is that it would result in a most unfair economic hardship on my constituents in New Hampshire and other consumers in New England and the Northeast. True, that is a parochial reason. But of the 12 States in this country that have no refineries, 6 of them are in New England. We have not one refinery in our region.

I note the presence in the Chamber of the distinguished Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE), who comes from one of the most beautiful climates in the world, where we all wish we could go every time we have a vacation. I note in the chair the distinguished Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS), who lives in one of the greatest States in this Union, and one that, while it has, I suppose, occasionally some cold weather, certainly does not have a climate which can be compared to the rigors of New England, or of New York, Minnesota, Michigan, and other Northern States which experience cold, bitter winters.

Moreover, unlike many other sections of the country, New England is heavily dependent upon imports of foreign oil for its petroleum needs. Therefore, New England would have to pay a disproportionate share of the higher costs resulting from cargo preference.

In this connection, Mr. President, I would like to point out that the provision contained in this bill to waive 15 cents per barrel of the oil import fee when crude oil is transported on U.S.-flag vessels only serves to exacerbate the discriminatory effect of cargo preference on the New England region. Due to the lack of refinery capacity to which I have just referred, imports to New England are primarily oil products rather than crude oil. As a result, this provision is an added discrimination against the State I represent, and the region represented by other Members of this body which extends beyond New England, including, certainly, the Northeast.

Whatever cost savings may accrue to consumers in New England by the waiver of this oil import fee can only be minimal, while other sections of the country which import mainly crude oil will receive the lion's share of any savings. In my book there would be no saving. In my book, it is just a degree of hardship for all consumers in this country as this energy crisis continues. This crisis is not over. It is going to intensify. I do not care what State you come from or what region you come from, it is just a matter of degree of what your consumers will suffer as a result of passage of this bill. As stated in the Washington Post editorial to which I have already referred:

> Supporters of the new bill try to argue that shifting oil imports to more expensive ships will not necessarily mean more expensive oil. The congressman who believes that will believe anything. The bill is, in fact, a transparent attempt to make the public subsidized the shipping industry through its fuel costs as well as through its taxes.

Mr. President, the foregoing summarizes my principal reasons for my opposition to H.R. 8193. However, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues that this legislation is also strongly opposed by the Departments of Commerce, State, Agriculture, Treasury, Defense, Transportation, Justice, and Interior, as well as the Federal Energy Administration and the Office of Consumer Affairs. All these are lined up unanimously opposing this legislation.

On August 1, 1974, I inserted in the RECORD at pages 26272–26279 letters from each of these departments and agencies of the executive branch, which were in response to my requests for their positions and comments on H.R. 8193 as reported by the Commerce Committee. A copy of those letters which I inserted in

the RECORD has been placed on each Senator's desk, and I invite attention to them.

Surely, such unanimous opposition by those departments and agencies which would administer or be affected by the proposed cargo preference legislation should be given careful consideration.

I have not tried to ascertain the attitude of President Ford on H.R. 8193, and I have no intention of trying to approach him about it, unless we reach that dire situation that this dangerous bill passes, comes out of conference, and is sent to be signed by the President. Except for the fact that I know that all these departments oppose the bill, the only news I have received about the President's attitude was kindly expressed on the floor this morning by the distinguished manager of the bill, the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. LONG). He gave me the information. He asserted that, first, he had talked casually with the President, mentioned this bill to him and I think he said that the President would feel a little better about it if it carried a provision that was applicable to the House bill concerning waiver authority vested in the President and Congress in case of an emergency.

Now, that is not what I would call enthusiastic endorsement of the bill.

Certainly, if passed, H.R. 8193 should be vetoed, because if there ever was a bill that promoted inflation, this one is it. Inflation is something we tear our hair about day and night.

The only information I can give as to President Ford's attitude on this bill is what I heard today from the manager of the bill, the Senator from Louisiana. Apparently he has news I have not yet received.

I know the Departments are all against it because I have their opposition in writing. I wish all my colleagues will look at the RECORD and read the reasons for their opposition.

In conclusion, for all the foregoing reasons, as well as those set forth in my statement before our Subcommittee on Merchant Marine on May 30, which I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the same date, my minority views contained in the committee report accompanying H.R. 8193, the minority views of my distinguished colleague from Kansas (Mr. PEARSON), also contained in the committee report, the numerous objections raised by the various departments and agencies of the executive branch, which were unanimous in their opposition to this legislation, I earnestly solicit the opposition of my colleagues in the Senate to the Energy Transportation Security Act of 1974. It is bad legislation. It should be defeated, just as the Senate wisely rejected a similar proposal 2 years ago.

Now, Mr. President, as we reach the time for a decision, I wish to recapitulate my objections to the bill:

First, it is inflationary. It has got to be inflationary. It is bound to cost more money for the consumer. H.R. 8193 will contribute to inflationary pressures in the construction and operation of U.S.-flag tankers.

Second, H.R. 8193 will establish the precedent of statutory quotas on the carriage of privately owned commercial oil cargoes, which preference heretofore has always been limited to the carriage of Government-owned and Government-financed cargoes. This could be expanded to other commercial cargoes, including our agricultural exports, and raw materials for which the United States is dependent upon foreign sources. We would invite this extension.

Third, there is bound to be retaliation as a result of our violation of treaties with more than 30 countries.

Fourth, H.R. 8193 would impose a statutory requirement for double bottom tanker vessel construction for which there is evidence that double bottoms are, at best, of small significance in protecting the environment. Double bottoms raise serious technical questions as to safety, and they would significantly increase tanker vessel construction costs.

At the International Conference on Marine Pollution, in recommending safeguards against oil spillage in the ocean, they voted against the recommendation of double bottoms for tanker vessels. The Norwegians, for instance, stated:

> We have had experience in Norway with double bottoms on oil and bulk oil carriers. We experienced much more difficulty with double bottoms than single bottom vessels. For example:
>
> 1. Gas would collect in the pipelines and owners found they had to install detectors in the double bottom as a safety measure against explosions.
>
> 2. There would be extensive leakage of oil into the double bottoms.
>
> 3. Cracks in the structure always occur and if the double bottom gets oil in it, without a piping system to remove the oil, it has to be discharged through the engine room, which is exceedingly dangerous to the ship and the crew.

It was also brought out that a ship fitted with a double bottom was more likely to capsize, was more unwieldy, and that double bottoms were actually dangerous.

Now, strict requirements for the safety of ships are enforced by the Coast Guard, which set the standards. The Coast Guard's most recent regulations do not require double bottoms.

Many ecologists and environmentalists have expressed apprehension about the fact that as soon as Alaska begins to get the pipeline constructed and brings the oil to the Pacific coast millions of tons of oil will be shipped down through a passage to the west coast which is one of the most dangerous passages anywhere in the world.

I would like to quote from an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on September 1, 1974, on this point:

> Speaking of Alaska, a lot of ecologists are worried about the possibilities of oil spills on the upper Pacific coast when the Alaskan pipeline goes into operation. Tankers will be carrying 2 million barrels of oil a day down through one of the roughest and most dangerous ship passages in the world. All of the tankers on this service will be American-flag, under the long-standing law that prohibits foreign ships from carrying cargoes between American ports. Has Congress required double bottoms for these tankers?
>
> You bet it has not.

And, Mr. President, you can bet that it will not, because it simply adds to the cost and, if anything, increases the danger.

Now, these points that I have discussed are all written by the committee into a new bill which is a substitute for the House bill and which is before the Senate, and on none of those points was there, as far as I have been able to ascertain, any direct testimony.

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

Mr. COTTON. Yes, I yield.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, is not the Senator aware of the fact that one of the biggest items on pollution of the sea is that these big ships, having loaded full of oil—and as we know we are talking about huge amounts of oil, these are enormous ships, a ship carrying a million barrels of oil—so these big ships today will sail, let us say, to England or to the United States loaded down with this oil—when they deliver the oil, and a lot of that is heavy oil, they have inches of sludge on the side of that tank?

When they go back and get into warm water, they proceed to flush those tanks out and flush all that junk out onto the sea, which pollutes the sea, and someone should stop them from doing this.

Now, what this bill would say is that we would use the double bottoms, fill the double bottom with water, which would not be the same tank in which the oil usually goes, and would also have some ballast tanks for water only.

Those ballast tanks would not be filled with oil, so we would not have these tanks polluting the sea.

Otherwise, if we do not do something like this, we are not going to be able to swim in the waters off New Hampshire or in the waters off North Carolina or Florida.

I can recall when it used to be very nice to go swimming in the Bahamas. If we go down there now and we go in swimming, we would do well to have a can of distillate so we can wash oil off where those big supertankers have been changing oil from one tanker to another tanker at a transshipment point.

Now anybody knows that if we are serious about stopping this pollution of the sea, we ought to start requiring that: One, we should not have these ships breaking in two like the *Torrey Canyon*, which filled the whole English Channel with oil; or, two, we should not have them flushing their tanks all over the ocean and high seas because after a while it will not be good for anybody.

Now, does the Senator really favor flushing those tanks out all over the Atlantic and the Pacific?

Mr. COTTON. I have here a statement made by the Honorable JOHN M. MURPHY, Democrat of New York, before the Department of Transportation on the Coast Guard's proposed regulations for tanker construction.

Congressman MURPHY is chairman of the Coast Guard Subcommittee of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

Congressman MURPHY points out that the International Conference on Marine Pollution of the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization rejected the requirement for double bottom and

that the Coast Guard has refused to include that requirement in its regulations.

Now, I do not claim to be the expert that the Senator from Louisiana is on these matters. But, if it is necessary to go to that expense for the protection against the pollution of waters and add that expense to the oil bill of the consumers of this country, I would suggest that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana take it up and convince the Coast Guard, with whom he is in close contact as chairman of the subcommittee that deals with it. That is the place to make regulations.

I am just simply taking the decision of the Coast Guard and the decision of the International Conference, in preference to the declaration of the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. As I understand it, the chairman of our committee (Mr. MAGNUSON) testified before a Coast Guard hearing in favor of double bottoms. I understand the Coast Guard decision is not final. For that matter, the committee recommendation is not final. If the Senate wants to change it, it can.

It is my understanding that the Interior Department submitted testimony to the Department of Transportation with regard to construction standards for tankers. It has advocated double bottoms, and advocated that this be required in these regulations for building tankers of this sort.

Mr. COTTON. Both of those Departments are opposed to this bill.

Mr. LONG. I know it.

Mr. COTTON. Let me further note that in conclusion, Congressman MURPHY states the following:

> I felt compelled, in view of the mountain of evidence and testimony to which I have been exposed, to come here to state for the record that double bottoms have the highest risk of probability of any currently known ship construction configuration of causing more oil to be spilled on more beaches in just one severe accident than all single skin accidents combined in any projected ten-year period.

Mr. LONG. It is my understanding that at the IMCO conference, the U.S. Coast Guard advocated double bottoms and they were not able to prevail.

I cannot understand why many nations on this Earth just do not care enough about pollution. It could well be, for example, that nations that do not border on the sea just do not care enough about the effect of the sea being polluted that they are willing to pay the cost of controlling pollution. But that is not the case of the United States. We are very much concerned about pollution. We think that we ought to lead the way in working toward——

Mr. COTTON. Who are "we"?

Mr. LONG. Those of us on the majority, on this committee, feel that the United States ought to try to lead the way in trying to control pollution of the sea. To me, it is a sad travesty to see these big tankers being flushed, with the huge amount of deliberate pollution of the sea involved in that as a regular proposition. They should not be permitted to flush those tanks and pollute the ocean until it is not good for marine life or anything else.

I just feel that someone ought to take the lead. As the Coast Guard could not prevail at this international conference, at least maybe we can prevail here to do something about this matter. I do not know why this man testified he did not think double bottoms were safe. I have known what it is to operate a ship without a double bottom, to know what it is to almost lose it, and having to be brought in by tug because the salt water got into the fuel. But it absolutely defies my imagination to understand why one would contend that a ship with only one thickness of steel between itself and the sea would be safer than a ship that has two bottoms, you might say, between itself and the sea.

In addition to a bottom, it has a void tank below it, which, if it sprung a leak, would still not permit the ship to be flooded.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his observations. I know he will be back at it again when presented with the opportunity.

I ask unanimous consent that at this point there be inserted in the RECORD the statement of the Honorable JOHN M. MURPHY before the Department of Transportation, in which Mr. MURPHY, chairman of the Coast Guard Subcommittee in the House, speaks of the 6 weeks of the IMCO debate that he and his staff listened to.

I will not take the time to read this statement because I have promised to yield to my colleague from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE).

I direct the attention of the Senator from Louisiana to this statement inasmuch as the questions he just raised are so well answered by his counterpart in the House of Representatives, who apparently spent a lot of time on this. He will find the answers to his questions there.

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

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE JOHN M. MURPHY BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (COAST GUARD)

TANK VESSELS IN DOMESTIC TRADE

JULY 31, 1974.

Mr. Chairman, I appear here today to support the proposed Coast Guard rules and suggest that no changes be made of a substantial nature, especially as regards the design and construction of vessels.

I felt compelled to appear in person because of representations that have been made to this body and to the Coast Guard by advocates in and out of Congress who insist that the so-called double bottom segregated ballast system be made mandatory under these regulations.

As chairman of the Coast Guard subcommittee of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, I have conducted extensive hearings into the problems of operational and accidental tank ship pollution and the recommended alternatives for eliminating such pollution. Further, I and members of my staff, were appointed to the IMCO (Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization) delegation which met in London during the months of October-November 1973, and which thoroughly explored the most efficient methods of reducing pollution of the world's oceans and waterways.

As I understand it, none of the people in the legislative branch of Government who are advocates of the double bottom system attended the IMCO convention, despite the fact that many were invited. On the other hand, members of the merchant marine and fisheries committee staff sat day and night for six weeks throughout the debate and the presentation of evidence and I attended similar meetings in excess of a week.

I had assumed in view of the wealth of knowledge and experience that is contained in the hearings of the House and the IMCO conference which overwhelmingly disputes the double bottom concept of pollution control that this issue would have been put to rest for the forseeable future. I can only assume that the advocates of double bottoms have not read any of the publications or extracts of these meetings.

I found great resentment against the cavalier attitude—the arrogance if you will—on the part of IMCO participants against those people in the United States who think their commitment to clean up the world's oceans and waterways is greater than that of the English, the French, the Norwegians, the Germans, the Danes, the Japanese, and others.

For people who were 3,674 miles distant from the intense IMCO debate to airily dismiss the combined expertise of the greatest maritime nations in the world—including experts from the United States outside of Government—is utter folly.

The Norwegian delegation in particular, was made up of men of the highest integrity. They were precise, knowledgeable, and persuasive. But above all, they had the facts—engineering-wise and experience-wise—to convince most participants at IMCO.

The Norwegians stated, "We have had experience in Norway with double bottoms on oil and bulk ore carriers. We experienced much more difficulty with double bottoms than single bottom vessels. For example:

"1. Gas would collect in the pipelines and owners found they had to install detectors in the double bottom as a safety measure against explosions.

"2. There would be extensive leakage of oil into the double bottom.

"3. Cracks in the structure always occur and if the double bottom gets oil in it, without a piping system to remove the oil, it has to be discharged through the bilge and through the engine room, which is exceedingly dangerous to the ship and the crew."

In short, Norway felt that double bottoms are dangerous to safety and pollution citing problems of grounding and sinking, difficulty in mooring, difficulty in salvaging and the constant threat of gas seepage into the double bottom space and explosions.

The British and French, who still shudder at the thought of *Torrey Canyon*, were also unalterably opposed to double bottom tank ship requirements. The British delegation pointed out that experience with double bottoms found the following negative effects:

1. Adverse effect on stability.
2. Adverse effect on stability of intact vessel when loaded.
3. Poor stability of damaged vessel.
4. Additional adverse effect when wind loading.
5. Possibility of leakage into the double bottom.
6. Added weight to double bottom.

The French delegation suggested at one point that IMCO actually prohibit double bottoms as a threat to the world's oceans.

I would remind you for the record that the original support and engineering data on double bottoms came to the Coast Guard from engineers who have since re-evaluated original data and collected new information. The advocates of double bottoms listened to them before, and I ask, why don't they listen to them now?

I feel it is no secret at this point in time that the Coast Guard advocacy of double bottoms at the IMCO conference was one of a series of acceptable alternatives one of which, segregated ballast, was overwhelmingly adopted.

As it turns out, however, thanks to those advocates whose knowledge and information has remained static since 1970–71, what was once an alternative has become an albatross around the neck of the United States Merchant Marine industry. The vote against the United States official stand on double bottoms at IMCO was much more substantial than the almost 3 to 1 ratio would indicate. Several delegations, including the Canadians, told me their vote for the United States position was a "sympathy vote", that they in no way supported the double bottom concept, and, in fact, if their votes had been crucial, would have voted against.

The evidence is now clear.

The facts are there for all to see, but the advocates refuse to accept—or even worse—they refuse to even acknowledge new evidence.

The Coast Guard is on the right course in this case. Their efforts in these regulations are directed at the major cause of oil pollution, i.e., segregated ballast for the intentional discharge of oil which causes 70 percent of the pollution by tankers and the development of vessel traffic systems to correct the accidents which cause an additional 18 percent of the pollution. I would point out that 85 percent of this figure is due to ship operator error. This means that when we discuss double bottoms, we are talking in the neighborhood of 3 percent of the total of accidental ship pollution.

Mr. Chairman, if double bottoms would solve even 1 percent of the problem, I would say go ahead and make them mandatory.

If double bottoms were neither effective or ineffective, I would probably not waste my time here today.

But, I felt compelled in view of the mountain of evidence and testimony to which I have been exposed to come here to state for the record that double bottoms have the highest risk probability of any currently known ship construction configuration of causing more oil to be spilled on more beaches in just one severe accident than all single skin accidents combined in any projected ten year period.

The French took the firmest stand at the IMCO convention, because they had come to the same conclusion that I just have—with one difference—they offered mathematical proof. According to the French presentation, their studies, using the same grounding and accident figures presented by the United States delegation, showed that pollution would be increased instead of decreased in double bottoms. They calculated that in the double bottom ship, there would annually be 235 tons of pollution by accidental outflow. On the other hand, in a non-double bottom ship, there would be an annual pollution of 123 tons by accidental outflow.

As I said at the beginning, my staff and I sat through six weeks of the IMCO debate. The people in the other body who are now sending "doomsday" communications and who are now trying to lay down the law on this issue, didn't deem it worthwhile to show up. One staff person did appear for approximately 20 minutes, but never sat down because the debate "was boring."

Now, these people want to dictate policy on an issue about which their ignorance knows no bounds.

Mr. Chairman, I am against oil and other types of pollution.

I support the IMCO recommendations.

I am convinced the regulations we have before us are the correct ones and the most promising.

I have faith in Admiral Benkert and his staff and their assessment of the solutions needed.

On a note of proprietary interest, Mr. Chairman, I understand that because the Coast Guard has changed its policy subsequent to exposure to the testimony of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee hearings and the convincing evidence presented at IMCO—the Coast Guard now stands accused of having "caved in" to industry pressure on the double bottom issue.

I think this is grossly unfair—I know it is untrue.

They were there and the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee was there. Together we have studied the facts, and until those dilettantes who have only skimmed the surface have looked at and studied these same facts, I, for one, will studiously ignore them.

I suggest this panel do the same.

I urge this body to listen to the tape recorded debate of IMCO committee number 2 during the days of the double bottom debate.

Further, I urge this body to read the hearings of the Coast Guard subcommittee and the 1973 activities report of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee, particularly the section dealing with the IMCO meeting, which I submit for the record.

This record should convince anyone, as I am, that double bottoms are not the answer.

The record of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee shows that the so-called double bottom solution to accidental oil pollution was no solution at all.

To the contrary, an analysis of the dynamics of a double bottom tanker, under adverse conditions showed that just one failure owing to the decreased stability of such vessels could cause a catastrophic discharge of oil greater than the annual 60,000 tons of spillage from conventional tankers—as the Norwegians pointed out.

There appeared to be four serious disadvantages to double bottom tankers that did not surface in original Coast Guard studies. These included: (1) an inherent decrease in stability, with a decrease in resistance to capsizing; (2) a loss of buoyancy in a grounded double bottom which would impair salvage efforts and increase the potential for losing an entire cargo; (3) the potential for gas accumulation in the double bottom and the danger of explosion; and (4) the fact that they only work with minor accidents.

I have also attached a chart showing the effects of single skinned and double bottom groundings along with supportive information. These charts and this information were prepared by the same people who developed the original tentative double bottom data for the Coast Guard. (Tanker Design and Equipment Committee, American Institute of Merchant Shipping—attachment three.)

I cannot help repeating that I think it is remarkable that the double bottom advocates in Congress believed them then, but they won't believe them now.

As far as I can determine, price is no longer the major objection of shipbuilders to this concept.

Segregated ballast is as much of an anathema to some United States shipbuilders as double bottoms were.

The problem is that a myth was created, and once created—like all myths—they die hard.

I ask you not to be intimidated by the "ivory tower" experts who would use this issue naively at best, or for a few days of political gain at worst.

If they win, in the long run the American merchant marine, the American people, and a good chunk of the United States coastline will stand a good chance of losing in an exorbitant and irretrievable manner.

In summation, I feel that what is happening here, thanks to Admiral Benkert and his staff, is that the Coast Guard aggressively sought the facts over these past three years and gained valuable knowledge on the best way to protect the marine environment. We are fortunate that the Coast Guard had the insight to put the knowledge that they have gained during these years to work and that they had the wisdom to come up with the package before us today.

I hope that we all now have the courage to see that this package is adopted.

I am convinced that if the final operating requirements outlined in these regulations are adopted for all vessels across the board and the design and construction requirements remain intact, as is, we have the best possible package given current technology.

DOUBLE SKINS

Another proposed method of mitigating the effect of tanker accidents is to require that tankers have double sides, double bottoms or complete double skins. Studies already submitted to IMCO have clearly demonstrated that double sides provide a low probability of success in mitigating outflow from collisions due to the breaching of both skins in most accidents of this nature. In addition, double side designs tend to decrease ship stability and to increase the risk of total loss. An additional problem with double skin tankers is the risk personnel would inclur during internal inspection of the void spaces.

Constructing tankers with double bottoms has been proposed by some as a means of dealing with grounding accidents which account for a significant amount of oil loss from tanker accidents. Conclusions presented in IMCO's Study I, undertaken by the United States, initially showed the average outflow in groundings of double bottom tankers to be about half the outflow of single bottom vessels. While these conclusions are believed to be correct under the assumptions of that study, subsequent examination of the assumptions leads to different conclusions. Specifically, the basic study did not adequately consider the drawbacks of double bottoms in extreme conditions and the future areas of operations which may be very different from existing ones, *e.g.*, more deepwater terminals.

With respect to serious grounding accidents, it appears that inadequate consideration was given in the study to the loss of buoyancy resulting from flooding of the empty double bottom space in groundings of double bottom ships. This loss of buoyancy complicates freeing a stranded ship and increases the probability of suffering total loss. Naturally, the importance of this factor depends on the comparative frequency of minor groundings which do not impede the progress of the ship and the more serious ones which leave the vessel stranded. In the latter case, cargo might have to be removed to free the vessel and in the extreme to save the ship.

The implications of buoyancy loss may be expressed in terms of the relative amounts of oil cargo that must be removed from the double bottom ship when the hull is breached and the empty space between the two bottoms is flooded. In this situation a 250 MDWT segregated-ballast-double bottom ship could require lightening by some 16,000 tons of cargo to give the same buoyancy as a single skin ship (segregated ballast or conventional) of like capacity. If time and facilities are available to transfer this quantity of oil to another vessel, the ability of the double bottom vessel to prevent oil outflow would be unimpaired. If not, the specified amount of cargo would have to be jettisoned. In such circumstances, the grounding outflow for a double bottom VLCC could be considerably higher than for a single skin

ship in the same situation. Roughly the same results would be obtained in the case of smaller tankers. In addition, the empty double bottom space in a loaded tanker reduces a ship's resistance to overturning in comparison with the single bottom ship.

Of paramount importance in considering the efficacy of the double bottom design is the fact that the total loss of a single loaded tanker, due to loss of buoyancy, or the occurrence of a few major incidents in which cargo would have to be jettisoned, would more than offset the advantages claimed for double bottoms. Furthermore, review of major tanker grounding accidents, of which the *Torrey Canyon* is the best-known example, shows that double bottoms would have had no positive effect. Thus the possible benefits of double bottoms in reducing outflow being uncertain at best, they hardly seem to justify the added capital costs imposed by such construction. This capital would be better employed through the installation and use of improved navigational equipment.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the Washington Post, dated Friday, August 23, 1974, entitled "The Maritime Lobby At Work" be printed in the RECORD at this point.

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

THE MARITIME LOBBY AT WORK

A few citizens may still think that the price of oil is not yet high enough, or that the layers of subsidy to the maritime industry are not yet thick enough. Those few will be glad to know that the shipping lobby has been hard at work, and Congress is now in the final stages of passing a bill to create a small number of jobs for seamen at a huge cost to taxpayers and consumers. The bill is formally titled the Energy Transportation Security Act, but it might have been more accurately styled the Shipyards' and Sailors' Public Welfare Act of 1974. Nearly all of the oil imported into this country arrives in ships under foreign flags, most commonly Liberian. The ships are cheaper to build abroad and cheaper to operate with foreign crews. The bill would require 20 per cent of all our imports to be transported in American-flag tankers, with the proportion rising to 30 per cent by 1977.

The shipbuilding industry and, even more so, the maritime unions are a rich and indiscriminate source of political campaign funds. It is the classic effect: the most prolific sources of contributions are the industries that survive only by government protection and subsidy. The amounts of money already going to this industry are not small. Since the Merchant Marine Act was passed four years ago, the federal government has spent near $1 billion in ship construction subsidies. Operating subsidies are running about $250 million a year. Of a typical tanker crewman's pay of $13,800 a year, $10,350 comes from federal funds.

Supporters of the new bill try to argue that shifting oil imports to more expensive ships will not necessarily mean more expensive oil. The congressman who believes that will believe anything. The bill is, in fact, a transparent attempt to make the public subsidize the shipping industry through its fuel costs as well as through its taxes.

The chief reason offered publicly in support of this bill is that the national security requires it—and never mind that both the Department of Defense and the Maritime Administration oppose the bill. The Maritime Administration points out that American shipyards are already heavily backlogged and cannot possibly build enough new tankers to meet the bill's requirements on time. To meet them even by 1980, three years late, would require immediate construction of a new shipyard, leading in turn to excess capacity as soon as these tankers were built.

Currently the world's tanker fleet is run by hundreds of owners including oil companies, shipping companies and individuals. No political power controls them. Even during the oil embargoes last winter no government tried to use shipping as a weapon. There was no way to do it. But there will be a way if the oil exporting countries follow the pattern that this bill would establish, and force their customers—including the United States—to use the exporting countries' tankers. Some of the oil-exporting countries are moving in this direction, with the Arab countries already getting into the tanker business in a very big way. If the United States now sets a world-wide precedent for requiring noncompetitive national-flag shipping, we may have to live with very unpleasant and costly consequences as other countries enthusiastically follow our lead. It is the exporting country, after all, which decides which ships to load. In this respect, the bill constitutes a real menace to our national security.

But the bill's authors are mainly interested in jobs. The Senate Commerce Committee grandly reported that the bill would generate 225,000 man-years of employment. But the great majority would be in the shipyards and support industries, which are already overstrained. Only one-sixth of the new jobs would actually be at sea, since the modern tanker is a highly automated machine. Sen. Norris Cotton (R-N.H.) argues that the committee's estimate of new jobs is much too high. He places it at about 145,000, created at a cost of $800 million in direct subsidies alone. "In other words," he pointed out, "the minimum average cost to the American taxpayer will be about $5,500 per man-year of employment, which is almost one-half the median income of $12,051 for all American families in 1973!" Sen. Cotton is conducting a lonley opposition to the bill. He has nothing on his side but the fact that he is right. The bill passed the House by an enthusiastic 266 to 136 last May, then the Senate Committee reported it in July 14 to 2. There seems little doubt that it will pass the Senate.

President Ford has threatened to veto bills that would aggravate inflation. The Energy Transportation Security Bill would not only do that, but jeopardize the whole tradition of a free and unrestricted market in ocean shipping. As the world's biggest importer and biggest exporter, the United States will pay more heavily than any other nation if that tradition now collapses. If this bill comes to President Ford's desk, he would perform an important public service by vetoing it.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT. Mr. President, I enjoyed listening to the colloquy between the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee and the ranking Republican member. This is a bill in which we have evidence both in favor and in opposition to the enactment of this proposal, as is often the case. It also will have an effect on my own State.

Both management and labor representatives have come by the office urging that I vote in favor of this bill and otherwise support it. There are shipyards in Tidewater, Virginia—Newport News Shipyards, one of the largest in the world—and naturally I am interested in this proposal.

The committee report indicates that the bill would require 20 percent initially and by June 30, 1977, 30 percent of the oil imported into this country to be transported on U.S.-flag commercial vessels to the extent that such vessels are available at fair and reasonable rates.

I know that all of us want to improve our merchant marine. We have enacted such legislation in the past, just a few years ago, that would increase our standing. We would like for merchandise that goes throughout the world, whether it be oil or other produce, to be transported on American vessels.

On the affirmative side of the proposal, we would like to end the reliance of this country on foreign-flag vessels for the carriage of U.S. oil imports.

We would like to have a sufficient fleet of our own ships for national security purposes. We would like to stop the payment of dollars for the carriage of oil in foreign-flag tankers, which would assist in reducing any balance of payment deficits.

We would like to require that U.S.-flag tankers be built in our own shipyards.

The American shipbuilding industry would be strengthened. Employment would be given to shipyard workers. We would like to have additional U.S.-flag tankers to provide additional jobs for the American seaman.

Mr. President, I notice on page 58 of the report on the opposite side, and against this proposal, the views of the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON).

On page 58, it is stated that:

> The Government presently subsidizes wages, including fringe benefits, for American seamen on the magnitude of in excess of 70 percent of the total wage cost.

We are talking about something in a period of inflation, and I agree with President Ford that it is the most serious problem that confronts the country. The quotation continues:

> For example, of an average annual salary for an American licensed merchant marine officer amounting to $53,000, the American taxpayer pay $38,319 of this amount; for unlicensed American seamen of a total annual wage cost of $26,000, the American taxpayer pays $18,928.

I wonder whether the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire would comment briefly on this. I know that he has just been talking about the bill generally and sharing his feelings. However, he may tell us why we have to pay a subsidy in such a large amount? I realize that this is not a part of the bill, but we are called upon to assist the shipbuilding industry to a greater extent. Is this an accurate statement? Do I understand correctly that we are paying an average of $38,319 as a subsidy toward the total income of the licensed merchant marine officer?

Mr. COTTON. That is true. I say to my friend and colleague that that is under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended by the Merchant Marine Act of 1970, in order to keep the American-flag ships operating by providing parity with foreign-flag ships. Unless the Government made up the difference, our foreign competitors, who pay their officers and their seamen much less, would take all the business, and we could not compete. So Congress, in the Merchant Marine Act made provision for an operating-differential subsidy, and this bill is designed to subsidize them more, although indirectly.

Let me add that the subsidy we pay in wages to the seamen and the officers is small compared with the subsidy we pay toward the construction of these new vessels. In the last 5 years, the taxpayers have paid more than a billion dollars in subsidy to construct ships to carry the American flag, and that includes tankers.

Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT. I wonder whether the American people realize that we are paying such a subsidy. I receive a great deal of mail any time a question arises as to an increase in pay for Members of Congress above the $42,500 we now receive, and here it says that the average merchant marine officer receives compensation of $53,000 a year, more than $10,000 above the salary of a Member of this body, and that 70 percent of that amount is paid by way of subsidy.

I am also impressed by the statement farther down on the page which indicates about the plight of the American citizen in his dual role, first as a taxpayer—he would have to pay additional taxes—and then as a consumer, in the form of additional cost of oil by having these vessels licensed by our own Government.

I recall that a couple of years ago, then President Nixon appeared before a joint session of Congress and indicated that we needed somehow to increase the technical knowhow of the American worker and that we needed to increase the productivity, so that we would be able to reduce the unit cost of whatever is produced in this country. It seems to me that perhaps we need to increase the technical knowledge and reduce the cost of building our ships. That might mean that we would not have to pay a subsidy such as this.

Mr. COTTON. I invite the attention of the Senator from Virginia to the fact that the costs he has been talking about, which have startled him so, are at least open. The Merchant Marine Act provides for them, and they are not hidden. The Congress must appropriate the necessary funds. That is the subsidy for the American merchant marine. But the cost in H.R. 8193 will be hidden. The people will not be able to know about it. However, the added costs will be right out of the pockets of the consumer and the taxpayer, because of the increased cost of oil and of getting it here. I do not wonder that it shocked the Senator from Virginia. In the Merchant Marine Act, the costs are all out in the open. This is worse, because these will be hidden costs—no one knows how much.

Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT. I yield.

Mr. BEALL. I would be remiss if I did not invite the Senator's attention to page 17 of the committee's report, when he talks about new technology, because on page 17 he will observe that in comparing the kind of ship built today with the kind of ship that was available after World War II, many of which are still in use, there has been a considerable advancement in technology. The new super tanker has a dead weight tonnage of 225,000, as opposed to a 14,000-ton tanker that was used during World War II. The large tanker today has a crew of 27, as opposed to a crew of 37 to 45 for one that is one-tenth smaller.

Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT. Is the Senator saying that the technology has improved to the extent that we could do away with this subsidy?

Mr. BEALL. No. I am saying that the technology has improved to the extent that we are making our ships much more efficient. If one of our purposes is to build a merchant marine and provide protection for ourselves in the form of national security, so we will not be dependent on foreign controlled ships to bring a necessary natural resource into our country, then it is a small price to pay.

Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT. I share the Senator's desire to have a strong merchant marine. I believe that every Member of this body shares the Senator's desire in that respect.

I have attempted in my remarks, first, to say positive things, and then I wanted to say something on the other side. There is much that can be said for and against this proposal.

Frankly, I am uncertain about the general provisions of the bill. But when this committee amendment is attached, which I believe the Senator from Michigan advocated, to transfer shipping to the Great Lakes, then I have no doubt as to how I am going to vote.

Mr. BEALL. I voted against the amendment of the Senator from Michigan, because I am opposed to it; but in spite of the fact that I voted against it, it was adopted in the committee. I am going to vote for the bill, despite the fact that the amendment is in it, because I think that even with the amendment it is extremely important that the bill is passed. The amendment in itself does not make the bill undesirable, from my point of view. From the point of view of national security, of providing a good merchant marine fleet, of providing marine environmental protection, and of providing an impetus to an industry that needs some provision made for it, I think this bill does the job.

Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT. I appreciate the Senator's comment. I do not share his conclusion with regard to the Griffin amendment. I think it is regional legislation.

Mr. BEALL. I do, too.

Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT. I feel that we should be thinking about the entire country and not be dividing the country by pitting one section and its commerce against the other. That is what our Founding Fathers had in mind when they formed this country—that we would not have this rivalry between our individual States and sections of the country.

I believe it is a poor amendment that the committee has adopted, and is now a part of the bill. Mr. President, among other arguments that have been brought to my attention are the higher costs for the shipment of the foreign oil in American-flag vessels; I understand it would add to the cost of the final user of residual oil.

The higher costs for oil would be passed on to all of the users, not only of oil, but of electric power.

In Virginia, the Virginia Electric Power Co. which recently received an increase in its rates, an authorized increase by our State Corporation Commission, is now asking for an additional increase. I believe one of the reasons is that the company is paying more for oil to produce the electricity.

We are told by the environmentalists that we must not use coal, that it pollutes the atmosphere, and we have to use oil, and many companies have converted. I hope there will be some reconversion and that we will try to use coal with low sulfur that will not unduly pollute the atmosphere.

We are not talking only about the price of oil; we are also talking about the price of energy in other forms that oil contributes to. The staff tells me that the east coast of the United States will bear the brunt of the added cost of the oil, since the 17 eastern seaboard States consume 70 percent of all of the imported oil during the calendar year 1970; that foreign countries could very well retaliate by requiring that their products be carried in their flag vessels rather than U.S. vessels.

Mr. LONG. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LONG. Is the Senator aware of the fact that this bill provides that of the 15.5 cents import fee that all imports must bear for the oil coming in in American bottoms, 15 cents of that 15.5 cents would be waived?

The Maritime Administration said that by using American labor and American ships, it would cost about 12 cents a barrel more to haul the oil to the eastern seaboard than it would if we were using foreign ships with coolie labor. If we thereby rebate the fee on this 20 percent of oil that would be coming in in American bottoms, does not the Senator recognize that that would then mean that the oil coming in in American bottoms would be cheaper to the consumer here than it would be otherwise?

Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT. Let me say, Mr. President, that the distinguished Senator from Louisiana has me at a disadvantage. He is chairman of the committee. He is much better informed on this proposal in the bill than I am. But I ask him, considering all factors, if we use the American-flag ships, will the cost of oil to the consumer be greater, remain the same, or be less, if he could say?

Mr. LONG. It would be less.

Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT. It would be less?

Mr. LONG. It would be less.

Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT. That is contrary to the information I have received, but I am glad to hear it.

Mr. LONG. Especially would it be less to people using Venezuelan crude, and that is mainly what they are bringing up the eastern seaboard.

Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT. It is not coming from the Middle East?

Mr. LONG. I say it would be a lot less for people using Venezuelan crude. It is estimated that on the average, the cost of bringing oil to the eastern seaboard is about 12 cents a barrel. That is on the average. But it is less than the average for Venezuelan crude, because that is not so far away as the Near East oil is.

As I said to the Senator, there is a fee of 15.5 cents which is charged on all foreign oil coming in now, and this would be waived with regard to the oil coming in in American bottoms. That waiver of that fee should more than offset any cost of using American labor and American materials.

Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT. Mr. President, my staff tells me that use of American vessels will add 4 cents per barrel to the cost for the final user of residual oil. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. LONG. The Senator is estimating one-third of what I am estimating. I am estimating that it is going to cost 12 cents a barrel more to haul this oil in American ships with American labor, which is three times the estimate the Senator just gave me. Our estimate is that it would cost 12 cents a barrel more to bring the oil here, but we would waive a 15-cent fee. By waiving that fee, the consumer would then get the oil 3 cents a barrel cheaper than he is paying for it now.

Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT. Let me ask the distinguished Senator, about the fee, are we talking about an import tax, or what is meant by fee?

Mr. LONG. That is what we are talking about. Under an existing Presidential proclamation relating to the importation of foreign oil, there is levied a fee of 15.5 cents. On the schedule, by the way, it goes up to 21 cents. Of that, we would require that 15 cents of that fee be remitted to those that bring in oil in American bottoms. By doing that, it is our estimate that we more than wipe out any cost increase that could occur by using American working men and American material.

Keep in mind that for every job we provide American seamen bringing oil in here, we provide at least 10 times that many jobs in building the ships, fabricating the material, making the products that go abroad, and transporting it on the railroads back and forth, because most of it does move by rail, to use in building those ships and putting that material aboard those ships. So it is jobs for railroad labor, it is jobs for trucking labor, it is jobs for the workers in the shipyards, it is jobs for everybody who produces electronic equipment, pumps, ventilators, anything else that has to go aboard a ship.

The overwhelming bulk of the jobs, I would say about 90 percent of them, are not on the ship but in making the ship and the materials that go aboard it.

So out of what will be done to help the American working people and help the American economy, most of it is not for the seamen that will sail on the ships that call at Norfolk or some of the U.S. ports; most of that is in the shipyard workers and the steelworkers and the coal workers and the railroad workers and the producers of all the other items that go into construction of the big ships.

In talking about ships, keep in mind that the ships we are talking about cost as much as $100 million, and we would like to manufacture some of them here. We know that one way or another, we will be paying for them.

I point out that the statement that it is Government deficit that is creating inflation will not really hold up, because my best information indicates that all Government funds, including State and local, when added to the Federal Government, actually end up with a Government surplus rather than a Government deficit at the present time.

That is not what created inflation. One of the big things that created inflation is the fact that we have $100 billion of American money kicking around over in Europe, with no way to redeem it, make it good, or repatriate it.

All of this American money that has been spent buying goods and services that should have been spent here, buying goods and services in this country, naturally tends to run up prices of oil, sugar, manganese, copper, tin, coffee, automobiles, electronics—just anything that we buy from abroad, because by devaluing the dollar, it can do nothing else than that when we keep spending all our money overseas with these enormous deficits in balance of payments and balance of trade; that is what is cheapening the dollar to a far greater degree than any deficit created here in Washington, D.C.

Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT. I appreciate the distinguished chairman's comments, and since he appears willing, I would like to pose a few other questions.

I am told that this would create an undesirable precedent, in that other products, perhaps automobiles or grains, should also be carried in American vessels, and there might be retaliation by other nations around the world, that they would put restrictions against us. Could the Senator comment on that?

Mr. LONG. Well, there are two things. First, we are already requiring that certain things be hauled in U.S. bottoms. We require that 50 percent of all of these commodities we give away all over the world be hauled in American bottoms.

Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT. Well, is that not a part of the problem of inflation? The Senator was talking about deficit spending.

Mr. LONG. It does not have anything at all to do with it.

Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT. We can give away $200 billion in foreign aid since World War II, and it has nothing to do with inflation?

Mr. LONG. I am just talking about the transportation part of it.

Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT. All right.

Mr. LONG. If you are going to give away a billion dollars worth of something, at least it does not create as heavy a burden on your deficit if you deliver it in your own ships as it does if you give it away with the other fellow's ships. When the Senator speaks about people insisting that a part of this maritime work be done in our own ships, other countries are doing it already, the oil-importing countries. I have already put that in the RECORD, but here it is. For example, Japan is bringing 47 percent, in fact she requires 47 percent be transported in her bottoms: Korea, 43 percent; France, 38 percent; the United Kingdom, 35 percent; West Germany, 29 percent; and Italy, 23 percent—they are doing it now. As far as these exporting countries insisting that some of this oil be moved in ships owned by them, any time they want to do it they have the power to do it. All they have to do is just tell us, as they did when they boycotted us last winter, or as they did when they quadrupled the price of oil, "If you don't like it, that is just too bad; you just don't get the oil."

They have the power to do it to us any time they want to. But we are in a better position to resist if we have something to say about the transportation of the oil, than we would have just to be completely at everybody's mercy. If these are American-owned ships, flying the American flag, manned by American seamen, subject to laws passed here in the Congress of the United States, if the Arabs try to boycott us tomorrow, at least we could require that the ships bringing every bit of the oil in are owned by the United States, rather than having them do like King Faisal did, and say, "Take those ships and redirect them somewhere else, and don't even let the U.S. Navy have any of that oil." We would at least have much more capacity to say what would happen on these ships that we own, than on ships that are under foreign flags, controlled by the laws of foreign nations, with foreign seamen aboard them.

Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT. I appreciate the Senator's comments. As the Senator probably observed, from the beginning of my remarks, I am in somewhat of a dilemma, on this bill, in deciding between two somewhat conflicting points of view. If the Griffin amendment is included, I shall have no hesitancy in voting against the bill.

Mr. LONG. There will be an effort to strike the Griffin amendment.

Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT. I am glad to hear that.

Mr. LONG. Some of us have some doubts about that amendment, and there will be a motion to strike it. I am not sure it will remain in the bill.

Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT. I appreciate the Senator's comments. Let me ask one or two further short questions of the Senator, if I may.

I am told there would have to be additional bureaucracy or additional government employees to ship the petroleum, and dollars to see that the law is being observed. I note from the report an additional cost estimate of only about $1 million a year; would the Senator comment on any additional employees that might be needed?

Mr. LONG. We do not believe we are going to need that. We believe that the existing agencies with their existing data can provide everything we need in the way of administering this law.

Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT. Would the Senator comment also on whether the shipbuilding industry already has a backlog of orders? I am told that there are 30 tankers on order as a result of a $303.5 million federally subsidized program under the Merchant Marine Act of 1970, and it will be 3 years before they can become current, that they have a 3-year backlog on orders for ships. Is this a fair statement?

Mr. LONG. These kinds of ships are long lead-time items, anyway. From the

time you place a supertanker on order—and some of these are larger than any American shipyards have ever built—you have to expect it is going to take some time from the time you place it on order until you can expect delivery. It may very well be that for this Nation to have on the ocean the kind of merchant marine that we should have, we ought to build more shipyards. If so, more power to them. It may be that we should expand the ones that we have.

In either event, I would point out that when we debate the trade bill, we are going to see more and more that people tend to project the trade of the United States as one in which we will export more and more agricultural commodities and we will import more and more manufactured goods.

There is only one thing wrong with all that; the Senator can figure it out for himself. If that is what the trend is going to be, the Senator and I know that every year, even though we produce more on the farm, we use fewer workers on the farm to do it. Each year American agriculture is more efficient, more mechanized, and uses less labor. As we export farm commodities, and every year, even though we produce more, we hire fewer people to do it, and we import more and more manufactured commodities from abroad, where are we going to find jobs for all of our people? At some point, we are going to have to do just the kind of thing we are talking about, saying, "Here is one area where, if we want to, we can require that some of this trade be in our own ships."

So, in view of the fact that we have to bring all of this oil in, let us insist that some of it be in our ships. Here is this great American merchant marine, at one time the pride of the whole world, at the present time carrying only 6 percent of U.S. foreign trade. That is a pitiful thing to be said of what was once the greatest maritime power on Earth.

This is a step, not a small step but a good step, toward moving us back to being a great maritime power again.

Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT. Mr. President, I agree with the statement that the distinguished Senator has made. As I recall—and I have not checked the record on the House side—I did support the 1970 bill. I believe in a strong merchant marine, and appreciate the comments of the Senator.

In the event, as he suggests, that a motion is offered and adopted to delete section 2, I will probably vote in favor of the bill. If the Griffin amendment is not deleted I might well vote against the entire bill.

My primary concern is section 2, or the committee amendment known as the Griffin amendment.

It provides that section 901(b)(1) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 which requires that 50 percent of the gross tonnage of all U.S. Government——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HELMS). Will the Senator suspend? The Senate is not in order. Senators are asked to take their conversations to the cloakroom. The Senator will not proceed until order is restored.

The Senator may proceed.

Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT. The amendment requires that 50 percent of the gross tonnage of all U.S. Government equipment, materials, or commodities transported on ocean vessels shall be transported on privately owned U.S.-flag commercial vessels to the extent such vessels are available at the range of ports nearest the point where such equipment, materials, or commodities are manufactured or produced.

Mr. President, this is regional legislation. I believe it is against the best interests of the country to pit one State or region against the other. It is not the type of government that we have. That is why some provisions are in our Constitution giving the Federal Government authority to legislation in specific fields on behalf of the entire country.

The committee report states that the purpose of this amendment is to correct a long-standing grievance of the Great Lakes region; namely, that since there is currently no regularly scheduled U.S.-flag vessel service between the Great Lakes and other continents, cargoes originating in the Great Lakes are being diverted to other ranges of ports—Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific—solely because U.S.-flag vessels are available at these ports. Although the committee report further states that the amendment "is not intended to be a cargo routing statute" and infers rather that it is a nonavailability or waiver provision, its effect is to divert traffic to the Great Lakes ports.

I am opposed to this amendment for a number of reasons:

First, U.S.-flag vessels may be forced to go to selected ports to pick up cargoes rather than have the cargoes move to those ports which are customarily served by these vessels. Should the U.S.-flag vessel fail to alter its port for receiving cargo, the Government would be free to ship its cargo on foreign-flag vessels from this selected port. Conceivably, also, should the U.S.-flag vessel on the other hand decide to accommodate the port selected for shipment of the cargo, the rerouting of the traffic very likely would be more costly to the Government and result in a delay in its movement.

Second, because the Department of Defense procures and consolidates its supplies in depots in many instances, to return these supplies to be shipped from the nearest port of their point of manufacture or production would impose an unmanageable and expensive burden on the Department. Private industry would not do anything like this, Mr. President. I also understand that the Department of Defense is opposed to this amendment. The Department has sent me a copy of its letter to the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON) in that regard.

Third, it is incorrect to state that cargoes are diverted to coastal ports solely because U.S.-flag vessels are not available in the Great Lakes since ports are selected by the Department of Defense, for example, on the principle of the lowest overall cost consistent with operational requirements. This is sound traffic management. There is nothing to indicate that shipments by way of the Great Lakes would be consistent with this prinprinciple.

Fourth, although the Maritime Administration advises that presently only 11 U.S.-flag vessels—1 break-bulk and 10 container ships—over 1,000 dead weight tons are capable of transiting the St. Lawrence Seaway, it would appear that the amount of traffic diverted from coastal ports could become significant in the future. In this regard, as a matter of reference, I bring to your attention the fact that for a 12-month period—fourth quarter fiscal year 1973 through the first three quarters of fiscal year 1974—approximately 710,930 measurement tons of Department of Defense cargo moved through the port of Hampton Roads, Va. Of this tonnage, 565,953 measurement tons were for export and 144,997 tons were for import. In addition, a substantial amount of traffic moved through this port on through-bills of lading, arrangements for which were made by freight forwarders or agents of steamship companies.

I urge that the committee amendment adding section 2 to the bill not be adopted by the Senate, but in the event it is adopted, that it be eliminated in a conference with the House of Representatives.

EXECUTIVE SESSION—PROTOCOL TO THE CONVENTION FOR THE INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL FOR THE EXPLORATION OF THE SEA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 3:30 having arrived, the Senate will now go into executive session and proceed to vote on executive V, 93d Congress, first session, Protocol to the Convention for the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea.

The resolution of ratification will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution of ratification was read, as follows:

Resolved, (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein). That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the Protocol to the Convention for the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea, done at Copenhagen on August 13, 1970 (Ex. V., 93-1).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the resolution of ratification on Executive V, 93d Congress, 1st session, the Protocol to the Convention for the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea?

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN), the

Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. McGEE), the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), the Senator from Utah (Mr. Moss), and the Senator from California (Mr. TUNNEY) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT) are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK) would each vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BROCK), the Senator from New York (Mr. BUCKLEY), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. McCLURE), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. PACKWOOD), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT), and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) would each vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 65, nays 0, as follows:

[No. 380 Ex.]

YEAS—65

Abourezk	Hatfield	Nunn
Aiken	Hathaway	Pastore
Allen	Helms	Pearson
Bartlett	Hollings	Pell
Beall	Hruska	Proxmire
Bennett	Huddleston	Randolph
Bible	Hughes	Ribicoff
Brooke	Inouye	Schweiker
Byrd, Harry F., Jr.	Jackson	Scott, Hugh
Byrd, Robert C.	Javits	Scott, William L.
Cannon	Johnston	Sparkman
Case	Long	Stafford
Chiles	Magnuson	Stennis
Clark	Mansfield	Stevens
Cotton	Mathias	Symington
Domenici	McClellan	Talmadge
Dominick	McGovern	Thurmond
Eagleton	McIntyre	Tower
Goldwater	Metzenbaum	Weicker
Gravel	Mondale	Williams
Griffin	Montoya	
Haskell	Muskie	
	Nelson	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—35

Baker	Dole	McClure
Bayh	Eastland	McGee
Bellmon	Ervin	Metcalf
Bentsen	Fannin	Moss
Biden	Fong	Packwood
Brock	Fulbright	Percy
Buckley	Gurney	Roth
Burdick	Hansen	Stevenson
Church	Hart	Taft
Cook	Hartke	Tunney
Cranston	Humphrey	Young
Curtis	Kennedy	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Two-thirds of the Senators present and voting having voted in the affirmative, the resolution of ratification is agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

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

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

APPOINTMENT BY THE CHAIR

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUGHES). The Chair, on behalf of the President of the Senate pro tempore, appoints the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. DOMENICI) to attend the United Nations World Food Conference, to be held in Rome, Italy, November 5–16, 1974.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF POSITION ON VOTE—PROTOCOL TO CONVENTION ON EXPLORATION OF THE SEA

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, because of a flight delay I was not present on the floor until just after completion of the vote on the protocol of the Convention for the International Council for the Exploration of the Sea.

I wish to announce that if present I would have voted "aye."

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Marks, one of his secretaries, stating that the President had approved and signed the following bills and joint resolutions:

On August 22, 1974:

S. 3066. An act to establish a program of community development block grants, to amend and extend laws relating to housing and urban development, and for other purposes.

On August 23, 1974:

S. 3331. An act to clarify the authority of the Small Business Administration, to increase the authority of the Small Business Administration, and for other purposes; and

S. 3782. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to extend through fiscal year 1975 the scholarship program for the National Health Service Corps and the loan program for health professions students.

S.J. Res. 66. Joint Resolution to authorize the erection of a monument to the dead of the 1st Infantry Division, U.S. Forces in Vietnam.

On August 24, 1974:

S. 3919. An act to authorize the establishment of a Council on Wage and Price Stability;

On August 27, 1974:

S. 2957. An act to amend the title of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 concerning the Overseas Private Investment Corporation to extend the authority for the Corporation, to authorize the Corporation to issue reinsurance, to terminate certain activities of the Corporation, and for other purposes;

On August 28, 1974:

S. 3190. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1975 for carrying out the Board for International Broadcasting Act of 1973; and

On August 30, 1974:

S. 2510. An act to establish an Office of Federal Procurement Policy within the Office of Management and Budget, and for other purposes.

S.J. Res. 220. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Doctor William A. M. Burden as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

S.J. Res. 221. Joint resolution to provide for the reappointment of Doctor Caryl P. Haskins as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; and

S.J. Res. 222. Joint resolution to provide for the appointment of Doctor Murray Gell-Mann as citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

On September 3, 1974:

S. 1871. An act to amend the Youth Conservation Corps Act of 1972 (Public Law 92–597, 86 Stat. 1319) to expand and make permanent the Youth Conservation Corps, and for other purposes; and

S. 3703. An act to authorize in the District of Columbia a plan providing for the representation of defendents who are financially unable to obtain an adequate defense in criminal cases in the courts of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Presiding Officer (Mr. HATHAWAY) 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.)

REPORTS ON TRAFFIC SAFETY PROGRAMS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. ABOUREZK) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States transmitting two reports of the Department of Transportation in accordance with the reporting requirements of the Highway Safety and National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Acts, which, with the accompanying reports, was referred to the Committee on Public Works and ordered to be printed. The message is as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

The 1950's and early 1960's were marked by enormous growth in the Nation's highway systems—the number of vehicles which used them and the miles which they traveled nearly doubled. We developed a modern, flexible form of transportation. It was also deadly. Deaths rose from 34,700 in 1950 to top 53,000 in 1966, when the Congress determined that a national effort was needed to contain the runaway slaughter and passed the Highway Safety and National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Acts. The attached reports, which I am transmitting in accordance with the reporting requirements in those acts, describe the various traffic safety programs, with emphasis on activities during 1973.

Without question, the seven-year-old national traffic safety effort has proved beneficial. As will be seen by figure 1 in the motor vehicle safety report, annual deaths among passenger car occupants, which were rising throughout the early 60's, have since leveled off and remained

fairly constant in face of a rise through 1972 in traffic deaths. This is in spite of large increases in mileage driven, number of vehicles, drivers, average speed, and alcohol consumption—to name some of the factors which we know contribute to highway accidents. The overall growth in traffic fatalities is attributable to motorcycle, pedestrian, and bicycle accidents. There is little doubt that our motor vehicle safety standards are saving lives and reducing the severity of injuries.

Improvements in the Nation's highways are also making a major contribution to progress in traffic safety. Since 1967 the death rate per 100 million miles traveled has declined steadily on our modernized roadways.

Although total traffic fatalities remain shockingly high, the fatality rate has declined from 5.5 per 100 million vehicle miles to 4.3—a significant decrease of 22 percent since 1967. Had the 1967 fatality rate continued, almost 72,000 Americans would have been killed in highway accidents in 1973, instead of the estimated total of just over 56,000. This estimated saving of 16,000 lives in a single year represents an enormous financial saving to society in terms of wages, medical costs, legal expenses, and property damage, not to mention human suffering. Such savings would not have come about without the combined efforts of Federal, State, and local officials involved in this national emphasis, as well as private citizens who have supported the program.

In 1973, the lowering of speed limits and other effects of the energy shortage situation had a dramatic impact on highway fatality statistics. During the last two months of the year, as States reduced their speed limits and motorists voluntarily limited their driving, the number of fatalities declined by as much as 25 percent below the November/December 1972 totals in some States. As a result, the Nation as a whole ended the year having lost 2,000 fewer lives than had been projected.

The saving in lives during the past year provides an added incentive for the Government and the Nation to persist in the endeavor to make our vehicles, our highways, and our drivers safer. I am confident that well-managed programs and well-managed use of our resources will continue to have a positive effect in improved highway safety.

GERALD R. FORD.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 4, 1974.*

SCHEDULE OF BUSINESS FOR TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 10, 1974

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, am I correct in stating there is now a 10-minute limitation on the Mondale amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the majority leader a question.

Many of us are faced with the problem next Tuesday of a primary election. Those of us who live in the West will require some advance notice of planning.

I was wondering what the disposition of the leadership might be relative to those of us who have the problem of having to vote next Tuesday in our home States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Well, may I say that this is the first time this year that this matter has come up.

There have been a number of primaries. The joint leadership has done its best to try to protect the rights of the Senators who are unavoidably absent; it would be our intention to do the same this time.

I would point out, though, that the joint leadership would like, if possible, to complete the business of the Senate by October 15. Whether or not we can make it remains to be seen. We do have three appropriation bills yet to consider, we very likely have a trade bill yet to consider.

I would hope some consideration would be given to the Long-Ribicoff catastrophic illness bill as long as it seems that we will not get a national health insurance plan out of the House as of this moment.

So I want to assure the distinguished Senator from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), who has asked for very little in his many years in the Senate, that we will do our best to protect him and others in the matter of voting while they are away.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I might inform the leader, since he is a westerner, too, that the airlines have curtailed transportation rather drastically to the Western States. It is no longer possible for me to fly all night to get back here from Arizona. It used to be possible. The old famous Red Eye from Los Angeles is no longer flying. So when we go west now we are confronted with not just an out-in-the-morning and back-in-the-night, but it is an out-in-the-morning and back-the-next day, or the day after. Those of us who have to be home for September 10th voting probably cannot make it back here much before late in the afternoon of the 11th. If there are just these Bed Check Charlie type of vote we have been having all year, we do not mind missing those. But if it is something really important, we would like to be here. Anything that the leader can do to make sure that we are not caught out in the boondocks when the votes come would be appreciated.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We will do our best. But the leadership has been forced to use these bed-check votes, so-called, to get the Members here in sufficient numbers to comprise a quorum. I would not refer to a vote on the convention which we have just voted upon as a bed-check vote. Anything that this administration sends down to the Senate for consideration and approval must be important.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I grant that. We are used to voting on treaties, and we expect to. I did not want to raise anything in my comments about that. But we have had a lot of funny votes this year that we did not need to have. I just did not want to be in Arizona when you had a really good one.

Mr. MANSFIELD. This calls for a rollcall vote. We cannot vote on this convention any other way.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I know that. I realize that. I am not complaining. I am here. It is when I am not here.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the Senator from Rhode Island.

Mr. PASTORE. The Senator from Arizona has answered the question for me. He claims they could not get back the same day. I was wondering if we could not have an agreement that if there are any votes on next Tuesday, they would not start until 5 o'clock in the afternoon. That would give us a chance to get back.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will observe that under the previous order——

Mr. GOLDWATER. I could not get back before 4:45. I am not complaining as one Senator. There are one or two others, though not many of us. I just wanted to get some idea.

Mr. PASTORE. We have a primary in my State, too. It would be rather inconvenient not to vote. On the other hand, we do not want to lose any votes here.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. What is the parliamentary situation, Mr. President?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I ask unanimous consent——

Mr. PASTORE. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That the unanimous-consent agreement be laid aside temporarily while we discuss this.

Mr. PASTORE. I withdraw my right to object.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. If the majority leader will yield, Mr. President, in our various meetings on this side we have frequently discussed the fact that, with all due respect, since we have no control over the proceedings—and as the distinguished majority leader knows our relationships are of the finest, and nothing has happened or will happen to alter that—from time to time that there do seem to be votes where a certain air of restraint might save some Senators from unavoidably running into a situation where they have to be recorded as absent, when the vote is not of the highest importance. Each Senator can demand, any time he wants, seconds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order. The Senator is entitled to be heard.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Yet on various occasions both the distinguished majority leader and I have indicated that we hoped Senators would not ask for votes on matters where they are unanimous, excepting, of course, treaties; that they will not ask simply because it looks good in their biography that something passed 88 to 0; that they would spare all Senators, particularly at this time shortly before an election, to give Senators a chance to go home, to try to play down votes so as to enable them to be here and, in return, ask of them the consideration that if they must be away—and we can arrange not to have major votes —and yet someone feels there should be a vote on whether or not we need more manhole covers in the District of Columbia, perhaps we can vote on that matter in their absence.

I do not know whether we need more manhole covers in the District of Columbia or not, and I hope nobody will demand seconds on that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. May I say that I personally would wish for fewer rollcall votes. I think we have gone off the deep end on many occasions to have rollcall

votes which were known beforehand to have no opposition. Of course, the treaties and conventions are different. We have to have a rollcall vote on those. But there are so many other votes we have that we could well do without.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. I think we could do well without frivolous, duplicitous, or barratrous votes. I will look up those words after I yield back my time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It sounds like a diet cola.

ENERGY TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ACT OF 1974

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (H.R. 8193) to require that a percentage of U.S. oil imports be carried on U.S.-flag vessels.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Mondale amendment will be considered for 10 minutes equally divided between the distinguished Senator from Minnesota and the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire. Who yields time?

Who yields time? The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. MONDALE. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. President, this amendment is offered by myself, Mr. GRIFFIN——

Mr. COTTON. Point of order, Mr. President. We only have 5 minutes on each side, and I think the Senator should be heard.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is in agreement. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator from Minnesota proposed the amendment. I will yield the rest of my time to those who are against it.

Mr. MONDALE. I yield myself 2 minutes.

This amendment is offered by myself, Mr. GRIFFIN, Mr. HUGH SCOTT, and several other Senators. It is supported by the distinguished manager of the pending measure (Mr. LONG). It is a modest proposal. It would require the Merchant Marine Administration to provide at least 10 percent of the total appropriations for operating subsidies and construction subsidies for shipping under U.S. flag on the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway system.

Since 1970 there has not been a single U.S. flag ship on the Great Lakes. Last year there were 13,000 longshoremen employed on the Great Lakes. This year there are only 3,000.

The number of ships traveling on the Great Lakes has dropped by 50 percent in a single year.

The cargo carried on the Great Lakes is down nearly 60 percent in a single year. From Duluth east to New York, each of these ports which are so very important to the economy and of the entire region have turned from strong, vital parts of the national economy and transportation system into literally ghost towns. It is a tragic and serious situation.

We are trying, through this modest amendment, to get the Maritime Administration to put some minimum focus on the need for including within the Nation's transportation policies an adequate response to the needs of the ports along the Great Lakes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's 2 minutes have expired. Who yields time?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, I have, as I said earlier, every sympathy for the position of the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, and other Senators who represent States adjacent to the Great Lakes. I think that most of us recognize that the Maritime Administration has not given the Great Lakes what most of us feel should be their fair share. In fact, they have not been given much of anything. But, Mr. President, this bill is not the way to remedy this situation. In fact, it sets a precedent which is extremely dangerous.

As one member of the Appropriations Committee—and I would think that other members of the Appropriations Committee would feel the same way—I believe this amendment would write into the law an ironclad provision that whenever an appropriation is made for any kind of subsidy—for construction, operation, or anything else—for the merchant marine, at least 10 percent of it automatically has to go to each of the Great Lakes, Atlantic, Gulf, and Pacific ports.

It sets a bad precedent. The next thing we know, someone will introduce a bill providing that for appropriations made for some other purpose, x percent shall be earmarked.

The part of the budget which is under the control of the Appropriations Committee is small now. Every time you start earmarking, you invite trouble in the future—not necessarily on this bill, but on any bill.

In 1970, when the Great Lakes wanted to be recognized along with the Pacific, Atlantic, and Gulf coasts, I felt that they were entitled to that recognition. I do not think the Maritime Administration has implemented what Congress intended, and I would be willing to vote for some measure that would bring them that recognition, or when they come before our committee, we can do something about it.

However, I feel that this bill sets a dangerous precedent of earmarking funds that go on forever, on every appropriation. Pretty soon we will have all kinds of other funds earmarked.

For that reason, I hope the amendment will not be approved.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HELMS). Who yields time?

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

Mr. COTTON. I yield for 1 minute, if I have any time.

Mr. AIKEN. Does not the Senator from New Hampshire feel that Lake Champlain, which over the years handles millions of tons of foreign cargo, foreign freight, ought to be cut in for at least 5 percent of the handout money?

Mr. COTTON. I love Lake Champlain, but I do not think we should legislate in advance in this way. Let us treat each case as it comes along.

I am most anxious to cooperate in doing something to remedy the situation for the Great Lakes. I think they have been discriminated against. I just object to this amendment, because it puts the whole thing into a vise.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I yield 1 minute to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, speaking as the manager of the bill—and I speak for the distinguished Chairman of the Committee—we see no harm in this amendment. We think it has hopes of realizing for the Great Lakes what all of us hoped would be the case when the St. Lawrence project was built. It does have some flexiblity in it. As I understand, the Secretary could make regulations with regard to this 10 percent.

I ask the Senator if that is not the case—that the Secretary would have the authority to make regulations with regard to the 10 percent feature.

Mr. MONDALE. That is correct.

Basically, the problem is, I say to the Senator from Louisiana and my colleagues, that the administration and the administrator have agreed that more has to be done. They have been agreeing to that for many years, but nothing has been done. This is a modest attempt to try to get them to respond to what we think are the dictates of the 1970 act and to do it without hurting other areas.

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

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 minutes.

Mr. MONDALE. I yield.

Mr. STEVENS. Do I correctly understand that this amendment not only reserves 10 percent to the Great Lakes but also 10 percent to the Atlantic coast and the Pacific coast?

Mr. MONDALE. Yes. We have four seacoasts described in the 1970 act. The only seacoast that has not received a dime of operating construction money under the act has been the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway. This amendment says that each coast must get at least 10 percent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield back the remainder of his time?

Mr. MONDALE. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER All time has been yielded back or used.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), the Senator Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. HART), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr.

McGEE), the Senator fom Montana (Mr. METCALF), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON), and the Senator from California (Mr. TUNNEY), are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT) are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY) would each vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BROCK), the Senator from New York (Mr. BUCKLEY), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. McCLURE), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. PACKWOOD), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY), are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 30, as follows:

[No. 381 Leg.]

YEAS—37

Abourezk	Huddleston	Nunn
Allen	Hughes	Proxmire
Bible	Inouye	Randolph
Biden	Jackson	Schweiker
Byrd, Robert C.	Johnston	Scott, Hugh
Cannon	Long	Sparkman
Chiles	Magnuson	Stennis
Clark	Mansfield	Stevens
Domenici	McGovern	Symington
Dominick	Metzenbaum	Taft
Eagleton	Mondale	Talmadge
Gravel	Montoya	
Griffin	Nelson	

NAYS—30

Aiken	Haskell	Pearson
Bartlett	Hatfield	Pell
Beall	Hathaway	Ribicoff
Bennett	Helms	Scott, William L.
Brooke	Hollings	Stafford
Byrd, Harry F., Jr.	Hruska	Thurmond
Case	Mathias	Tower
Cotton	McClellan	Weicker
Goldwater	McIntyre	Williams
Gurney	Muskie	
	Pastore	

NOT VOTING—33

Baker	Dole	Kennedy
Bayh	Eastland	McClure
Bellmon	Ervin	McGee
Bentsen	Fannin	Metcalf
Brock	Fong	Moss
Buckley	Fulbright	Packwood
Burdick	Hansen	Percy
Church	Hart	Roth
Cook	Hartke	Stevenson
Cranston	Humphrey	Tunney
Curtis	Javits	Young

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MONDALE. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. McINTYRE) be recognized.

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

Mr. MANSFIELD. And that following the Senator from New Hampshire, the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) be recognized to offer an amendment.

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

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, today we are debating a major piece of legislation that will have great effects on my State of New Hampshire and the entire region of New England. Let me say at the outset that I do not believe this legislation is in the best interest of New England, New Hampshire or the United States as a whole. And I want to congratulate my distinguished senior colleague, NORRIS COTTON, for his leadership in opposing this measure.

For many years now New England has been strongly dependent on imported oil to maintain its industry, run its electric generating plants and warm its homes. New England uses more No. 2 fuel oil than the rest of the country, and a major proportion of its residual fuel oil.

In the Northeast we use about 50 percent of its residual fuel oil. Because we are unable to produce all of this fuel in this country, 90 percent is imported. Imports of fuel into the New England area are what make the region hum. It is our lifeline right now, and it is an expensive lifeline.

Mr. COTTON. Mr. President, may we have order in the Chamber? I want to be sure my colleagues hear the Senator's remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

The Senator may proceed.

Mr. McINTYRE. Heating oil in New England used to cost about 20 cents a gallon to the average homeowner. Today, now, this moment the cost is about 40 cents a gallon. Residual fuel oil used to go for about $3.50 a barrel, now it is well over $12 a barrel. These are costs that translate into higher electric bills, sometimes reaching over $100 a month in winter when they were were less than half that 2 years ago.

Because of the high cost of fuel to New England, it seems to me that enactment of this legislation that would require that 30 percent of U.S. oil be imported in U.S.-owned-and-operated ships is not in our region's interest. Estimates that have come to me point out that New England will see its No. 2 fuel oil cost rise by at least 1 cent per gallon if this bill is enacted. That translates out to another 2½ percent price increase on top of the already burdensome increases that our homeowners have paid this year.

What is worse, this bill requires that our homeowners, the people from Waltham, Mass.; Pawtucket, R.I.; Berlin, N.H.; New London, Conn.; Lewiston, Maine; and so on, pay for the security that the Members of this body seem to believe is necessary for the whole country.

We will be the ones that will pay the price for using U.S.-owned ships to transport 30 percent of our imports. And we will be the ones first hurt in these times when prices are rising daily.

I fully understand the concern that the members of this body have for our national security. There is good reason to feel that it is in our best interests to be secure in fuels, but I do not see the argument of forcing one region of the country, in this case the east coast, to pay for the security of us all.

Labor, whom I frequently support, is strongly pushing this bill on the American people. They believe it should be done in the name of national security. Where is the national security, I ask, when you see the people pauperized in the supposed need for control of the fuel supply? Is not there an ulterior motive behind the labor view that we should control our shipping with our own crews?

There is. We have seen, time and again, that an uncompetitive American group will apply for subsidies to maintain its business. In this case, we are seeing the American unions come forth not to maintain themselves, but to increase their income at the expense of the taxpayer. There is no problem in American shipyards, and there should be no problem in crews as our current maritime expansion continues.

In the early years of this decade, the 1970's, we embarked on a program of building U.S. ships, including tankers, that is run by the Maritime Administration. Now that program is going full swing and has cost about $1 billion. But, according to the Secretary of Commerce:

> The current maritime program has already stretched the limits of U.S. shipyard capacity to build large tankers, and the increased demand for such ships resulting from the enactment of H.R. 8193 would force upward the prices of steel and other scarce materials without significantly increasing the rate of tanker construction over the next few years.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator suspend? The Senate is not in order. The Senator is entitled to be heard. The Chair requests Senators to take their conversations to the cloak room.

The Senator may proceed.

Mr. McINTYRE. We do not want to add more inflationary pressures, and more shortages to an economy that is already reeling from lack of basic materials.

Let us go another step further. The proponents of this bill, in the name of national security—and if that is not a farce, I never heard one, Mr. President. I work on the Armed Services Committee, and when we get DOD opposing something that the proponents say is in the interest of national security, something has got to be wrong somewhere.

They would have the American companies own enough ships to transport fuels to this country in the event that other ships of other nations are denied

access to the Middle East supplies that they traditionally import into this country. This is an expensive piece of protection that may not protect us at all.

As I see it, if the Arabs ever reinstitute another embargo such as the one we saw last winter, the chances are pretty slim that they will let American ships come into their ports to load. What is the point of embargoing the ships of other nations that trade with the United States and letting in American ships because they happen to be American owned? There is none.

Additionally, what is the point of building a huge tanker fleet when the Arab nations have already announced that they are considering building their own fleet? Do we want a fleet, and the Arabs have one too. Seems to me there will be a lot of tankers around.

A decision by the largest economic giant of the world to build its own ships will encourage other countries to do the same. The Washington Post, in an editorial on Friday, August 23, noted that:

> If the United States now sets a world-wide precedent for requiring non-competitive national-flag shipping, we may have to live with very unpleasant and costly consequences as other countries enthusiastically follow our lead. It is the exporting country after all which decides which ships to load.

Might the exporting country decide that it will load the ships of nations that are particularly friendly? Not ours?

While I know that the House of Representatives has already passed this legislation, I would like to bring up a few other points.

At a meeting that I attended last spring in Durham, N.H., sponsored by the International Center of New England, the New Hampshire Council on World Affairs and the Squam Lakes Science Center, Carroll L. Wilson, of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, told us some problems that we can face in the future as our energy base changes.

The difficulties we are now having, he said, will compound. We import about 1 million barrels of gasoline a day, he said. This could be cut off if the refiners in Europe are forced to direct their production to domestic needs. If these imports are cut, I ask, what happens to the huge fleet of tankers that we are building. We will end up paying for them whether we can use them or not, and we will have further tied up our shipyards to the extent that we will worsen our position to not even being able to add to our nuclear submarines fleet as required by our defense posture.

We also assume that we will continue to increase our imports. What happens to these tankers if we do not? Consumption of petroleum products is up in this country, and production of crude oil is down, but consumption is not up as much as our figures suggested and production may begin to increase because of the price increases we have seen for oil in this country over the past 2 years.

What I am pointing out, Mr. President, is that we should not set ourselves on a course today that may have major repercussions in the future, and will cost one segment of the country more than another.

While this bill has support from many groups, it lacks support from many others. The administration of President Ford, through the Maritime Administration and the Department of Defense, opposes the bill. The tanker fleet operators, generally, oppose the bill, the terminal operators who store the fuel oppose the bill, the fuel oil dealers oppose the bill, and even Mr. President—believe it or not—the major oil companies oppose this bill.

But foremost, Mr. President, my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from my home State of New Hampshire is against this bill.

I would like to congratulate Senator COTTON for his long and determined vigil against this legislation. He has worked diligently to protect the American consumer from the costs that would come from this attempt to grab jobs at public expense with no public benefit by the unions.

I yield the floor.

AMENDMENT NO. 1812

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I call up my amendment, No. 1812, and ask the clerk to report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

> On page 3, beginning with line 23, strike out all through line 2 on page 4.
>
> Redesignate the following sections of the bill accordingly.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is not a sufficient second.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, this amendment should not take too much time in trying to accommodate our distinguished colleague from Minnesota who has to leave and who wants his position known on this particular amendment.

Specifically it differs from the amendment of the Senator from Minnesota in that my amendment talks about—Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HOLLINGS. I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia (Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, Jr.) be added as a cosponsor.

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

Mr. HOLLINGS. I have offered the amendment to delete section 2 from the Energy Transportation Security Act of 1974. The Senate Commerce Committee has approved this section which was offered by Senator ROBERT GRIFFIN to the House-passed Energy Transportation Security Act, commonly known as the "Oil Import Cargo Preference Bill" which would amend the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, section 901(b)(1) to require Government-impelled export cargoes to move through "the port or range of ports nearest the point where such equipment materials or commodities are manufactured or produced."

Introduced at the behest of Great Lakes ports interests, the Griffin amendment would virtually exclude coastal ports from competing for substantial Eximbank financed, Public Law 480, AID and other Government-backed shipments originating in the Midwestern United States. It is inconsistent with constitutional mandate in article 1, section 9, C16 that—

> No preference shall be given any regulation of commerce * * * to the ports of one State over those of another.

If enacted, the Griffin amendment would cause substantial cargo diversions from coastal ports and result in serious job losses for coastal port area residents dependent on the handling, processing, documentation and promotion of international commerce for their livelihood.

In addition, intrusion by governmental regulation via the Griffin amendment into established, competitive, commercial practice would be inimical to the best interests of American industry. Compelled under the Griffin amendment to ship to the nearest port or port range, the options of the American supplier to provide satisfactory delivery to his customers would be severely reduced as his prerogatives to obtain healthy competition among inland, port and ocean services for his business would be curtailed. Certainly the Griffin amendment runs counter to the goal of maintaining viable service by transportation systems through competitive private enterprise.

The so-called Griffin amendment to H.R. 8193 should be deleted. This amendment would amend section 901(b)(1) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. This section is often referred to as the Cargo Preference Act of 1954 or the 50–50 act.

The 50–50 act defines certain equipment, materials, and commodities which are procured by or contracted for by the U.S. Government or with the assistance of the U.S. Government for a foreign nation, as being Government preference cargo. The act then requires that at least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of such cargo when transported on an ocean vessel must be transported on privately owned U.S.-flag commercial vessels. This 50 percent requirement does not apply when U.S.-flag vessels are not available at fair and reasonable rates.

The 50–50 act has been interpreted by the General Accounting Office and by several agencies and departments that ship cargoes under its provisions, as requiring the shippers of preference cargo to use reasonable efforts to seek out U.S.-flag ships. If for example, U.S.-flag ships do not call at port X, but are available at port Y and can provide the needed service at fair and reasonable rates, the shipper is required to route cargo through port Y to meet the U.S.-flag vessel requirement, even in those instances when port X may be closer to the cargo's origin point.

The Griffin amendment would change existing law so as to provide that foreign-flag ships can be used to carry government generated cargo if a U.S.-flag ship is not available "at the port or range of port nearest the point where such equipment, materials, or commodities are manufactured or produced." Thus, the use of foreign-flag ships would be encouraged even though U.S.-flag ships

were available at fair and reasonable prices at ports not closest to the origin of cargo.

The amendment totally ignores the fact that the fastest, cheapest, most efficient and most natural service is often found at a port not the closest to the origin of cargo. Thus, the amendment creates rather than corrects an inequitable situation.

For a number of reasons, the U.S.-flag cargoliner vessels in the foreign trade and indeed most of their foreign-flag competitors do not call at ports on the Great Lakes, but rather confine their services to tidewater ports located on the east, gulf, and west coasts. The lengthy transit into the Great Lakes, the relatively short shipping season, and size restrictions on vessels made necessary by the locks unfortunately have made providing cargoliner service to and from the Great Lakes uneconomical. This regrettable fact of life has been dramatically underscored through the past months of energy shortage in which there has been a substantial decline in the number of cargoliner vessels calling at Great Lakes ports.

It has been estimated that about 35 percent of all preference cargo tonnage originates in one of the Great Lakes States. However, less than 5 percent of all preference cargoes is shipped through the Great Lakes ports. This has led some to conclude that the Cargo Preference Act mentioned above should be amended to require U.S.-flag vessels to serve at a particular port or groups of ports and if they fail to do so, preference cargo originating in the vicinity of those ports would not have to be transported aboard U.S.-flag vessels. Indeed, this is the thrust of the Griffin amendment, which is clearly designed to increase the volume of preference cargoes being shipped through Great Lakes ports.

This approach, based on the idea that Great Lakes ports are being discriminated against, is clearly erroneous. Great Lakes ports handle less than 5 percent of all commercial exports even though over 35 percent of these exports originate in one of the Great Lakes States. Those ports, in short, receive about the same percentage of preference cargo as they do of commercial cargo.

The reasons why they receive so little commercial are outlined briefly above—ports are uneconomical to serve; can only be reached with small relatively inefficient vessels and are closed 4 months of the year due to ice. In fact, over the past 10 years at least four U.S.-flag operators have started services to the Great Lakes but had to withdraw because of the financial losses they were experiencing—despite the fact that the services were being subsidized by the U.S. Government. It should be obvious that tampering with the Cargo Preference Act will correct none of these fundamental problems.

During the 1969 Great Lakes shipping season, the Department of Defense conducted a test program to determine the economic feasibility of shipping cargo through Great Lakes ports. Despite chartering two U.S.-flag vessels to provide regular service to England and Europe—despite force-feeding of vessels with cargo to insure an optimum load on every voyage—despite a commitment from senior Pentagon officials, including then Secretary Laird, formerly of Wisconsin, to make the test succeed—it was a failure. The results, which were extensively reviewed by the General Accounting Office and by many Members of Congress in addition to the Defense Department, clearly demonstrated that despite the best conditions and intentions, preference cargoes could not be efficiently and economically shipped through Great Lakes ports. They found that it cost $415,000 more than it would have cost to ship through other ports.

The Griffin amendment was included in H.R. 8193 during an executive session of the Senate Commerce Committee. Hearings have never been held on the amendment in either the House of Representatives or the Senate. Indeed, insofar as it is known, there has never been any study, discussion, or analysis of the pros and cons of this sweeping change in longstanding law.

The enactment of the Griffin amendment would have the effect of forcing Government-sponsored cargoes onto foreign ships. Thus, it would frustrate the goals and objectives of the Merchant Marine Act of 1970 and do serious damage to segments of the U.S.-flag fleet. Legislation, particularly legislation as important as this, should not be enacted until careful study and thorough hearings have created a record upon which the judgment of its merits and demerits can be made.

The Great Lakes Senators and House Members are constantly besieged by their particular constituency for unnatural, uneconomic, unserviceable, unconstitutional preferences.

Look at the particular committee conference report on the Members' desks; we get to where we vote on everything. We had hearings and everything else. But without any hearings, record vote or otherwise, this was accepted at the last minute when many of us had to be at other committee meetings and, in essence, really adulterates the actual thrust of this bill, which is a cargo preference for all of the United States, all of the several States of this particular Republic.

So if we can build up a capability in this energy crisis of carrying oil, at least 20 percent carriage capability, and not just rely totally on foreign flags, instead of doing that it comes around and says that we have got to go to the nearest domestic American-flag lines, and they are in business for profit, then it goes over to the foreign-flag vessel. So what starts off at this very moment a cargo preference carriage act for the United States of America becomes under the Griffin amendment a cargo preference for foreign-flag vessels.

This is all in the spirit of helping out our great State of Michigan.

I would like to, and we did not put up a great howl because we still question what the Senator from Minnesota has just done; he gave it 10 percent, but he gave it in sort of constitutional terms. The Senator just gave it all around and tried to give at least a 10 percent allocation to each one of them, knowing all along he is only getting 5 percent through the regular laws of supply and demand and shipping economy.

So if that sustains in conference—I doubt if it sustains on the House side—but if that sustains, very cleverly what sounded like grandiose or equal justice under law, I think, everybody being treated equally, at least 10 percent, taken away from the Gulf and Eastern Seaboard, at least a 5 percent gross amount put through the Great Lakes.

As the Senator from Minnesota, and I am sure the Senator from Michigan would point out, this is particularly a serious matter because of the energy crisis.

I do not know whether the gentlemen have been up to the Great Lakes, I wish they would have traveled as I did just 3 years ago at this time. At this time of year, there was no ice or fog. But to go through the locks, we are limited by size of the vessel.

I had the opportunity to be on and to help pilot a particular vessel, but only certain private boats can get in, a certain number, and sometimes a big cargo vessel has to wait.

So we have the time factor, we have the size factor, and then, of course, we have the geographical factor, because cargo is one closer to my port of Charleston, S.C., than New York, you only have to look at the geography, and if we are shipping a lot of farm machinery down to our markets for the United States, the Latin American markets, they all go through New Orleans, they go through the Port of Charleston and the eastern seaboard.

But coming on down by truck and rail, carriers to the eastern ports are much faster, more efficiently handled, more economically handled, and that is the way it goes. Of course, finally, 4 months out of the year they are not even in business up there in that particular area.

So what we are trying to do—by law, politicians say—is this. Here is a port that is not a port 4 months out of the year; it just does happen to be, we cannot make apples out of oranges.

It is a burden, particularly with respect to oil preference cargo where we are going into the supertankers.

The Senator from Louisiana, the distinguished chairman handling this bill, knows that particular vessel is not going to be able to get there and be carried.

As I have previously discussed, section 901(b)(1) of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936 has since 1954 required that at least 50 percent of Government-generated cargoes move on U.S.-flag ships. This section was enacted in the belief that it is only reasonable that when our Government acts as shipper, it should move at least half of its cargo on our national-flag ships so as to promote the objectives found in the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. Many foreign governments move all of their government-generated cargoes on their national-flag vessels. These objectives are set out in section 101 of that act in a declaration of policy which states in part:

It is necessary for the national defense and

development of its foreign and domestic commerce that the United States shall have a merchant marine sufficient to carry . . . a substantial portion of the waterborne export and import foreign commerce . . . to provide shipping services essential for maintaining the flow of such domestic and foreign waterborne commerce at all times, (b) capable of serving as a naval and military auxiliary in time of war and national emergency.

The proponents of the Griffin amendment urge, we believe, that their intent is not to divert Government cargoes to foreign-flag ships, but to encourage a greater supply of U.S.-flag shipping in the Great Lakes. However, as I have stated before, the lengthy transit into the Great Lakes, the relatively short shipping season, and the size restrictions on vessels made necessary by the locks, unfortunately have made providing cargoliner service to and from the Great Lakes uneconomical. I do not believe that U.S.-flag cargoliner service would generally result from the Griffin amendment and furthermore, this amendment would cause a substantial diversion of Government cargoes to foreign vessels even though more efficient and economic U.S.-flag vessels were available at other ports. Thus, the amendment would be contrary to the purpose and intent of the Cargo Preference Act of 1954 and of the purpose and intent of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936.

So right to the point, we hope that this particular Griffin amendment, actually put on at the very last minute, without hearings, without debate, and certainly, in my opinion, unconstitutionally added, will be deleted from the bill so that we will have a good Cargo Preference Act.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, permit me to say to the Senator that I will support his amendment.

Since having voted for the Griffin amendment in committee, I have been called to task by shipping people from Louisiana and elsewhere in the country. I have not been able to defend the amendment.

For example, here is an advertisement by the Fesco Lines, Far Eastern Shipping Co., Vladivostok, U.S.S.R. These people are advertising their new shipping service. They say, "Meet the new kids on the block."

In seeking business, they advertise they hope to do business through their offices in Milwaukee, Detroit, Duluth, Cleveland, and Toledo, and offer sailing schedules out of Chicago, Milwaukee, Detroit, Toledo, and Cleveland.

I did not know that under the Griffin amendment cargo which ordinarily would have been destined for New Orleans, Baltimore, Savannah, or New York, or somewhere, such as U.S. AID cargo under Public Law 480, and cargo of that sort, is to be put instead aboard these Russian ships.

I thought I was voting for something at the time that would not be 100 percent inconsistent with the philosophy of the bill, as the Senator so well pointed out.

The bill is to help U.S. shipping and the amendment is one that hurts U.S. shipping. The Hollings amendment, I think, is necessary if the bill is to be consistent in trying to see to it that we maintain a certain stature and try to move forward toward placing the American merchant marine back in the fine position that it once occupied, rather than moving away from that position.

I believe that is the case now for the majority of us on the committee. Of course, the rollcall will show, when we call the vote.

I discussed this with the chairman of the committee (Mr. MAGNUSON). He voted for the amendment, and I believe he felt the same way I did about it, that we simply did not have adequate time to study it and we were anxious to report the bill.

Having had the opportunity to study it, and having seen what the reaction was from people who understood it a lot better than we did, we feel that we could support the Hollings amendment to strike this from the bill.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I think at this point it will be well to place in the RECORD a letter in its entirety from the Honorable John K. Tabor, the Under Secretary of Commerce.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE UNDER SECRETARY OF COMMERCE,
Washington, D.C., September 3, 1974.

Hon. ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: This is in reply to your request of August 21, 1974, for the views of this Department on the possible detrimental effects of section 2 of H.R. 8193, as reported by the Senate Commerce Committee.

Section 2 would alter existing cargo preference legislation (Section 901(b)(1) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, 46 U.S.C. 1241) by providing that the determination of availability of privately owned U.S.-flag commercial vessels to carry Government-impelled cargoes shall be made "at the range of ports nearest the point where such [cargoes] are manufactured or produced." If U.S.-flag vessels were not available at such nearest range of ports, the cargo could then be transported on foreign-flag vessels.

A literal reading of section 2 would force vessels to go to the "range of ports nearest the point where [Government-impelled cargoes] are manufactured or produced" to pick up such cargoes rather than require such cargoes to be routed to the ports which are customarily served by privately owned U.S.-flag commercial vessels. If U.S.-flag vessels did not offer service at the "range of ports" indicated, the Government agency would have a strong inducement to transport cargo reserved under the existing legislation for U.S.-flag vessels on foreign-flag vessels. We are aware that the report of the Senate Committee on Commerce contains contradictory language to the effect that the section "does not require that cargo move through the nearest range of ports." (See S. Rept. No. 93-1031, 93rd Cong. 2d Sess., 35 (1974).

The literal reading of the section causes a serious conflict with existing cargo preference statutes. This conflict would be most detrimental to the shipment of military cargoes. Military cargoes are required by the 1904 Cargo Preference Act (10 U.S.C. 2631) to be carried in U.S.-flag vessels. The Comptroller General held in 48 Comp. Gen. 429 (1968) that this Act requires that military cargoes either be routed to ports served by U.S.-flag ships, or that the Department of Defense attract U.S.-flag ships to other ports where the cargo is directed for shipment. Section 2 of the bill would require military cargoes to be routed to the range of ports nearest to the place of manufacture or production. The resulting dilemma could be solved only by adopting one of the costly and inefficient alternatives. Military cargoes could be accumulated so as to induce U.S.-flag vessels to call at the designated port, or U.S.-flag vessels could be routed to pick up small lots at each of a number of ports which they normally do not serve. The not effect of either alternative would be to disrupt present cargo routings, which are the product of decades of cargo trends and transportation experience. Transportation efficiency would be ignored. The resulting higher costs would be borne by the U.S. taxpayer, while the inevitable delays in supplying our armed forces abroad would undermine our national security.

Another detrimental effect of the "range of ports" requirement applicable to all Government-impelled cargoes would be added shipment costs and time delays since the nearest port may not be served by the appropriate intermodal facilities, have the most suitable loading and discharging capabilities or be served by the optimum ships for the transportation involved. Likewise, the requirement could have an adverse effect on distribution systems, such as existing rail, barge and truck service, that are used to marshal Government-impelled cargoes from the points of origin to the loading ports. In this era of efficient and economical intermodal transportation systems and facilities, the routing of cargo based on a standard of the distance from the point of manufacture or production to a range of loading ports is an anachronism. Applied only to Government-impelled cargoes this concept is anomalous to the developments that have occurred and are continuing with respect to the transportation of commercial export cargoes that have resulted in more efficient and cost effective cargo movements.

Finally, it should be noted that the "range of ports" requirement would not provide significant benefits to the U.S.-flag merchant marine in the Great Lakes area, since only a very limited number of U.S.-flag commercial vessels can transit the St. Lawrence Seaway fully laden.

As you know, this Department has strongly opposed enactment of H.R. 8193 in the form in which this act was passed by the House of Representatives on May 8, 1974. We do not view the proposed legislation that has been reported to the Senate as an improved version. The many amendments to the legislation that were added by the Senate Commerce Committee, including section 2 which your amendment would delete, do not alter our opposition to this unwise legislation.

Please advise if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely,

JOHN K. TABOR.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I would like to quote a couple of passages from that letter. I do not want to mislead. This does not change, as I understand it, the administration's position in its opposition to the particular provisions of the Cargo Preference Act, that is, the bill in its entirety. But barring that, the distinguished Under Secretary goes right to the heart, and he says:

> The literal reading of the section causes a serious conflict with existing cargo preference statutes. This conflict would be most detrimental to the shipment of military cargoes.

He goes into how military cargoes are protected under the 1904 Cargo Preference Act, and says it is entirely too costly.

Another detrimental effect of the "range of

ports" requirement applicable to all Government-impelled cargoes would be added shipment costs and time delays.

Finally, it should be noted that the "range of ports" requirement would not provide significant benefits to the U.S.-flag merchant marine in the Great Lakes area—

I do not know but what, if this particular amendment is maintained, the President would have to veto this bill. It would be an unnatural situation on this closeness of range of ports. It would be something that would have to pass unnoticed to him.

I am sure he has a notification of it now.

I know our distinguished friend from Michigan has no idea of injuring military cargoes and going to the most expensive route.

I yield to the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I want to say a word in support of the amendment of the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

Section 2 of the committee bill does not relate, of course, to the title of the bill or the purpose of the bill regarding energy transportation. It would, in effect, have an enormous effect upon the agricultural commodities and the export of various food assistance programs.

It would require not only that a certain percent of exports be in American bottoms, and also the nearest range of ports. But the truth of the matter is that the internal transportation system within this country has now been developed over a period of time to provide by the most practical means, the most economic means, the most efficient means of transportation of food grains and feed grains through river transportation and unit trains.

I merely want to put into the RECORD now some of the statistics from the various States as to the range of ports now being used. In the State of Iowa, 85 percent of the food grains are shipped from the gulf ports; from Missouri, 100 percent; from Kansas, 90 percent.

The gulf coast receives about 70 percent of the export grains from South Dakota, while the east coast receives 55 percent of production from Ohio and Indiana destined for overseas markets.

What this amendment would do in section 2 of the bill, it seems to me, would be to disrupt a highly developed internal transportation system for food and feed grains which has been developed over a long time, providing for the most economical means, the most efficient means, and the most practical means for grain transportation.

Mr. President, I support the amendment proposed by the distinguished Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) to strike section 2, the so-called "Great Lakes provision" from the pending cargo preference legislation.

H.R. 8193 is offered as a bill to require petroleum products to be imported on U.S.-flag commercial vessels. The short title is the "Energy Transportation Security Act of 1974." But section 2 of the bill, as reported by our Committee on Commerce, has nothing to do with energy transportation. This section deals primarily with transportation of U.S. agricultural commodities destined for export under various food assistance programs.

Under the terms of the committee bill, the exporting company must look to the nearest "range of ports" from the point of production for transportation of Government owned or financed grain. This simply means that food and feed grains produced in those States which lie closer to the lakes than any coastal facilities must be shipped from the lakes if transportation facilities are available. Under this bill, the cargo preference associated with food-for-peace consignments takes on a new dimension: the exporter is told not only that his consignment must be shipped on U.S. bottoms, but also that his consignment must be shipped from the range of ports nearest to the producing region.

Mr. President, the economics of internal transportation of grain destined for export have reached an advanced state of development. The comparatively low cost of river transportation and the economic advantages of unit train operation have overcome geographic proximity as the controlling factors for determining ports of embarkation. Thus, only a small proportion of our exported grain is moved from the Great Lakes ports although they are closest to the producing regions of most of the corn and wheat grown in the United States.

The following statistics are relevant in understanding the internal movement of grain for eventual export. About 50 percent of the Minnesota export production is shipped from the gulf coast; Iowa ships 85 percent from the gulf; Illinois about 70 percent; Missouri 100 percent; and Kansas 99 percent. The gulf coast receives about 70 percent of the export grain from South Dakota, while the east coast receives 55 percent of the production of Ohio and Indiana destined for the overseas market.

Under the terms of section 2 of the committee bill, the economies of transportation which would have established this pattern would be overturned by legislative fiat regardless of the fact that it is more efficient and practical to move grain from the gulf and east coast ports. The bill would require those shipments subject to the preference to be transported from the lakes.

Mr. President, I support the amendment by Mr. HOLLINGS to delete section 2 of the committee bill. I believe it is unjustified and imposes burdens upon the internal transportation system which it has not been designed to accommodate. Enormous investment has been made in gulf coast and east coast port facilities to accommodate our grain trade. The transportation system has been designed to manage volumes of traffic to these ports. It is unreasonable and unrealistic to conclude that the Senate, by fiat and without the benefit of hearings or superficial analysis, can defy historic experience and the traditional pattern of commerce without severe economic repercussions and inefficiencies resulting from such a mandate as contained in section 2 of the committee bill.

Mr. President, the Senate would be well advised to approve the Hollings amendment and thus limit the mischief done by H.R. 8193 to the transportation of petroleum products. If there is any justification for mandating grain traffic out of the lakes by Federal edict, then that issue properly should be addressed separately in separate legislation.

I hope the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina will be accepted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, I realize that this amendment points up a certain amount of competition among various regions of our country. The only thing that the so-called Griffin amendment seeks to do—is to give the Great Lakes—St. Lawrence Seaway area a fair and equal opportunity. It does not seek any preference for the area.

It does seek to do something about the discriminatory application and implementation of the existing cargo preference law.

Several unintentional inaccuracies have crept into the debate, and I should like to correct them, at least for the RECORD.

The Senator from South Carolina said that the amendment refers to "the port or range of ports."

There is an important technical difference that should be noted. The Griffin amendment refers to a "range of ports"—a whole group of ports—rather than to a single nearest port.

Furthermore, it was suggested by the distinguished Senator from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) in his argument that the Griffin amendment would require that cargo be routed through the nearest range of ports. The fact is that the present 50–50 law places a restriction on the right of a Government agency to ship its cargoes by whatever means it chooses. The proposed amendment would not add further restrictions but, instead, would give an agency more discretion in routing cargo if U.S. vessel were not available at the range of ports nearest the point of cargo manufacture or production.

As the committee report clearly states, the amendment is not intended to be a cargo routing statute. Whether or not a U.S.-flag vessel is available at the nearest range of ports, the shipping agency can still route the cargo through any port it chooses, based on normal factors governing routing.

The principal normal factors governing routing are economics. If it were not economically advantageous to route cargo through the Great Lakes, even after the adoption of the so-called Griffin amendment if it were to remain in the bill, there would be no mandatory requirement that such cargo would have to go through Great Lakes ports.

It has also been suggested or argued that the Griffin amendment would apply to and affect military cargoes. This is not true. Shipments of military cargo

are governed by a 1904 act which requires that 100 percent of such cargo be shipped in U.S. vessels.

The basic law to which the Griffin amendment applies does not affect military cargo. That should be made clear in the legislative history.

Mr. President, the Mondale amendment pointed to the need for a positive program to construct U.S.-flag ships for seaway traffic. The absence of a positive program to bring U.S.-flag overseas shipping into the lakes has been bad enough. But, incredibly, Federal maritime officials have actually promoted the diversion of cargo away from Great Lakes ports, because there is no U.S.-vessel service.

For example, at a National Maritime Council dinner in Detroit last October, local shippers were urged by the Assistant U.S. Maritime Administrator for Commercial Development to channel their exports to U.S.-flag vessels, according to an article in the October 5 edition of the Detroit News. That article also pointed out the following:

> The dinner was paid for by the Federal Maritime Administration, three unions, and 12 American operators of ocean ships, who cooperated in the effort to sell Detroit area shippers on the use of American ships.
>
> The appeal to Detroit area shippers might have appeared to be misplaced since none of the American operators paying for the dinner provides ocean vessel service from Detroit.

This discriminatory policy is also reflected in the administration of the 50-50 cargo preference law. Under that law at least 50 percent of foreign aid shipments must be carried in American-flag vessels to the extent that such vessels are available at reasonable prices. Agricultural commodities constitute the largest portion of these shipments and much of it originates in the Midwest and the Great Lakes region.

However, in the last 4 years there has been a precipitous decline in the volume of this cargo moving through Great Lakes ports. For example, in 1971 approximately 44 percent of cargo originating in the midwestern agricultural States under title II of Public Law 480 was shipped overseas via the seaway. Through June of this year the Great Lakes share had dropped to only 14 percent, or more than a threefold reduction.

Because most of this is general cargo, and therefore labor intensive, the effect on employment at Great Lakes ports has been devastating. It is my understanding that man hours of employment at Detroit ports are down about 40 percent this year over last, and this is typical of the situation throughout the Great Lakes.

So far this year the number of ocean going vessels calling at Great Lakes ports is off by more than 50 percent and the diversion of government cargo away from Great Lakes ports is driving foreign-flag vessels out of the lakes. The number of regularly scheduled foreign liner services is down by more than 100 percent from 22 in 1972 to 10 in 1974.

In the Merchant Marine Act of 1970, Congress sought to provide for a more equitable administration of the 50-50 cargo preference law by directing the Secretary of Commerce to establish regulations governing the administration of the cargo preference law by the various Federal agencies.

As the Commerce Committee stated in its report on that legislation, the change in the law was needed to correct—

> [a] lack of uniform and rational administration has worked to the disadvantage of shippers, carriers, and *geographic areas of our nation. . . .*" (Emphasis added)

It is rather ironic that one of the intended beneficiaries of that provision, tended beneficiaries of that provision—the Great Lakes region—is actually worse off today than it was in 1970.

Because this congressional mandate for greater fairness in the administration of the cargo preference law has not been followed, I offered an amendment in the Commerce Committee to the pending bill to correct this practice. As agreed to by the committee, the amendment simply provides that the 50 percent U.S.-flag requirement may be waived if U.S. vessels are not available at the range of ports nearest to where the cargo is manufactured or produced.

Thus, if U.S. vessels are not available at Great Lakes ports, cargo originating out of that region may be shipped through the seaway without regard to the 50-percent limitation. The amendment does not require that preference cargo be shipped through a particular port range. It only means, as the committee report clearly states, that—

> Cargo will not be diverted from a range of ports solely because a U.S.-flag vessel is not available there, but is available elsewhere.

In many instances this diversion leads to higher transportation costs. The Department of Agriculture, in a June 6 letter to Senator COTTON which is included in the hearing record, pointed out that the cost of using U.S.-flag vessels frequently is 100 percent higher than the comparable cost of using foreign-flag vessels.

While I recognize that some of my colleagues from coastal States may be concerned about this amendment, the impact on those States should be minimal. For instance, a doubling of agricultural aid commodities shipped through Great Lakes ports represents only about 1½ percent of all exports of preference cargo. Furthermore, the amendment would not affect military cargo or Export-Import Bank financed shipments, which are governed by other laws.

Without some relief for the Great Lakes, I could not support the pending measure. Adding yet another Government subsidy to induce the construction of more U.S. tankers, is of no benefit to Great Lakes shipping. None of the modern tankers are even capable of "fitting" into the seaway locks. My amendment and the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Minnesota (Mr. MONDALE) will help to assure that Federal maritime policy takes into account the shipping needs of all regions and port areas.

The importance of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Seaway transportation system was initially recognized when Congress appropriated $130 million to open the seaway in 1959. In 1966 the Secretary of Commerce determined that several trade routes from Great Lakes ports were essential to the foreign commerce of the United States.

In 1970 the existing seaway interest debt of approximately $23 million was canceled and that same year Congress authorized nearly $10 million to demonstrate the feasibility of winter navigation in the Great Lakes. That program was extended for 2 more years in 1973.

If this investment is to pay off every effort must be made to establish a competitive American-flag overseas fleet in the Lakes. Conflicting Federal policies that discourage use of the seaway must be changed.

Unfortunately, those of us in the Great Lakes area know from past experience how difficult it is to get these policies changed without legislation. Regrettably that is the case today.

Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to vote against the Hollings amendment—which would strike out the Griffin amendment.

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

Mr. GRIFFIN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I commend the Senator from Michigan for his leadership in what I think is a long overdue proposal in the entire Great Lakes maritime problem.

I would extend my remarks further, were it not for the fact that a time problem is involved.

I also point out a further discrimination that is intimately connected with this matter, and I am sure the Senator has mentioned this in his remarks. The discrimination situation with respect to the Great Lakes ports is one that I have talked about in the Senate and in the House over a period of 4 or 5 years. It is clear that not only are we being discriminated against so far as the maritime laws are concerned but also in getting the products to those ports. I realize that we cannot correct that here today, but we can take a small step forward to do something about giving recognition to this problem. I think the Senator's amendment is very much in order, for that reason, and I certainly am going to oppose any attempt to strike it from the bill.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I disagree with those who feel that there has been discrimination. I do not think there is any discrimination whatever in this law at this time. In fact, the constitutional provision, article I, section 9, clause 6, prohibits that. Those who want to discriminate and give a preference should first move to amend that particular section of the Constitution.

Second, while the distinguished Senator from Michigan is very thorough and not only had the amendment adopted but also the language in the report modified to fit his particular intention and need, the fact is that the Under Secretary of Commerce, the Honorable John K. Tabor, states that regardless of that language—

> We are aware that the report of the Senate Committee on Commerce contains contradictory language to the effect that the section is not a cargo routing measure.

But, in essence, a literal reading of section 2 would force those vessels in cargo preference fashion, which would be discriminatory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NUNN). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator Michigan (Mr. HART), the Senator from Massachusetts Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. MCGEE), the Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF), the Senator from Utah (Mr. MOSS), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON), the Senator from California (Mr. TUNNEY), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), and the Senator from Georgia (Mr. TALMADGE) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT) are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. BURDICK), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON), and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY) would each vote "nay."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT), the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BROCK), the Senator from New York (Mr. BUCKLEY), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOK), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. DOLE), the Senator from Arizona (Mr. FANNIN), the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. HANSEN), the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. MCCLURE), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. PACKWOOD), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH), and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. YOUNG) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. FONG) and the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) are absent on official business.

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

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 13, as follows:

[No. 382 Leg.]

YEAS—52

Abourezk	Cannon	Gurney
Aiken	Case	Haskell
Allen	Chiles	Hatfield
Bartlett	Cotton	Hathaway
Beall	Domenici	Helms
Bible	Dominick	Hollings
Brooke	Eagleton	Hruska
Byrd,	Ervin	Huddleston
Harry F., Jr.	Goldwater	Inouye
Byrd, Robert C.	Gravel	Jackson
Johnston	Pastore	Stafford
Long	Pearson	Stennis
Magnuson	Pell	Stevens
Mathias	Randolph	Symington
McClellan	Ribicoff	Thurmond
McIntyre	Scott,	Tower
Muskie	William L.	Weicker
Nunn	Sparkman	Williams

NAYS—13

Clark	Metzenbaum	Schweiker
Griffin	Mondale	Scott, Hugh
Hughes	Montoya	Taft
Mansfield	Nelson	
McGovern	Proxmire	

NOT VOTING—35

Baker	Curtis	McClure
Bayh	Dole	McGee
Bellmon	Eastland	Metcalf
Bennett	Fannin	Moss
Bentsen	Fong	Packwood
Biden	Fulbright	Percy
Brock	Hansen	Roth
Buckley	Hart	Stevenson
Burdick	Hartke	Talmadge
Church	Humphrey	Tunney
Cook	Javits	Young
Cranston	Kennedy	

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to.

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

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I rise today to reaffirm my strong support for H.R. 8193 as amended. In so doing, I would like to commend Senator LONG, chairman of the Subcommittee on Merchant Marine of the Commerce Committee, and the members of his subcommittee for the conscientious job they did during the hearings on this legislation as well as all the members of the full committee for their contribution during our deliberation and markup of the bill.

The testimony presented at the subcommittee's hearings showed conclusively that the enactment of this legislation would result in numerous benefits for the United States. The use of American-flag tankers to carry a percentage of our oil imports as required by H.R. 8193 as amended would among other things strengthen our security, provide jobs for Americans in shipbuilding and allied industries and on board ship and improve our balance of payments posture.

In addition, H.R. 8193 as amended affects another area that I, as a U.S. Senator and an American citizen from the Northwest region of our country, have been extremely interested in—the struggle to preserve and protect our Nation's marine environment.

Every Member of this body is fully aware of the continuing and growing concern in the United States over the risks facing our waters, coastlines, and sea life from the carriage of oil in tankers. As the United States increases the amount of oil it imports, the potential for damage likewise rises. Not only will the probability of pollution from accidents in our ports and harbors be greater as the number of tankers increase, but pollution from the normal operations of tankers, which already account for more than half of the oil pollution problem. will likewise increase.

I am proud, therefore, that the Commerce Committee acted to amend the legislation we are now considering so as to make it the latest in a series of American environmental protection measures. H.R. 8193 as amended by the committee goes further than any legislation enacted to date to insure that America's marine environment will be protected as much as possible against both intentional and accidental oil pollution.

This legislation requires that U.S.-flag tankers constructed to carry oil under the provisions of H.R. 8193 be built using the best available pollution technology, including a segregated ballast-double bottom system. The segregated ballast-double bottom system has long been considered by the U.S. Coast Guard as the best means for eliminating intentional oil pollution. In fact, a report prepared by the Coast Guard under the authority of the Ports and Waterways Safety Act (P.L. 92–340) and presented in June, 1973, concluded, and I quote:

> . . ships incorporating the segregated ballast and double bottom feature were definitely the best alternative from a pollution abatement/cost point of view.

Significantly, this concept, advanced by the Coast Guard as well as the Environmental Protection Agency, and incorporated into H.R. 8193 by the Senate Commerce Committee, was rejected by other maritime nations at last year's International Conference on Marine Pollution.

The international rejection of strict environmental standards prompted the Commerce Committee to rightfully conclude that the United States, to preserve and protect its marine environment, will have to act unilaterally. The committee also noted that it would be meaningless to adopt environmental safeguards if only foreign flagships, as is the case today, carry the bulk of our oil imports. The United States has virtually no control whatsoever over a foreign flagship, and none over its construction and manning. Only if a foreign flag offender puts into a U.S. port can he be penalized under our national laws. If he, however, dumps oil and then heads out into international waters, the only recourse available to the United States is to make a complaint to the nation whose flag the vessel flies.

The United States now receives one-half of its oil imports in the flag of convenience vessels of Panama and Liberia. Figures compiled by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, OECD, demonstrate that when compared to OECD fleets, including that of the United States, losses for Liberian flag vessels are twice as high and for Panamanian vessels, three times as high.

The U.S. Coast Guard is not able to regulate foreign-flag vessels as it does the U.S. fleet. It has no jurisdiction over the manning of foreign vessels or for the inspection of such vessels; nor is it able to assess foreign standards of crew competency.

In contrast, American-flag vessels are manned by crews which are highly trained and stringently and frequently tested by the Coast Guard. Adding to this and the already strict Coast Guard imposed construction standards, the pro-

visions of H.R. 8193 as amended make U.S.-flag tankers among the most environmentally safe vessels in the world.

In addition to requiring that new vessels be constructed using the best available pollution technology, the legislation specifically excludes from its provisions U.S.-flag vessels either older than 20 years or reconstructed but beyond their economic lives. In so doing, tankers with deteriorating equipment and less modern safeguards will be systematically replaced by U.S.-flag tankers containing the equipment necessary to best protect our environment.

In closing, Mr. President, I would like to remind my colleagues that in the past, when we considered environmental legislation, concern was expressed as to whether Americans would lose their jobs, and whether the American people would, as a result, experience higher prices. I am pleased to note that with respect to H.R. 8193 as amended, the entire maritime industry—labor and management, shipbuilding and seafaring—not only supports the legislation but has unequivocably stated that the environmental safeguards for U.S. vessels, which are already high, can and will be strengthened; that this legislation, while protecting our environment, will make jobs for Americans in the shipbuilding and seafaring and allied industries, not take them away; and that the American people will, through the other provisions of H.R. 8193 as amended, experience no higher price for their oil through the use of U.S.-flag tankers.

It is rare indeed that this body has the opportunity to enact legislation that not only adds to the protection of our environment but affords the Nation numerous other benefits, all at no cost to the American people. We have that opportunity now with H.R. 8193 amended.

THE ENERGY TRANSPORTATION SECURITY ACT—A CONNECTICUT PERSPECTIVE

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, after carefully considering the arguments on both sides, I shall vote against the pending bill, H.R. 8193—the Energy Transportation Security Act. Since the Senate last considered this issue 2 years ago, the energy situation—both in terms of availability and price—have changed drastically. And the reasons for rejecting this bill have become all the more compelling.

On the basis of the evidence presented this legislation will not only be inflationary but substantially increase the cost of oil products for consumers in Connecticut and New England.

While various sets of figures have been presented, it is apparent that there will be significant additional costs involved if 30 percent of U.S. oil imports is required to be moved in U.S.-flag vessels.

One estimate made by the FEA is that there will be an increased transportation cost of between 0.3 to 1 cent per gallon on all imports—with the upper end of the estimate being the more likely. If all price controls are removed in the future, the price of domestic oil will increase to a parity with the delivered price of foreign oil including the higher cost of using U.S.-flag tankers. Thus, with a projected oil consumption of 25 million barrels per day in the 1980's the total cost to U.S. consumers could be $1.2 to $4.2 billion per year.

The New England Fuel Institute, representing 1,300 independent heating oil distributors has informed me that:

> The requirement that 30 percent of all oil imports be carried on U.S.-flag vessels will overtax to the utmost the capacity of the American registered tanker fleet just at a time when a world surplus of tanker capacity is becoming available.

The passage of this act would create in a very short time, a shortage of U.S. registered tanker capacity that would be most costly to the New England consumer.

NEFI also maintains that:

> New England home heating oil consumers will have the price of the 30 percent of No. 2 oil that is imported increased by 2.3 cents per gallon. This will increase the home heating oil bill of its 2.4 million heating oil customers by $27,600,000 for the coming winter.
>
> Residual heating oil costs will increase by more than $50,000,000 through the next year. Since one half of the residual oil is used by New England utilities and one half by regional industry, costs to overall New England consumers for energy and industry products and services would rise by another $50,000,000. The passage of this act would add over $77,000,000 to the bills that New England consumers will pay for heating oil, energy, industry services and products.

The added costs of imported oil will ultimately fall hardest on the area of the country most heavily dependent on foreign oil—New England.

As the Bridgeport Post in an editorial of August 10, 1974, pointed out:

> Most of this added cost would be paid directly by consumers on the Eastern Seaboard. Count Connecticut residents and businesses among the penalized.

The cargo preference legislation would increase the cost of oil to U.S. consumers in the following ways:

First, past experience with cargo preference for Government cargos has indicated that the "fair and reasonable" rates for U.S. ships in a captive market are usually higher.

Second, the difference in rates between U.S. and foreign flag tankers of smaller size is much greater so that the lack of deepwater ports in the United States will increase the cost.

Third, the passage of cargo preference legislation by the United States could result in similar action by producing nations for their own exports.

Fourth, also, cargo preference laws would reduce the flexibility of using readily available tankers or diverting tankers to alternate destinations thereby further increasing the cost of U.S. imports.

When you are talking about something adding "only" a penny or two to a gallon—you are talking about a total $1 or $2 billion in added costs.

I agree with my colleague, the distinguished senior Senator from New Hampshire, that the goal of increasing the tanker vessel capacity of the American merchant marine lies with our present tax laws which encourage the major oil companies to transfer windfall profits to foreign tanker subsidiaries.

If the objective is to insure fuel supplies for the United States—unless we have reliable access to the foreign oil, what good is there in having the tanker capacity?

Mr. President, no one has all the answers to the energy shortage. No field is as complex and important for the economic well-being of this country. The choices facing the Congress in setting a national energy policy are difficult. However, the choice before us today is clear. I shall oppose any legislation that will increase the cost of fuel to the consumers and businesses of Connecticut.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until the hour of 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.

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

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATORS BIDEN AND EAGLETON, FOR THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS, AND FOR RESUMPTION OF THE UNFINISHED BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that after the two leaders or their designees have been recognized on tomorrow under the standing order, the distinguished Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN) be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes, that he be followed by the distinguished Senator from Missouri (Mr. EAGLETON) for not to exceed 15 minutes, after which there be a period for the transaction of routine morning business for not to exceed 15 minutes, with statements therein limited to 5 minutes each, at the conclusion of which the Senate shall resume the consideration of the cargo preference bill.

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, as I understand it, we are going to have a Democratic conference in the morning at 9:30.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. That is correct.

Mr. GOLDWATER. Can I come?

Mr. MAGNUSON. The Senator can come, because it will be to discuss the question of whether or not the Senator from New Hampshire and I can again prevail with the whole Senate in stopping amendments on the floor of the Senate to the HEW bill.

Mr. COTTON. We will have a Republican conference also.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I understand there will be a Republican conference on the same subject. If we can do that, we can get that bill out. It is one of the major bills remaining.

Mr. COTTON. I hope you are very successful in your conference.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, I know it will be. If I can do as well as the Senator can do, I will be successful.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, there will be no further rollcall votes tonight.

ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1974

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives on H.R. 9456. This has been cleared on both sides of the aisle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NUNN) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 9456) to extend the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1970 for 3 years, as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate engrossed amendment, insert:

That this Act may be cited as the "Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Act Amendments of 1974".

SEC. 2. (a) Section 1 of the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1970 (21 U.S.C. 1001) is amended to read as follows: "This Act may be cited as the 'Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Act'.".

(b) Section 2 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. (a) The Congress hereby finds and declares that drug and alcohol abuse diminishes the strength and vitality of the people of our Nation; that an increasing number of substances, both legal and illegal, are being abused by increasing numbers of individuals; that abuse of any substance is complex human behavior which is influenced by many forces, including school, family, church, community, media, and peer groups; and that prevention and early intervention in such behavior require cooperation and coordination among all of these elements in strategies designed to respond to carefully defined problems.

"(b) It is the purpose of this Act to encourage the development of new and improved curricula on the problems of drug abuse; to demonstrate the use of such curricula in model educational programs and to evaluate the effectiveness thereof; to disseminate curricular materials and significant information for use in educational programs throughout the Nation; to provide training programs for teachers, counselors, law enforcement officials, and other public service and community leaders; and to offer community education programs for parents and others, on drug abuse problems.

"(c) It is further the purpose of this Act to provide leadership to schools and other institutions in the community by supporting projects to identify, evaluate, demonstrate, and disseminate effective strategies for prevention and early intervention and to provide training and technical assistance to schools and other segments of the community in adapting such strategies to identified local needs."

(c) Section 3 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION PROJECTS

"SEC. 3. (a) The Commissioner of Education shall carry out a program of making grants to, and contracts with institutions of higher education, State and local educational agencies, and public and private education or community agencies, institutions, and organizations to support and evaluate demonstration projects, to encourage the establishment of such projects throughout the Nation, to train educational and community personnel, and to provide technical assistance in program development. In carrying out such program, the Commissioner of Education shall give priority to school based programs and projects.

"(b) Funds appropriated for grants and contracts under this Act shall be available for activities, including bilingual activities, such as—

"(1) projects for the development, testing, evaluation, and dissemination of exemplary materials for use in elementary, secondary, adult, and community education programs, and for training in the selection and use of such materials;

"(2) comprehensive demonstration programs which focus on the causes of drugs and alcohol abuse rather than on the symptoms; which include both schools and the communities within which the schools are located; which emphasize the affective as well as the cognitive approach; which reflect the specialized needs of communities; and which include, in planning and development, school personnel, the target population, community representation, and parents;

"(3) creative primary prevention and early intervention programs in schools, utilizing an interdisciplinary 'school team' approach, developing in educational personnel and students skills in planning and conducting comprehensive prevention programs which include such activities as training drug and alcohol education specialists and group leaders, peer group and individual counseling, and student involvement in intellectual, cultural, and social alternatives to drug and alcohol abuse;

"(4) preservice and inservice training programs on drug and alcohol abuse prevention for teachers, counselors, and other educational personnel, law enforcement officials, and other public service and community leaders and personnel;

"(5) community education programs on drug and alcohol abuse, especially for parents and others in the community;

"(6) programs or projects to recruit, train, organize, and employ professionals and other persons, including former drug and alcohol abusers and former drug- and alcohol-dependent persons, to organize and participate in programs of public education in drug and alcohol abuse; and

"(7) projects for the dissemination of valid and effective school and community drug and alcohol abuse educational programs.

"(c) In addition to the purposes described in subsection (b) of this section, funds in an amount not to exceed 10 per centum of the sums appropriated to carry out this Act may be made available for the payment of reasonable and necessary expenses of State educational agencies for assisting local educational agencies in the planning, development, and implementation of drug and alcohol abuse education programs, including such projects as—

"(1) inservice training of education personnel,

"(2) technical assistance to local school districts,

"(3) creative leadership in programing for indigenous minorities, and

"(4) training of peer counselors.

"(d)(1) Financial assistance under this section may be made only upon application at such time or times, in such manner, and containing or accompanied by such information as the Commissioner deems necessary, and only if such application—

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

"(B) provides for carrying out one or more projects or programs eligible for assistance under subsections (b) and (c) of this section and provides for such methods of administration as are necessary for the proper and efficient operation of such projects or programs;

"(C) sets forth policies and procedures which assure that Federal funds made available under this section for any fiscal year will be so used as to supplement and, to the extent practical, increase the level of funds that would, in the absence of such Federal funds, be made available by the applicant for the purposes described in subsections (b) and (c) of this section, and in no case supplant such funds; and

"(D) provides for making such reports, in such form and containing such information, as the Commissioner may reasonably require, and for keeping such records and affording such access thereto as the Commissioner may find necessary to assure the correctness and verification of such reports.

"(2) An application from a local education agency for financial assistance under this section may be approved by the Commissioner only after the applicant has submitted the application to the State educational agency. The State educational agency shall, not more than thirty days after the date of receipt of the application, submit to the Secretary in writing its comments on the application. A copy of such comments shall be submitted at the same time to the applicant.

"(3) Amendments of applications shall, except as the Commissioner may otherwise provide by or pursuant to regulation, be subject to the requirements set forth in subsections (d)(1) and (d)(2).

"(e)(1) The Commissioner may use funds in an amount not exceeding 1 per centum of the funds appropriated to carry out this section for a fiscal year for independent analysis and evaluation of the effectiveness of the drug and alcohol abuse education programs assisted under this section.

"(2) The Commissioner shall, not later than March 31 of each calendar year, submit an evaluation report to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations, the House Committee on Education and Labor, and the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. Such report shall—

"(A) contain the agency's statement of specific and detailed objectives for the program or programs assisted under the provisions of this Act, and relate these objectives to those in the Act,

"(B) include statements of the agency's conclusions as to effectiveness of the program or programs in meeting the stated objectives, measured through the end of the preceding fiscal year,

"(C) make recommendations with respect to any changes or additional legislative action deemed necessary or desirable in carrying out the program or programs.

"(D) contain a listing identifying the principal analyses and studies supporting the major conclusions and recommendations, and

"(E) contain the agency's annual evaluation plan for the program or programs through the ensuing fiscal year for which the budget was transmitted to Congress by the President, in accordance with section 201 (a) of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921 (31 U.S.C. 11).

"(f) There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the purposes of this section $26,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1975, $30,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and $34,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1977. Not less than 60 per centum of the amount appropriated for a fiscal year under this section shall be used for drug and alcohol abuse education programs and projects in elementary and secondary schools."

(d) Section 4 of such Act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. (a) Each recipient of Federal assistance under this Act, pursuant to grants, subgrants, contracts, subcontracts, loans, or other arrangements, entered into other than by formal advertising, and which are otherwise authorized by this Act, shall keep such records as the Commissioner shall prescribe, including records which fully disclose the amount and disposition by such recipient of the proceeds of such assistance, the total cost of the project or undertaking in connection with which such assistance is given or used, the amount of that portion of the cost of the project or undertaking supplied by other sources, and such other records as will facilitate an effective audit.

"(b) The Secretary and the Comptroller General of the United States or any of their duly authorized representatives, shall, until the expiration of three years after comple-

tion of the project or undertaking referred to in subsection (a) of this section, have access for the purpose of audit and examination to any books, documents, papers, and records of such recipients which in the opinion of the Secretary or the Comptroller General may be related or pertinent to the grants, subgrants, contracts, subcontracts, loans, or other arrangements referred to in subsection (a)."

(e) Section 5 of such Act is amended by striking out "drug abuse" each time it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "drug and alcohol abuse".

(f) Section 8 of such Act is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c); and

(2) by adding after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

"(b) The term 'Commissioner' means the Commissioner of Education.".

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, in June of this year the Senate passed H.R. 9456, extending the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1970, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the provisions of S. 2848 as reported by the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. S. 2848 had been introduced by the distinguished Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) with a number of cosponsors from both sides of the aisle. Our Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Narcotics held hearings on the legislation in February, and S. 2848 was reported by the committee and approved by the Senate without a dissenting vote.

Following meetings between our staff and the staff of the Select Subcommittee on Education of the House Education and Labor Committee, the House has now agreed to accept the basic provisions of H.R. 9456, as passed by the Senate, with further amendment. This final version is acceptable to the Senator from New York and to me. Indeed, I am well-satisfied with the bill, and I want to express my appreciation not only to the distinguished Senator from New York, who is always a source of wisdom and commonsense, but to the distinguished chairman of the House Select Subcommittee on Education, Mr. BRADEMAS, and to the author of the original bill, Mr. MEEDS. We have been able to work together through our staffs in a spirit of accommodation and good will, and I believe that the result of this effort on all sides is a good bill.

Mr. President, this new Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Act authorizes a relatively modest amount of money, only $90 million over a 3-year period. It continues and expands the scope of this small program administered by the Office of Education since passage of the act of 1970.

Yet, I believe it is an important program for two reasons: First, it speaks to school administrators in a more direct and credible fashion than do those programs administered by other Federal agencies whose orientation is toward health or law enforcement programs; and second, it assists those thousands of smaller communities throughout the Nation which have not experienced crises of heavy abuse of heroin but have found their young people increasingly involved in dangerous experimentation with the whole range of drugs, including alcohol. Indeed, communities everywhere are now reporting a rise in alcohol abuse among young people, and a turning away from heroin toward the use of alcohol either alone or in combination with marihuana or the various barbiturates and hallucinogens.

For the smaller community, and I know this to be true in Iowa and other Midwestern States, the program to be continued under this bill has become one of the most useful tools for educating both schoolchildren and the adult community toward a better understanding of alcohol and drug abuse and toward constructive alternatives for solving personal problems.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I want to emphasize that the bill contains the provision added by the Senate requiring the Commissioner of Education to submit to the Congress an annual evaluation report with a detailed listing of program objectives, conclusions as to effectiveness, a listing of the principal studies leading to these conclusions, an evaluation plan for the ensuing year, and any legislative recommendations deemed necessary or desirable in carrying out the program. I am confident that this provision will not only help to improve the approach of the Office of Education to the difficult task of evaluation, but that it will also assist the Congress in exercising its oversight responsibilities during the next 3 years.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I urge my colleagues to concur in the House amendment to the Senate-passed Alcohol and Drug Abuse Education Act Amendments of 1974—H.R. 9456.

The bill we are considering today which concurs in the Senate amendment with an amendment is substantially similar to the bill I authored and introduced with Senator HUGHES, the chairman of the Alcohol and Narcotics Subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, who has provided all Americans with outstanding leadership and dedication to establishing a national commitment to a war against alcoholism and drug abuse, and cosponsored by Senators WILLIAMS, DOMINICK, CRANSTON, BEALL, EAGLETON, HATHAWAY, RANDOLPH, SCHWEIKER, STAFFORD, TAFT, and JOHNSTON.

The House amendment provides the following revisions to the Senate-passed bill:

First, the statement of purpose provision has been modified to reiterate the inclusion of "school-based" programs.

Second, the grant authority provision is modified to require a priority in grant approval to "school-based programs and projects."

Third, not less than 60 percent of appropriations are earmarked for "drug and alcohol abuse education programs and projects in elementary and secondary schools."

Fourth, the effectiveness evaluation provision would permit "independent" analysis and evaluation.

When I introduced this bill almost 8 months ago, I directed my comments to what I believed then were the crucial issues surrounding the national problem of dependency, particularly youthful dependency, upon dangerous substances.

Subsequent events have affirmed my deep concerns, and have tended to substantiate my basic points:

First, that heroin abuse, while still a grave problem demanding appropriate national attention and resources, is slowly on the downgrade among our Nation's youth;

Second, that polydrug use—the indiscriminate ingestion of several kinds of nonnarcotic drugs such as amphetamines, barbiturates, tranquilizers, and the like—is on the upgrade; and

Third, that there has developed, as part of this phenomenon of polydrug use, a disturbing pattern of destructive alcoholic intake by the young—even the very young—among us. In too many instances, alcohol is being abused in much the same way that the hard drugs were abused in the early 1970's: as part of a destructive, total lifestyle which affects the youthful consumer's family unity, his schoolwork, the nature of his associations with his peers, and his intellectual and emotional access to alternative productive avenues of personal growth.

I believe we stand at a point now where we have to deal with a serious threat to the stability of our adolescent and young adult population. We have but two ways to go. I hope we have learned from our sobering experience with the heroin epidemic that so tragically afflicted our young people to choose the right path.

In the past we have chosen to deal with "the drug problem" solely in terms of the clinical or treatment model. I am concerned that when we relate to the drug abuse phenomenon simply as an issue involving sick people who have become dysfunctional through improper use of certain chemicals, we are asking the medical and other health professionals to add to their already excessive burdens total responsibility for a multidisciplinary problem which not only is not theirs alone, but not theirs to begin with.

The destructive use of chemical substances is similar to other basic problems in one's daily life that must be attended to before they lead to dysfunction. I believe what we must begin to concentrate upon now are those elements in human behavior which are influenced by school, family, church, community, media, and peer groups. We must focus upon prevention and intervention strategies that bring about cooperation and coordination among all these elements.

We should not be concentrating solely upon the care in clinical treatment programs of those already crippled through alcohol and drug abuse. Rather we must choose to provide leadership to schools and allied institutions in the community and encourage the creation of effective strategies for prevention and early intervention that will involve a substantially larger segment of our national population at risk.

I do not advocate that we neglect our alcoholic and addict population. I suggest, rather that we do not reserve our concern solely for that small desperate segment of our population, to the detriment of our infinitely larger population at risk that may be spared the agony of addiction by early attention, care, and concern. We must provide exposure to positive programs in the areas of education, training, creative leadership and the like which may help provide those pathways to productive, construc-

tive life syles and goals that will allow each individual to realize his or her full creative potential. This is the purpose of my bill which we are considering today.

The bill before us provides the only source of funding at the Federal level for prevention and early intervention programing through the use of the educational process. We must concentrate upon the human resources present in our primary and secondary school systems, and in our systems of higher education, and their connecting roots in the communities, and the community institution which they serve. Also, because the bill is aimed at the total population, it will provide assistance to those smaller, nonurban communities all over America whose fundamental drug problem is not one of heroin addiction, but rather one of developing local strategies to deal with alternatives to the burgeoning use of nonnarcotic stimulant and depressant drugs.

I urge the passage of this bill not on the false assumption that it guarantees an end to the drug problem in America, but on the basis of demonstrable past experience, that it provides a worthwhile beginning effort in the right direction. It will help forward total educational community involvement in solutions to a problem that affects all of us and must be attended to by all of us: Teacher, student, parent, minister, policeman, clinician, involved citizen.

As legislators, let us begin the process here and now.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a recent Department of Health, Education, and Welfare news release describing approximately $3.4 million of federally supported community and school based drug education projects, with a listing of such grants by State, amount and type of project.

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

NEWS RELEASE

Grants totaling more than $3.4 million will support 584 projects to help schools and communities deal with the problems of drug use and abuse, HEW Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger announced today.

The awards, which will provide training for 3,500 school and community leaders, went to the 50 States, Puerto Rico, American Samoa, the Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia.

Local education agencies received over $2.7 million for 338 projects to train groups of administrators, teachers, counselors or psychologists, school board members, paraprofessionals, and school nurses. Training will focus on the development of prevention and early intervention programs for students in grades 9 through 12.

In addition, community agencies received nearly $800,000 to train local persons to recognize and correct drug problems in their areas. Those who will be trained include school personnel; health and social workers; church, civic, and youth groups; and law enforcement and other officials.

All persons attending training sessions will live at U.S. Office of Education Training and Resource Centers for a 10- to 13-day period. Each center will also serve as a continuing resource for both school and community teams and will provide technical assistance after the trainees have returned to their local areas.

Since the program began in 1972, over 11,000 people have been trained. Training is conducted at: Awareness House, Oakland, Calif.; Brass Foundation, Chicago, Ill.; Trinity University, San Antonio, Texas; University of Miami, Florida; and Adelphi University, Garden City, N.Y.

COMMUNITY AND SCHOOL-BASED DRUG EDUCATION PROJECTS, FISCAL YEAR 1974 (DRUG ABUSE EDUCATION ACT OF 1970)

State	Community-based projects	School-based project
Alabama	$10,729	32,218
Alaska	4,516	33,490
Arizona	27,789	31,692
Arkansas	15,031	44,675
California	53,259	206,450
Colorado	26,768	45,333
Connecticut	5,374	58,247
Delaware	3,915	26,676
District of Columbia	2,310	
Florida	5,724	93,841
Georgia	30,151	42,124
Hawaii		48,263
Idaho	14,721	26,450
Illinois	5,626	122,321
Indiana	40,754	51,480
Iowa	6,116	51,651
Kansas	10,348	22,552
Kentucky	23,072	25,653
Louisiana	34,435	54,938
Maine	7,897	33,180
Maryland		24,545
Massachusetts	10,765	100,224
Michigan	21,097	153,081
Minnesota	3,093	69,086
Mississippi	28,861	22,189
Missouri	41,289	64,969
Montana		24,234
Nebraska		43,991
Nevada	2,976	24,011
New Hampshire		6,015
New Jersey	27,824	72,551
New Mexico	9,644	33,610
New York	41,539	118,522
North Carolina	26,353	25,848
North Dakota		19,113
Ohio	25,884	86,331
Oklahoma	22,975	46,563
Oregon	23,736	54,766
Pennsylvania	15,287	84,847
Rhode Island	2,669	16,121
South Carolina	4,970	41,582
South Dakota	10,597	25,693
Tennessee	8,154	30,965
Texas	25,029	130,117
Utah	39,362	36,332
Vermont	6,721	16,750
Virginia	17,804	39,396
Washington	3,554	70,192
West Virginia		18,415
Wisconsin	11,077	42,502
Wyoming	8,562	28,480
American Samoa		16,195
Puerto Rico		38,223
Virgin Islands		25,640
Total	801,835	2,731,070

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I believe the bill we are now considering, which concurs in the Senate amendment with an amendment, is a most satisfactory resolution of the differences between the original House and Senate passed drug abuse education bills. In great measure the satisfactory accommodation of all viewpoints is due to the efforts of staff on behalf of the Members of both the House and the Senate.

In particular, I would want to commend Mary Ellen Miller, counsel to the Alcohol and Narcotics Subcommittee, Jay Cutler, minority counsel to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, Jack Duncan, counsel to the House Select Subcommittee on Education, and Martin LaVor, minority legislative associate of the Health Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the Senate amendment to H.R. 9456.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Iowa.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HUGHES. I ask unanimous consent that there be included at this point in the RECORD the following summary of H.R. 9456 as passed.

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

SUMMARY OF H.R. 9456 AS AMENDED BY THE SENATE AND FURTHER AMENDED BY THE HOUSE

1. Extends the Drug Abuse Education Act of 1970 grant and contract authorities for another three years—Fiscals 1975, 1976, and 1977; adds alcoholism education, and makes the Commissioner of Education the responsible officer.

2. Authorizes $26 million in Fiscal 1975, $30 million in Fiscal 1976, and $34 million in Fiscal 1977—a total of $90 million over 3 years. Requires not less than 60 per centum of the sums appropriated to be used for programs and projects in elementary and secondary schools.

3. Eligible applicants are institutions of higher education, State and local education agencies, and public and private education or community agencies, institutions, and organizations, with priority to be given to school based programs and projects.

4. Activities to be funded, including bilingual activities, will include development, testing, evaluation, and dissemination of curricular materials and training in the selection of materials; development of comprehensive school and community programs that focus on the causes of youthful drug and alcohol abuse; pre-service and in-service training for school personnel, law enforcement officers, and other public service and community leaders; and public education programs for parents and other interested persons in the community.

5. Up to 10% of the sums appropriated will be available to State education agencies for the costs of assisting local education agencies in developing and carrying out drug and alcohol abuse education programs. Local education agency applicants will submit grant applications to State education agencies for comment within 30 days.

6. Applications must include assurances that the purposes of the Act will be carried out, that Federal funds will not supplant other available funds, and that appropriate records will be kept, with access for HEW and GAO personnel.

7. Not more than 1% of sums appropriated will be used for independent analysis and evaluation of programs, and an annual evaluation report will be submitted to the Congressional authorizing and appropriating committees.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 238—TO DESIGNATE MARCH 16–23, 1975, DEMOLAY WEEK

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I send to the desk a joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President of the United States to proclaim and designate March 16 to March 23, 1975, as National DeMolay Week, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I will not object—I understand that this has been cleared with the majority leader and with the distinguished Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HRUSKA), and the leadership on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. HELMS. Senator MCCLELLAN.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. So I do not object.

Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I

would like to have my name added as a cosponsor.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the distinguished Senator from Virginia (Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT) be added as a cosponsor.

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

The joint resolution will be stated by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A joint resolution to designate March 16–23, 1975, DeMolay Week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Senate will proceed to its immediate consideration, and, without objection, the joint resolution will be considered to have been read the second time at length.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter from the President of the United States endorsing this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, August 28, 1974.

Hon. JESSE HELMS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR JESSE: Many thanks for your August 20 letter enclosing a proposed Resolution which would proclaim March 16–23, 1975 as "National DeMolay Week".

I share your high regard for The Order of DeMolay and recognize it to be an outstanding organization of young men, dedicated to character building, citizenship and other virtues associated with Freemasonry.

I commend you for offering this joint resolution and trust it will be promptly considered by the Congress upon its return from summer recess.

As President, I will be proud to designate a special week in March to honor the Order when the joint resolution passes Congress.

With warmest personal regards,

Sincerely,

GERRY FORD.

Mr. HELMS. The Order of DeMolay is a nationwide organization of young men dedicated to furthering the principles and precepts which serve as the foundation of our national character. As the DeMolay chapters all across our land celebrate the 55th anniversary of their founding, I am asking the Senate to mark the occasion by designating a special national DeMolay Week in their honor.

The Order of DeMolay is a fraternal organization closely associated with freemasonry. Indeed, each chapter of DeMolay is sponsored by a Masonic lodge in its community. The mature and established generation extends its encouragement and assistance to the younger, and thus provides for a continued adherence and dedication to proven values and sound principles.

The purpose of the Order of DeMolay is to build up the character and integrity of its youthful membership. Its goal is to provide each community and the Nation with better citizens, and to create leaders through the development of character by emphasizing the virtues of comradeship, reverence of God, love of parents, patriotism, courtesy, cleanliness, and fidelity.

The entire program of the Order of DeMolay, Mr. President, revolves about these seven cardinal principles. DeMolay does not attempt to take the place of the home, church, or school, but seeks to supplement these with a supporting program of teaching good citizenship to its members. DeMolay accomplishes its goal of building better citizens by offering the teenage young man a wholesome occupation of his spare time in the company of worthwhile associates in an environment which encourages truthfulness and fidelity.

The Order of DeMolay takes its name from the last Grand Master of the Order of Knights Templar, an organization which served on the front line of defense of Western culture for many centuries. Though Jacques DeMolay was persecuted and tortured, he refused to betray others to those who would unjustly destroy and pillage the order, DeMolay was burned at the stake in 1314, a martyr to fidelity, truth, loyalty, and tolerance.

The modern Order of DeMolay cherishes these virtues and provides a real strength to society in these times of a declining interest in and adherence to moral values. The order involves teenage boys in building their communities through charitable activities of its own, as well as assisting many other local organizations in their efforts.

I have had a close association with the DeMolay chapter in my community, and have been greatly impressed with the spirit and determination of the young men who belong to it, and who participate in its activities. I am proud to associate myself here with the principles and accomplishments of this fine group of dedicated young men. I commend them upon their anniversary and wish them every success in the years to come. It is in that spirit that I offer this resolution for the consideration of the Senate.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 238) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

The joint resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

Whereas the Order of DeMolay is a character-building organization of young men from thirteen to twenty-one years of age; and

Whereas the Order of DeMolay for more than fifty years has worked to instill in its members strong qualities of personal character and integrity through programs of athletic competition, social activities, civic service and charitable projects, thereby preparing them to be better citizens and leaders in their communities; and

Whereas this organization merits the appreciation of the Congress and all Americans for its many public-minded activities: 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 directed to publish and proclaim that the week of March 16–23, 1975, be designated "DeMolay Week".

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution 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.

PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate will convene tomorrow at 10:30 a.m. After the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order, Mr. BIDEN will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes; after which Mr. EAGLETON will be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes; after which there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business of not to exceed 15 minutes with statements limited therein to 5 minutes each, at the conclusion of which period the Senate will resume consideration of the cargo preference bill. Rollcall votes are anticipated on tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT TO 10:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until the hour of 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and, at 5:31 p.m., the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, September 5, 1974, at 10:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate on August 23, 1974, pursuant to the order of August 22, 1974:

IN THE ARMY

The following-named officer under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 3066, to be assigned to a position of importance and responsibility designated by the President under subsection (a) and section 3066, in grade as follows:

To be lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Samuel Vaughn Wilson, [redacted], Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following Air National Guard of the United States officers for promotion in the Reserve of the Air Force under the provisions of setcion 593(a), title 10 of the United States Code, as amended:

To be lieutenant colonel

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

Maj. George R. Armitage, Jr., [redacted]
Maj. Al H. Asay, [redacted]
Maj. Bobby R. Baker, [redacted]
Maj. Bruce Beatty, [redacted]
Maj. Maxie O. Beheler, [redacted]
Maj. Donald H. Caswell, [redacted]
Maj. Charles H. Collins, [redacted]
Maj. Kenton B. Creuser, [redacted]
Maj. George A. Demers, [redacted]
Maj. John M. Hafen, [redacted]
Maj. William K. Hanson, [redacted]
Maj. Glenn A. Kowal, [redacted]
Maj. John S. W. Lee, [redacted]
Maj. John E. McCarthy, [redacted]
Maj. John S. McLaughlin, [redacted]
Maj. Fred L. Michel, [redacted]
Maj. Charles L. Mielke, [redacted]
Maj. William O. Neal, [redacted]
Maj. Carl G. Oliver, [redacted]
Maj. Albert L. Powell, [redacted]
Maj. Grover C. Ripley, [redacted]
Maj. Wesley D. Robertson, [redacted]
Maj. Jack D. Saulls, [redacted]
Maj. John H. Sowerby, [redacted]
Maj. Kenneth R. Stick, [redacted]
Maj. James H. Tuten, [redacted]
Maj. Newton T. Williams, Jr., [redacted]
Maj. Robert S. Zetzer, [redacted]

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Maj. William C. Mays, [redacted].

MEDICAL CORPS

Maj. Daniel B. Jackson, [redacted]

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, sections 3370 and 3383:

ARMY PROMOTION LIST

To be colonel

Ashcraft, Allan C., [redacted].
Basil, Jack C., Jr., [redacted]
Bater, Ralph S., Jr., [redacted].
Black, Charles E., [redacted]
Burney, Phillip G., [redacted].
Clardy, John C. [redacted].
Golosov, Robert E., [redacted].
Graham, John R., [redacted].
Gray, Charles W., [redacted].
Gray, Roy C., Jr., [redacted]
Green, William J., [redacted].
Hand, Paul E. [redacted]
Heon, Jean Marie, Jr., [redacted].
Jardin, Edmund V., [redacted].
Kernan, Charles H., [redacted].
King, Jack H., [redacted]
Lemley, John E., [redacted]
Merkel, Donald E., [redacted]
Micun, Richard P., [redacted].
Montgomery, James R., [redacted]
Pruitt, Rufus H., [redacted].
Settle, Clair W., [redacted]
Sirhal, Charles M., [redacted]
Stephens, Robert A., [redacted]
Thompson, George R., Jr., [redacted]
Wedgwood, William G., [redacted].

CHAPLAIN

To be colonel

Bauder, Richard K., [redacted].
Kolb, Erwin J. [redacted]

ARMY NURSE CORPS

To be colonel

Aird, Margery E., [redacted]
Barbieri, Marian C., [redacted]
Bolduc, Ernestine H., [redacted]
Creigh, Helen J., [redacted]
Frederico, Anna, [redacted]
Johns, Lois A., [redacted]
Ligon, Esther R., [redacted]
Stone, Lyndsey, [redacted]
Van Brocklin, Hattie, [redacted]

DENTAL CORPS

To be colonel

Addy, Richard T., [redacted]
Akins, Allen C., [redacted]
Brown, Robert E., [redacted]
Cole, William W., [redacted]
Cusick, Kenneth H., [redacted]
Dell, Colman L., [redacted]
Dyer, Raymond C., [redacted]
Husen, Herbert R., [redacted]
Immes, Henry C., [redacted]
Merz, Donald M., [redacted]
Noonan, Roger G., [redacted]
Popowicz, Andrew, [redacted]
Winters, Matthew F., [redacted]

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonel

Badger, Virginia, [redacted]
Butler, Richard L., [redacted]
Campana, Hernan A., [redacted]
Chalaire, Frank M., [redacted]
Crudo, Frank S., Jr., [redacted]
David, Walter E., [redacted]
Freeman, James H., [redacted]
George, Lynn D. [redacted]
Goodrich, Edward O., [redacted]
Hidalgo, Carlos A., [redacted]
Humbrecht, Mary, [redacted]
Kraft, Sumner C., [redacted]
Laird, Robert D., [redacted]
Morse, James O. [redacted]
Mueller, Travis H. [redacted]
Newell, Robert C., [redacted]
O'Leary, John B. [redacted]
Sieber, Otto F., Jr., [redacted]
Ward, Joseph P., [redacted]

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

To be colonel

Bartholomai, C. W., [redacted]
Bertea, Octavian, [redacted]
Bonner, Francis E., [redacted]
Bowden, Leon A., [redacted]
Brandstein, Murray, [redacted]
Cook, Clarence H., Jr. [redacted]
Davis, Frank E., [redacted]
Elzea, William D., [redacted]
French, Vernon A. [redacted]
Hafer, Robert L., Jr., [redacted]
Haigh, James T., [redacted]
Harper, Jewell B., [redacted]
Hassell, Joe W., [redacted]
Ho, Stanley B. H., [redacted]
Jellerson, Richard, [redacted]
Johnson, G. D., Jr., [redacted]
Jones, Jasper I., [redacted]
Kinsaul, Charlie F., [redacted]
Macon, James M., [redacted]
Majka, Richard A., [redacted]
McCall, Willard J., [redacted]
McCarthy, George W., [redacted]
Mitchell, Robert M., [redacted]
Morrison, Robert E., [redacted]
Munzer, Grace E., [redacted]
Murawski, William J., [redacted]
Rio, Kenneth W. [redacted]
Sandifar, Dallas E., [redacted]
Schroeder, William, [redacted]
Smith, Donald S., II, [redacted]
Smith, Harold F., [redacted]
Sullivan, Joseph B., [redacted]
Tudor, Walter J., [redacted]
Vrchota, Clement F., [redacted]
Wittner, Harvey, [redacted]
Zucker, Gerald A. [redacted]

ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

To be colonel

Anderson, B. J., [redacted]
Choren, Bernadine G., [redacted]
Fondacaro, Alfred P., [redacted]
Hazelton, Frank T., [redacted]
Jarneic, Frank I., [redacted]

VETERINARY CORPS

To be colonel

Hewitt, Henry C., [redacted]
McManus, Norbert R., [redacted]
Peacock, Walter H., [redacted]

The following-named officers for promotion in the Reserve of the Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, sections 3366, 3367, and 3383:

ARMY PROMOTION LIST

To be lieutenant colonel

Ackerman, Rene J., [redacted]
Agan, Eugene F., Jr. [redacted]
Akre, Richard D., [redacted]
Allen, Robert D., [redacted]
Althouse, Howard W., [redacted]
Arnold, Charles E., [redacted]
Baggett, Jimmy D., [redacted]
Bailey, Malcolm K., [redacted]
Barnard, Joe D. [redacted]
Bass, David A. [redacted]
Blankenbeker, Richard, [redacted]
Boone, Don W [redacted]
Boyt, Edward A., [redacted]
Braverman, Robert, [redacted]
Breazzano, James, [redacted]
Browning, Howard B., [redacted]
Bynum, James L., [redacted]
Carne, Robert G., [redacted]
Clark, Francis M., [redacted]
Claybrook, Linden D., [redacted]
Coker, Larry G. [redacted]
Comte, A. J., Jr., [redacted]
Conneely, Joseph J., [redacted]
Crawford, Byron D., [redacted]
Dearing, James H., [redacted]
DeLucia, Francis C., [redacted]
Diaz, Roberto, [redacted]
Dodd, Robert E., Sr. [redacted]
Durfee, Charles L., [redacted]
Engel, Frederick W., [redacted]
Estermyer, Charles, [redacted]
Fox, John F., [redacted].
Fruend, Philip S., [redacted]
Gahres, Frederick L., [redacted]
Gatlin, Clifford I., [redacted]
Gehrt, Floyd F., [redacted]
Geiglein, John E., [redacted]
Gelinas, William P., [redacted]
Gordon, Johnnie W., Jr. [redacted]
Haley, Richard H., [redacted]
Hanson, Roy C., [redacted]
Harvey, James, [redacted]
Hasam, Lewis K., [redacted]
Helm, Lewis M., [redacted]
Henritzy, Adam F., [redacted]
Hinckfoot, Walter G., Jr., [redacted]
Hollis, Levy V., [redacted]
Johnson, Alan E., [redacted]
Joiner, James L., [redacted]
King, Mark R., [redacted]
Klemme, Roland V. [redacted]
Kloppenburg, Gary C., [redacted]
Knies, John B., [redacted]
Kohlhoff, Karl F., [redacted]
Lamm, Arthur E., Jr., [redacted]
Land, James R., [redacted]
Larkin, Donald J., [redacted]
Lau, Daniel K. M., [redacted]
Lee, Haydn C., Jr., [redacted]
Lewis, John S. [redacted]
Liebert, Richard W. [redacted]
Loewis, Franklin A. [redacted]
Losekamp, Bernard F., [redacted]
Magerovsky, Eugene L., [redacted]
Manolakis, Soterios G., [redacted]
Marvin, Ernest A., Jr., [redacted]
Mattison, Franklin S., [redacted]
McClendon, Joe M., [redacted]
McCloskey, John C., [redacted]
Meus, Allen B., [redacted]
Miller, Edward M., [redacted]
Mills, Thomas L., [redacted]
Mitchell, Ennis L., [redacted]
Moesser, John D., [redacted]
Montgomery, Marion, [redacted]
Moore, Billy G., [redacted]
Morgan, Jackie T. [redacted]
Nicholson, Herschel H., [redacted]
North, Leroy A. [redacted]
Olsen, Alfred, [redacted]
Peipher, John F., [redacted]
Pennycuick, Robert F., [redacted]
Perry, James T., [redacted]
Ralphs, Seeley E., [redacted]
Read, Herman M., Jr., [redacted]
Ridgeway, Herbert L., Jr. [redacted]
Robbins, Stoyell M., [redacted]
Sanders, Robert J., [redacted]
Saxton, Billy R., [redacted]
Schumann, David R., [redacted]
Sellers, Nicholas, [redacted]
Skalican, John J., [redacted]
Trail, James H., Jr., [redacted]
Tulaney, John E., [redacted]
Tuman, Donald E., [redacted]
Utsey, Bert G., Jr. [redacted]
Walker, Jack W., [redacted]
Walsh, Francis E., [redacted]
Weber, Louis L., [redacted]
Welch, Daniel A., [redacted]
Werner, Charles P., [redacted]
Wilson, William D., [redacted]
Wiskemann, Kenneth A., [redacted]
Wolff, Aaron J., Jr., [redacted]

CHAPLAIN

To be lieutenant colonel

Nelson, Oral D., [redacted].

ARMY NURSE CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Antilla, Betty J., [redacted]
Baro, Marte J., Jr., [redacted]
Barrelle, Margaret, [redacted]
Bourne, Olga C., [redacted]
Burg, Doris P., [redacted]
Condiloro, Angela, [redacted]
Donahue, William W., [redacted]
Dove, Hetzel E., [redacted]
Finn, Elizabeth P. [redacted]
Gretenhart, L. F., [redacted]
Hamilton, William P. [redacted]
Heller, Rita [redacted]
Istvan, Dorothy E., [redacted]

Leslie, Martha [redacted]
Magdalenski, Fred F., [redacted]
McNerney, Cynthia L., [redacted]
McQuillan, Constance, [redacted]
Norris, C. T [redacted]
Olson, Beverly L., [redacted]
Palmer, Monica B., [redacted]
Prather, Elaine R., [redacted]
Scicchitano, C. E., [redacted]
Scoville, Beverly V., [redacted]
Sullivan, Gerald E., [redacted]
Tench, Mary L. [redacted]
Throwe, Gerald J., [redacted]
White, Agnes I. [redacted]

DENTAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Billingsley, Audell [redacted]
Blevins, Byron C. [redacted]
Chamberlain, William, [redacted]
Dixon, Richard L. [redacted]
Draper, Theron N. [redacted]
Hembree, John H., Jr., [redacted]
Johnson, Robert D., [redacted]
Maas, David H [redacted]
McGinnis, J. P., Jr., [redacted]
Pittman, H. V., Jr [redacted]
Wolfson, Sherwood H. [redacted]

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Giulian, Karl A., [redacted]
Hope, Peter B [redacted]
Kuglar, Everett C., [redacted]
Messany, Franklin L., [redacted]
Raborn, Charles P., [redacted]
Santiago, Juan J., [redacted]

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Alex, Robert J., [redacted]
Bagley, Richard M., [redacted]
Ballard, William C., [redacted]
Bengel, James E., [redacted]
Boland, Ernest P [redacted]
Boyajian, Myron H., [redacted]
Cannarella, Joseph, [redacted]
Cantwell, George E., [redacted]
Cates, Raymond H., Jr., [redacted]
Chapman, Edwin R., [redacted]
Cochran, Donald G., [redacted]
Crowell, Edwin P., [redacted]
Czarnecki, Roland F., [redacted]
Daniel, Julian W. [redacted]
Delsanto, Peter [redacted]
Dempsey, Donald L., [redacted]
Donnick, Robert M., [redacted]
Downer, William J. J., [redacted]
Eastwood, Reuben A. [redacted]
Elmore, Elmon M., [redacted]
Ender, Traugott, [redacted]
Eschenfelder, V. P., [redacted]
Fountain, William A., [redacted]
Foy, Jerome S. [redacted]
Fredericks, Herman, [redacted]
Freeman, Jimmy L., [redacted]
Frey, Cecil G. [redacted]
Guida, Anthony M., [redacted]
Hammonds, Mallory W., [redacted]
Hanners, Donald R., [redacted]
Harper, F. A. Jr. [redacted]
Hernandez, Alfred, [redacted]
Hess, Garnet H. [redacted]
Holmes, Roy J., [redacted]
Jerome, Leslie L., [redacted]
Kaye, E. Donald, [redacted]
Kemp, Harold L. [redacted]
King, Douglas D., [redacted]
Kobren, Nelson H., [redacted]
Kornegay, Ervin T., [redacted]
Kusaba, George [redacted]
Laitin, Howard [redacted]
Lambert, Dorothy A., [redacted]
Lewis, Carl B. [redacted]
Linder, Robert D., [redacted]
Lownsbery, N. E., Jr., [redacted]
Marhefsky, Louis A., [redacted]
Martin, Roberts R., [redacted]
Matthews, Lee C, [redacted]
Mazur, Joseph L. R., [redacted]
Milan, Robert N., [redacted]
Norman, Ernest J., [redacted]
O'Steen, Wendell K., [redacted]
Parker, John L., [redacted]
Perillo, Albert S., [redacted]
Peterson, Donovan E., [redacted]
Phillips, William G., [redacted]
Prochazka, George J. [redacted]
Racki, Henry R., [redacted]
Ragan, Arthur D., [redacted]
Reagan, Walter A., [redacted]
Reinsch, Herman T., [redacted]
Renner, Leelyn J., [redacted]
Renner, William H., [redacted]
Rosen, Martin J., [redacted]
Russell, John W. Jr., [redacted]
Scibelli, Arthur P., [redacted]
Sherer, Richard B., [redacted]
Smith, Richard J., [redacted]
Stoetzel, Paul M. [redacted]
Stroud, Robert W., [redacted]
Terrell, Leroy S., [redacted]
Thomas, John K., [redacted]
Thygeson, Earl S., [redacted]
Tutwiler, Richard C., [redacted]
Ubertalli, James A., [redacted]
Valenta, George F., [redacted]
Woodruff, John I., [redacted]
Wright, Charles D., [redacted]
Young, James L., [redacted]
Yuh, Larry P. C., [redacted]

ARMY MEDICAL SPECIALIST CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Daniel, Alfred N., [redacted]
Herden, Irene L., [redacted]
Pennucci, Jean C., [redacted]
Phelps, Elmer E. Jr., [redacted]
Ruiz, Guzman, Buenav, [redacted]
Taketa, Takumi J., [redacted]

VETERINARY CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Brown, George M., [redacted]
Fletcher, William D., [redacted]
Geci, Theodore R., [redacted]
Harting, Robert D., [redacted]
Johnson, Malcolm C., [redacted]
Malm, Gerhard A., [redacted]

The following-named officers for appointment in the Reserve of the Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, U.S.C., sections 591, 593, and 594:

DENTAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Boyce, William A., [redacted]
Hammer, Henry S., [redacted]
Pagan, William J., [redacted]

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Cavin, Elwyn [redacted]
Dobbs, Robert M., Jr., [redacted]
Dossett, Burgin E., [redacted]
Flair, Robert C., [redacted]
Fuqua, William B., [redacted]
Harris, Julian L., [redacted]
Kennedy, Charles W., [redacted]
Kichler, Jack [redacted]
Olson, Ralph A., [redacted]
Patterson, Joseph P., [redacted]
Santaella-Latimer, L. R. [redacted]
Teneyck, James R., [redacted]

The following-named officers for appointment in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of title 10, U.S.C., section 3494:

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Hart, Gerald N., [redacted]
Bobbitt, Roy L., [redacted]
Calkins, Richard A., [redacted]
Ruy, Peter B., [redacted]

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, U.S.C., section 3385:

ARMY PROMOTION LIST

To be colonel

Beale, Walter H., Jr., [redacted]
Boyer, Donald L., [redacted]
Hugh, Roy D., [redacted]
Sprayberry, Robert H., [redacted]
Strawberry, Robert W., [redacted]
Sullivan, Michael T., Jr., [redacted]
Thompson, Walter M., Jr., [redacted]
Webster, Norton R., [redacted]

ARMY PROMOTION LIST

To be lieutenant colonel

Anderson, Douglas F., [redacted]
Atteberry, Ernest W., [redacted]
Brackeen, Charlie D., [redacted]
Brennan, Daniel L., [redacted]
Brewer, Tom, [redacted]
Camuso, Anthony L., [redacted]
Carlson, John W., [redacted]
Chastain, Richard L., [redacted]
Davis, Derwin H., [redacted]
Ditzler, Francis W., Jr., [redacted]
Doody, Lee A., Jr., [redacted]
Empson, Edgar P., [redacted]
Genovese, Peter E., Jr., [redacted]
Gorski, Chester E., [redacted]
Graybill, David C., [redacted]
Hall, William H., Jr., [redacted]
Hoyt, John V., [redacted]
Krenitsky, Peter, [redacted]
Leach, Dan P., [redacted]
Litchfield, William C., [redacted]
Martin, Joseph G., Jr., [redacted]
McDonald, John E., Jr., [redacted]
Munger, Edward E., [redacted]
Nordgren, Daniel J., [redacted]
O'Hayer, Thomas J., [redacted]
Pelka, Robert F., [redacted]
Przedpelski, Zygmunt J., [redacted]
Puckett, Harold W., [redacted]
Record, Walder J., [redacted]
Redmond, Michael J., [redacted]
Reinartz, David F., [redacted]
Samia, Robert K., [redacted]
Scraba, Stanley A., [redacted]
Skelton, Thomas E., [redacted]
Stevens, Jack D., [redacted]
Stuart-Collazo, William, [redacted]
Williams, John F., Jr., [redacted]
Wilson, Harlan Y., Jr., [redacted]
Winner, Francis L., [redacted]
Woodin, Archie J., [redacted]

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant (junior grade) in the line and staff corps, as indicated, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

LINE

Adams, Charles R.
Adams, Michael R.
Adamson, Robert E.
Adkins, William K., Jr.
Aiken, Joel W.
Akerson, Daniel F.
Algiers, Michael A.
Allen, Barbara A.
Allsopp, Ralph S., Jr.
Almony, Joseph R.
Altman, David H.
Ammerman, Larry R.
Andersen, Harald
Anderson, Dennis J.
Anderson, Leroy
Anderson, Thomas E., Jr.
Anderson, Thomas F.
Angleton, John M.
Angstead, Donald E.
Anton, William M.
Anzelon, Judy M.
Arfman, John F., Jr.
Armstrong, Andrew A.
Armstrong, David J.
Arnold, James C.
Arthur, Marvin L., Jr.
Arthur, William C.
Ashby, Donald A.
Ashton, Richard A.
Averett, Gregg H.
Avery, Robert B.
Axtell, Robert D.
Ayres, Steven E.
Babin, Ordale P., Jr.
Bacon, William R.
Bahn, Theodore I.
Bahnmiller, Michael P.
Bahr, Walter E.
Bailey, Bernis H.
Bailey, Robert J.
Baker, Kenneth J.
Baker, Norman E.
Baldridge, Craig J.
Barbero, Frank, Jr.
Barker, John P.
Barker, Michael D.
Barnett, Stewart R., III
Barrett, James M.
Barry, Phillip A.
Barry, William P.
Bateman, Douglas A.
Bates, Marshall E.
Battell, James J., Jr.
Batten, Hugh N., Jr.
Baxla, Robert E.
Beamgard, Richard S.
Becker, Dennly R.
Becker, Stephen E.
Beckley, Stephen A.
Beckwith, Donald C.
Bell, Edison L.
Bell, James M.
Bell, John F.
Belli, Lawrence A.
Belinoff, Alan E.
Berck, Henry F., Jr.
Berman, Michael R. P.
Bernard, Eugene P.
Bernard, Paul L.
Berry, Colin M.
Besser, Robert S.
Best, David R.
Bethke, Gary W.
Bevers, Richard E.
Biber, Reginald E.

Bier, Gary L.
Biggers, Edward M.
Bigos, Randall E.
Birkholz, Howard D.
Bishop, Grover C.
Bloom, Wade D.
Bloomfield, Walter W., Jr.
Blount, Thomas E.
Bloxom, Richard R.
Bommett, David E.
Booth, David H.
Borsh, Richard M., Jr.
Boutz, Allen R.
Bowman, Neil O.
Boyd, Garland A., Jr.
Brabenec, John J., III
Brace, Timothy B.
Bradley, William F.
Branan, Phillip H.
Brandon, William R.
Brandt, Charles R.
Brannan, Lee R., Jr.
Brasher, Stephen J.
Breede, Matthew J.
Brenner, Robert C.
Brennon, Roy L., Jr.
Britt, James F.
Brooks, Nicholas G.
Broome, Norval L.
Brophy, James M., III
Brown, Gerald A.
Brown, Paul M.
Brown, Richard M., III
Brown, Stanley M., III
Brown, William H., Jr.
Browning, Dural W.
Brunet, Gerard J.
Bruninga, Robert E.
Bruun, James L.
Bryan, Carroll L., II
Bugelski, Michael T.
Burger, James C.
Burggren, Peter C.
Burkhardt, Harold J.
Burnham, Johnny W.
Burr, Frederic W.
Busching, William
Bush, William F.
Butcher, Kenneth W.
Butler, William R.
Butterfield, David A.
Cable, Robert L.
Cadden, Charles J.
Callaham, Thomas E.
Callaway, Dwight M.
Campbell, Fred P.
Campbell, William R.
Carlton, Kenneth M.
Carrig, Michael F.
Carter, John C.
Cary, Helin W.
Caster, Gary D.
Cavender, John B., III
Chaffee, Edmund J.
Chamowitz, Michael, Jr.
Chatham, Ralph E.
Cheney, Martin J.
Chepenik, Stanley B.
Chernesky, John J., Jr.
Childers, Robert B.
Christian, Richard
Christopher, Angelu D.
Church, Donald W.
Clabaugh, Ronald S.
Clark, Robert A.
Clark, Robert A.
Clausen, Charles P.
Clayton, Richard E.
Cleverdon, Thomas F.
Cocowitch, John H.
Coffer, Joe R.
Coffin, Robert P.
Combs, Osie V., Jr.
Connolly, Hubert C.
Conrad, Emerson S.
Conrad, James H.
Conway, Patrick M.
Coons, William E.
Cooper, Marshall G.
Cope, Stuart S.
Coppins, Michael F.
Corn, Richard, III
Corner, Malcolm D.
Corsey, John W.
Cowan, Daniel G.
Cowell, David E.
Cox, Harold L., Jr.
Cox, Patrick G.
Cox, Quida L.
Crane, Larry S.
Creamer, Chadwick G.
Creekman, Charles T., Jr.
Creighton, Richard A.
Crim, George N.
Crossland, Roger L.
Cruser, Thomas P.
Cuccias, Robert F., Jr.
Culverson, Kenneth
Culwell, Clarence W., Jr.
Custer, Laurence D.
Cutcher, John M.
Dandal, Ides W.
Daniel, David D.
Daniel, James M.
Darden, Welborn O., Jr.
Darnell, Donald L.
Darrow, Edward E., Jr.
Davies, William E.
Davis, Norman F.
Dean, Thomas E.
Dearth, Lawrence C.
Defliese, Phillip L., Jr.
Dejohn, Charles A.
Denton, Walter R.
Deuter, Richard C.
Devane, John M., III
Devaney, James F.
Dibello, Michael F.
Didier, Henry N.
Diel, Harry A.
Dieter, Kenneth A.
Dietz, Douglas W.
Dilloff, Neil J.
Dillon, Hall S., II
Dinwiddie, David O.
Dipadova, Arthur A.
Dixon, Lewis R.
Doane, Robert K.
Dodd, Carl T.
Dolan, James E., Jr.
Donnelly, Robert J.
Doryland, Adrian T.
Doubleday, Michael W.
Douglass, Gene A.
Doyle, John J.
Dunbar, Terry F.
Duncan, Robert R.
Dunnington, Robert A.
Dwyer, Dennis E.
Dye, George W.
East, Don C.
Eckert, Warren R.
Eckhardt, Bruce K.
Edson, James M.
Edwards, Jesse D.
Eklof, Sven P.
Ekstrom, Robert H.
Ellis, James M.
Ellis, Thomas C.
England, Don R.
Engstrom, George H.
Erickson, Paul R.
Evans, John O.
Ewan, Lawrence K.
Fages, Malcolm I.
Falkner, James R.
Falten, Paul J., Jr.
Fare, Freddie E.
Fargo, Thomas B.
Farrell, Gerard M.
Farver, Richard K.
Farver, Rick C.
Fenneman, Leigh R.
Fenoughty, Carolyn A.
Ferranti, John P., Jr.
Fetterly, Larry R.
Fiebig, Edward R.
Finnegan, Gerard R., Jr.
Fisk, Stephen W.
Fitzgerald, Robert L.
Flores, Roberto, Jr.
Floyd, Stephen D.
Foote, Herbert W.
Ford, Robert E.
Fox, John R.
Fraley, Randall M.
Francis, Robert M.
Frederick, Georgie
Freed, John W.
Fuller, Daniel W.
Funke, David J.
Galbraith, Donald E., II
Galloway, Harold L.
Garcia, Larkin E.
Gardner, Daniel E.
Garland, Gary W.
Gaudi, Robert D.
Gautreaux, Terrence M.
Gebhart, John W.
Geisler, Fred A.
Gengler, Patrick L.
Gex, John M.
Geyton, James M.
Gibbons, Peter W.
Gibson, Robert L.
Giffen, Robert M., III
Gilmer, Franklin B.
Goldstein, Abraham J.
Gongaware, William
Good, Layne W.
Gouslin, William A.
Graef, Stephen R.
Graham, Bryce L.
Graham, Roy E.
Grampric, Gail L.
Grant, George M.
Green, Albert A.
Griffin, William R.
Grimmer, George K.
Gronemann, Bruce W.
Grunge, Lance C.
Gruver, William K.
Guilfoil, Thomas P.
Guppy, Gerald F.
Gurnon, Richard G.
Haas, Frank A.
Hackman, Rhodric C.
Hagerman, Jon G.
Haggerty, Jerry M.
Haigis, John
Haines, Frank D.
Hall, William B., Jr.
Hallenbeck, Amos E., Jr.
Hammar, Jonathan A.
Hancock, Edward L., Jr.
Hanna, Norman W., II
Hansen, Donnel E.
Hansen, Frederick D.
Hardy, Charles T.
Harkness, George C.
Harleston, William, Jr.
Harlow, Margaret A.
Harmon, Sidney W.
Harris, Ronald R.
Harrison, John G., Jr.
Harrison, Mark M.
Harsanyi, William S.
Hart, William G.
Haser, Gerald D.
Hawkins, Jeffrey B.
Heilman, Stephen C.
Heller, Stephen L.
Hemmerle, George E.
Henderson, Harold A.
Hendricks, Leon A.
Henry, Dean
Henry, Gary R.
Henson, Lovell K.
Herda, Raymond J., Jr.
Herrick, Glenn W.
Herrick, John B.
Hersh, Joel R.
Heustis, Robert L.
Hickman, Charles R.
Hight, Jimmy F.
Hinman, David A.
Hitchcock, James R.
Hobbs, Harold T.
Hoffman, Richard B.
Hogan, John E.
Hoke, Mark A.
Holden, Hollis W.
Holdt, Bruce E.
Holmes, Ronald E.
Horn, Paul B., Jr.
Horsley, Russell D.
Horst, Gary L.
Horton, Daniel W.
Houde, Paul L.
Hough, Marvin F.
Houle, Normand A.
House, Frederick A.
House, Prentice L.
Howd, Robert F.
Howdyshell, Walter S.
Howick, James F.
Hoyt, Carol A. P.
Hrenko, John, Jr.
Hughes, John G.
Hume, Richard L.
Hunter, Bruce R.
Hunter, Edward E.
Hunter, Peter G.
Hussey, Anthony J., Jr.
Hutchins, Albert M.
Huth, Douglas P.
Hyde, John W.
Hyjek, Michael L.
Ilgenfritz, Kenneth
Iselin, Robert A.
Jackson, Douglas L.
Jackson, Timothy H.
Jacques, Harry A., Jr.
Jamison, Earl J.
Jaques, James A., III
Jarrell, John A.
Jeffcoat, John P.
Jenners, Joseph A.
Jennings, Olin H., III
Jennings, Edward P., II
Jensen, Jon R.
Johanson, Donald W.
Johnson, Gary F.
Johnson, Jon R.
Johnson, Richard G.
Jones, Bobby D.
Jones, Darrell W.
Jones, James D.
Judnich, Francis A.
Kain, Michael R.
Kalman, George
Kampen, Roy W.
Kane, John E., II
Kane, Thomas J.
Kapinos, James M.
Kaufman, Edwin J.
Kavale, Joseph J.
Keesling, William D.
Keller, Terrence K.
Kendall, Charles W.
Kengla, Donald C.
Kenyon, Ralph E.
Ketring, Michael E.
Kidd, Raymond C.
Kidder, John L.
Kidder, Marvin W.
Kidder, Paul A.
Kincheloe, Everet V.
King, Franklin G.
Kingsbury, Robert L.
Kingseed, Jeb B.
Kjellander, Jon P.
Klotz, Steven I.
Knuth, Dean L.
Koehler, David L.
Kokstein, Robert G.
Kopinitz, Seigmond
Krafft, Frederick W., Jr.
Kraska, Kenneth W.
Krumbholz, Karl O.
Krupski, Paul J.
Kuhlman, Henry F., Jr.
Kuhn, Richard C.
Kunigonis, Michael
Lackey, Herman E.
Lambert, John P.
Landon, Philip C.
Langford, William K.
Langland, Rodger A.
Lassen, Clyde E.
Laughead, David C.
Lautenschlager, Jack A.
Lawhorn, Robert M.
Lawson, Thomas N.
Ledbetter, Wayne D.
Lee, Earl C.
Lehtonen, Harold, II
Liberatore, Mary A.
Lilly, Dale R.
Linger, Theodore G.
Lingo, Michael W.
Lins, Roderick W.
Lobalbo, Benedetto
Locke, Gerard F.
Lopez, Delio, Jr.
Low, James R.
Luczak, Daniel W.
Ludwig, Bruce B.
Luebbecke, Donald S.
Lydiard, Jeffrey R.
MacDonald, James, R.
Mack, Lawrence J., Jr.
Madren, Samuel T.
Madruga, Robert J.
Magoun, Peter R.
Mandsager, Dennis L.
Manes, Ezra E., Jr.
Mangan, John L.
Mann, Craig R.
Manning, Robert J.
Manson, Terrance L.
Marnane, Michael J.
Marshall, Harold E.
Martel, Reginald T.
Martin, Roy L., Jr.
Marvin, Richard B.
Maslin, George W., Jr.
Matarese, Marcia D.
May, Clarke D.
Mayberry, Jack B.
Mazach, John J.
Mazour, Thomas J.
McCarty, James D.
McClanahan, Michael W.
McCoy, James G.
McCoy, Rex C.
McCracken, James R.
McCurry, Robert A.
McGonigle, Paul W.
McGuane, Gary F.
McGugin, Leonard F., Jr.
McHale, Robert V.
McHugh, Donald, Jr.
McMenamin, William F.
McNall, Lynn T.
McPherron, Charles A.
McReynolds, Darwin
McReynolds, Michael J.
McWhirter, Janice H.
Meador, Garry R.
Meek, Terry L.
Melchioris, Charles, Jr.
Menke, James E.
Merki, Richard L.
Michaels, James R.
Midkiff, George N.
Miller, Joseph G.
Miller, Patrick A.
Missimer, Jack R.
Mitchell, Larry J.
Mitchell, Tom E.
Mitschang, George W.
Mobley, Joseph S.
Modzelewski, Daniel M.
Moe, George L.
Mollet, Robert E.
Molochko, Gerald A.
Monteville, Arthur R. Jr.
Montgomery, John B.
Moomy, David H.
Moore, Edmund E.
Moore, Hollis A., III
Moore, Larry I., III
Moore, Richard A.
Morrow, Roy E.
Mosby, David C.
Moss, Dennis R.
Motten, Alexander F.
Moulder, Edward D.
Moulton, David W.
Moussette, David K.
Moyer, Jeffrey K.
Mulkeen, John J., Jr.
Muller, David G., Jr.
Mulvey, Gerald K.
Musselman, Stephen
Mussett, Gerald T.
Myers, Henry B.
Myers, Terry R.
Naile, Thomas C.
Nann, Peter A.
Nelms, Kenneth L.
Ness, Frank G.
Newman, Vernon L.
Newton, William H., III
Nickens, Donnell J.
Nicol, Henry O., III
Nie, John C.
Norvell, Larry M.
Nurthen, William A.
Nutter, Robert W.
Nye, Richard R.
O'Connor, Theodore J.
O'Dell, James M.
Oehler, Michael W.
Offerdahl, David C.
Ogle, Russell W.
Ohlert, Edward J.
O'Keefe, Michael J.
Oleson, Gary Y.
Olsen, Charles C., Jr.
Olson, Larry S.
Olson, Michael D.
Othic, Francis E.
Panzigrau, Jerome E.
Para, Alan E.
Park, Patrick J.
Parker, Lutrelle F.
Patrick, Peter D.
Patterson, Philip D.
Patterson, Thomas L.
Payne, Robert L., Jr.
Pedrotty, John R., Jr.
Pence, Daniel M.
Perkins, Thomas A., III
Perrault, Thomas J.
Peterson, Carl M.
Phillips, Charles D.
Phillips, Kenneth K.
Picquet, Roger T.
Piland, Monroe G., III
Pinz, Bradley A.
Pisz, Robert J.
Pitkin, Richard C.
Pittman, Alan R.
Plank, George E.
Plunkett, John C.
Plyer, Bruce A.
Pohl, William C.
Pool, James A.
Porritt, Richard H., Jr.
Porter, David G.
Powell, David L.
Pratt, James W.
Prell, Richard E.
Prescott, Leonard F., III
Prevost, John J.
Prokasky, Stephen S.
Puhlman, Robert L.
Purcell, Richard L.
Quigley, Michael D.
Quinton, Mark S.
Ragland, Gordon G., Jr.
Rainey, Daniel L., Jr.
Ralston, Gary G.

Rankin, Thomas P.
Rathburn, Curtis S.
Rauch, Dale A.
Raymond, Terry A.
Regener, Donald F.
Reid, James E.
Reid, Jaseph B.
Rentschler, Donald
Renuart, Robert F.
Revenaugh, John T.
Reynerson, Donald M.
Reynolds, Richard B.
Rhedin, David V.
Richards, Francis G.
Richards, John R.
Richardson, Frederick K.
Riebe, Donald E.
Riegel, Michael G.
Ries, Robert R.
Ries, Stephen H.
Riffle, Donald L.
Rios, Trinidad, Jr.
Robinson, Charles L.
Roddy, Charles P.
Rogers, Herman A.
Romberg, Wayne D.
Root, Stephen L.
Rose, Marilyn R.
Ross, Jessie C., Jr.
Rowland, Curtis A.
Rugen, Sanford L.
Ruhe, Barnaby S.
Runnerstrom, Eric
Rusch, Preston G.
Rusczyk, Richard S.
Russell, Thomas G.
Saavalainen, Mark T.
Samuels, Arthur M.
Sandberg, Larry A.
Sanders, James T.
Sanders, John R.
Sanders, Penelope L.
Sarich, Ace J.
Saur, Joseph M.
Savory, John R.
Sawyer, David R.
Sawyer, William J.
Schilhabel, Larry A.
Schmidt, Edwin A.
Schmidt, Hubert F.
Schmidt, Joseph D., Jr.
Schnaars, Carolyn J.
Schott, Jeffrey M.
Schranz, Peter A.
Schrobo, Stephen M.
Schrot, John R.
Schukis, Francis J.
Schwartz, Robert W.
Schwechten, Robert, II
Scott, Lawrence W.
Scott, William R.
Seekins, Steven S.
Segur, Gregory V.
Seitz, Thomas A.
Sellers, Ronald E.
Sellman, Robert L.
Sexton, Ralph J.
Shaffer, John N., Jr.
Shapiro, Alan J.
Shaughnessy, Ruth C.
Shaw, Daniel N.
Shaw, William R.
Shipman, Mary C.
Shelton, Diana C.
Shelton, John R.
Shewell, Daniel J.
Sholars, Robert E.
Shoudy, Peter N.
Shower, William A., Jr.
Shultz, John W.
Shumaker, Karl C.
Sidner, Robert W.
Siegel, Dan A.
Siemon, Douglas H.
Siler, Virgil R.
Silverthorne, Craig W.
Simmons, Edward J.
Siple, Roy C.
Sitz, William W.
Skiles, Rolland W.
Skille, Alan J.
Slaton, Steven G.
Smedberg, James E.
Smith, Baker A.
Smith, Charles H.
Smith, Donald S.
Smith, Gordon K.
Smith, Gregory C.
Smith, John V., Jr.
Smith, Kenneth L.
Smith, Randal E.
Smith, William G.
Snapp, Paul T.
Snell, Dean A.
Snell Dennis A.
Snyder, Thomas F.
Soo, Robert L.
Spencer, Jerome F.
Spengler, Richard P.
Staeheli, Bruce W.
Stahl, Lawrence O.
Standley, Cecil E.
Stanga, Robert D., Jr.
Stankowski, Barbara J.
Stark, Thomas A.
Stasiowski, James M.
Steelman, Barry L.
Steinger, Gerard R.
Stender, Robert G.
Stephan, George M.
Stevens, James D.
Stevenson, Robert W.
Stewart, John M.
Stewart, Michael M.
Stockhaus, Daniel Q.
Stone, John L.
Stout, Charles M.
Stribling, Ronald A.
Strohaker, John G.
Strzemienski, Stephan J.
Stubbs, Gary W.
Sumner, Gary B.
Sutton, Harry W.
Swenson, Carl F.
Swoope, James P.
Tauber, Richard J.
Taylor, Eugene W.
Taylor, John M.
Taylor, Richard H.
Taylor, Samuel W.
Teetz, William R.
Tennant, Douglas M.
Thacker, Richard L.
Thompson, Douglas S.
Thompson, Richard A.
Thompson, Robert B., Jr.
Thomson, James S.
Timberlake, William
Tomasko, John A.
Trafton, Wilbur C.
Trenker, Gary C.
Tribelhorn, Ronald W.
Trumbower, Glenn C.
Tucker, Richard K.
Tully, Webb W.
Twyman, William E.
Tyler, Gary L.
Tyler, John T., Jr.
Tyson, Robert K.
Uffenorde, George D.
Unruh, Howard K.
Uthe, David, II
Vance, Thomas C.
Vandenberg, George E.
Vanhoften, James D.
Vercher, John B.
Vetsch, William J.
Vines, Larry P., Sr.
Vinson, James W.
Vitek, Michael F.
Voight, Thomas C.
Waddell, James B.
Wagner, Paul H.
Waite, Lynn L.
Walker, Jon B.
Wallace, David K.
Wallace, Donald S.
Wallace, Harold B.
Walling, Kenneth E.
Watkins, Val E.
Watkins, William A.
Weaver, Lloyd R.
Webb, Stephen E.
Weber, Douglas E.
Weborg, Gene M.
Webster, Kirwin S.
Weeks, Steven B.
Weir, Marshall R.
Wellborn, Richard B.
West, Edward M.
West, James C., Jr.
West, John G.
Westcott, Richard E.
Westfall, John C.
Wheat, Luther W.
Wheaton, Martha J.
Whitaker, Dwight V., III
White, Allen H.
White, Phillip J.
White, Robert D.
Whitman, David R.
Whitney, Darrell E.
Wierzbicki, Gregory T.
Williams, David M.
Williams, David M.
Williams, Douglas H.
Williams, James H.
Williams, Lillian A.
Williams, Pharis E.
Williamson, Edward H.
Wilson, Dennis A.
Wilson, Martin B.
Wilson, Phillip R.
Winge, Donald E.
Wojtkowiak, Daniel
Wolf, Peter T.
Wolfe, Daniel T.
Wolpert, William L.
Woo, Robert A.
Wood, Don A.
Woodall, Jonathan H.
Woodard, John H.
Wozniak, John F.
Wright, Gerrit L.
Yerick, Martin R.
Young, William F.
Yunker, John M.
Zarichny, Russell J.
Zeola, John P.
Zogby, Reagan J.
Zweerink, James E.
Zysk, Thomas S.

SUPPLY CORPS

Allen, Dennis J.
Anunson, Merton G.
Beaty, Richard M.
Beckett, John C.
Burgess, Roy H.
Campbell, Thomas A.
Cantrell, Floyd O.
Chitty, Frederick C.
Compton, David D.
Crandall, Stephen G.
Davies, David A.
Devries, Christine R.
Evanoff, Richard A.
Featherstone, Harry L., Jr.
Gallagher, Stephen
Garner, Darrell W.
Gibbons, Lawrence B.
Ginman, Richard T.
Harris, Richard A., Jr.
Haynes, James M.
Hemmy, Victor H., Jr.
Herbst, Howard P.
Herrington, Michael C., Sr.
Hodgskin, Henry A., Jr.
House, Thomas F.
Huban, George H.
Jaudon, James E.
Jenkins, Gwilym H., J.
Jepson, Francis E.
Jones, David C.
Jordan, Larry J.
Jordan, Robert R.
Kamel, Mohsen
Keeton, Ronald J.
Lee, Burton J.
Leenstra, Richard B.
Lemburg, Myrl L.
Leverentz, James M.
Lorenc, Edward L.
Marquez, Ernest B., II
Master, Meryln M.
McCarthy, Justin D.
McGinnis, William J.
Mitchell, Colonus J.
Morrell, Dennis L.
Nolan, Richard T.
Parr, John B.
Pecuch, Ramon
Pennington, Craig H.
Poliock, William J.
Reese, James M.
Reinmann, Edward C., Jr.
Richard, James C.
Richards, John D.
Ridgley, Joe L.
Robertson, James M., III
Ross, Charles A.
Schimpf, Barry J.
Scott, William C.
Shaw, Mark C.
Shelton, Billy R.
Shirley, Richard H., Jr.
Simmons, John R.
Stankeivicz, David
Tarleton, George L.
Taylor, Allen G., Jr.
Thomes, James K.
Tinker, William M.
White, Charles E.
Wilson, Paul A.
Wilson, Richard D.
Woods, Charles J.
Woodward, George G.
Worthen, Winston K.
Young, Charles K.
Zulak, Barbara

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Alfredson, Leonard
Bleakley, Robert L.
Bone, Talbot W.
Borowski, Casimir, Jr.
Brookman, Peter J.
Burke, William F., III
Cahill, Patrick J.
Carpenter, Ronald G.
Casey, Michael F.
Ching, Clayton Y.
Christensen, Thomas H.
Deluca, John, Jr.
Delunas, Leonard J.
Dempsey, John G.
Fehlig, Charles J.
Filson, James V.
Fucile, Eugene P.
Givens, Larry R.
Gnerlich, Robert R.
Gregory, Ronnie R.
Groncznack, Robert
Hanley, John T.
Hart, Stephen L.
Heath, John E.
Johnson, Michael R.
Jones, John E.
Keller, William J., Jr.
Key, Thomas S.
MacCaferri, Don A.
Mason, Robert D.
Micheau, Terry W.
Mondoux, William J., III
Parker, Robert V.
Pilie, Joseph M., Jr.
Rabold, Bernard L., Jr.
Rockwood, Thomson W.
Rowett, Henry M.
Samuelson, Gene R.
Schramer, Mathias
Shepard, David B.
Smith, Earl L., Jr.
Smith, Louis M.
Spore, James S., III
Stpeter, Harold B.
Teater, Richard M.
Thomas, Kenneth W., Jr.
Thompson, Stephen R.
Venable, Joseph B.
Vogt, John F.
Wade, Richard L.
Walley, James M., Jr.
Walsh, David F.
Wenck, Stanley E.
Williams, James R.
Wright, James C.
Yankoupe, George W.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Baker, Charles W.
Blome, Michael A.
Bowman, Jeffry S.
Brubaker, Ralph W.
Cowart, Paul R.
Criscitiello, Joseph J.
Donohue, Edwin A.
Flondarina, Melchor
Galbreath, Robert S.
Hermann, Dean A.
Higgins, Janet L.
Kellner, John R.
Leadbeater, Warrell F.
Lemmerman, Donald J.
Logan, Robert S.
Maskulak, Michael J.
Mitchell, Michael L.
Mitchell, Troy G.
Moore, Patrick H.
Moses, William R.
Mullin, Jimmie
Myers, Charles M.
Oldham, Richard T.
Potter, Duane E.
Pron, Sergei F.
Renfro, Mary A.
Reynolds, Richard D.
Steiner, Joseph R.
Talcott, Bruce E.
Todd, Michael L.
Turocy, Regis H.
Ziner, Anthony J.

NURSE CORPS

Arlov, Christine S.
Bessent, William M.
Bloshinski, Elizabeth
Chick, Carole L.
Cronin, Mary A.
Deveney, Anne M.
Dretsch, Margaret F.
Eilers, Barbara G.
Ellis, Jeannine K.
Field, Marion G., Jr.
Fitzsimmons, James
Gryniewski, Margaret K.
King, Susan G.
Luck, Reginald L.
Lyons, Doris A.
Marostica, Marilyn
Minzes, David H.
Monahan, Jeanne S.
Parrotte, David F.
Poland, Edith A.
Roberts, James W.
Robinson, Leslie E.
Snider, Stephen E.
Trent, James E.
Walgren, Kenneth D.
Zuber, Beverly A.

The following named officers of the United States Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Supply Corps in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade) and temporary grade of lieutenant:

Arllen, Eric A.
Forney, Robert A.
Owens, James D.
Welch, Benjamin H., II

The following named officers of the United States Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Supply Corps in the permanent grade of ensign:

Ehmcke, Lance D.
Frietze, Michael J.

The following named officers of the United States Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Supply Corps in the permanent grade of ensign and temporary grade of lieutenant (junior grade):

Branaman, Larry G.
Capizzi, David A.
Cassano, Anthony J., Jr.
Crowley, Indy C.
Dennis, David A.
Fennell, Walter F., Jr.
Grames, Steven M.
Hart, Joseph M., Jr.
Lowndes, Rawlins
Kennan, Kevin B.
Solomon, John W.

The following named officers of the United States Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade) and temporary grade of lieutenant:

Cosgrove, Robert M.
Ellis, Howard D.
Hein, Gary W.
Shepard, Scott H.

The following named officers of the United States Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Civil Engineer Corps in the permanent grade of ensign and temporary grade of lieutenant (junior grade):

Clements, Neal W., Jr.
Di George, Frank P., II
Elkins, James E.
Gecan, Anton S.
Interholzinger, Jared
McKay, Kenneth P.

The following named officers of the United States Navy for transfer to and appointment in the Judge Advocate General's Corps in the permanent grade of lieutenant (junior grade) and temporary grade of lieutenant:

Mitchell, Thomas W.
Riggio, Michael V.
Seiders, Marlin D., Jr.
Warden, Irving D., Jr.

Lieutenant (junior grade) Michael R. Har-

grave, of the United States Navy, for permanent grade of ensign in the Nurse Corps subject to qualification therefor as provided by law.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named temporary disability retired officers for reappointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Navorska, Donald R., [redacted] USMC.

The following-named temporary disability retired officer for reappointment to the grade of captain in the Marine Corps, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Bell, John R., [redacted], USMC.

Executive nominations received by the Senate on August 29, 1974, pursuant to the order of August 22, 1974:

IN THE NAVY

The following-named (Naval Reserve Officers Training Corps Candidates) to be permanent Ensigns in the Line or Staff of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law:

Dana M. Broach
Michael D. Crocker
Benjamin L. Devane
John E. Flynn
Richard D. Gillespie
James E. Haas
Zenon Hac
John A. Sokolowski
David J. Thorn

The following-named (Civilian College Graduates) to be permanent Commanders in the Medical Corps in the Reserve of the U.S. Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law:

Bafael Correa-Coronas
John A. Hansen
Oscar L. Jaurigue

Walter F. Merdinger (Ex-Army Officer), to be a permanent Captain in the Medical Corps in the Reserve of the U.S. Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law:

John W. C. Copeman (Civilian College Graduate), to be a permanent Commander and a temporary Captain in the Medical Corps in the Reserve of the U.S. Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

Ollie B. Emerine (Ex-Lt., USNR), to be permanent Commander and a temporary Captain in the Medical Corps in the Reserve of the U.S. Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named U.S. Navy Officers to be Commanders in the Dental Corps in the Reserve of the U.S. Navy for temporary service, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law:

Jimmy E. Albright
Robert S. Burke

Dale T. Zorn, U.S. Navy Officer to be a Commander in the Medical Corps in the Reserve of the U.S. Navy for temporary service, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

James D. Arnold (Naval Reserve Officer), to be a permanent Lieutenant and a temporary Lieutenant Commander in the Dental Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

Arlie E. Burnham, Jr. (Civilian College Graduate) to be a permanent Lieutenant and a temporary Lieutenant Commander in the Denetal Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Martin A. Funk (Naval Reserve Officer) to be a permanent Commander in the Medical Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

Robert R. Schuteenhofer (Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps Candidate) to be a permanent Ensign in the Line or Staff Corps of the Navy, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

Janet R. Hutcheson (Civilian College Graduate) to be a permanent Commander in the Medical Corps in the Reserve of the U.S. Navy, subject to the qualifications therefor as provided by law.

Peter B. Blanchard, U.S. Navy Officer, to be a Commander in the Medical Corps in the Reserve of the U.S. Navy, for temporary service, subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law.

The following-named temporary commissioned warrant officers to be permanent Chief Warrants in the classification indicated subject to the qualification therefor as provided by law:

Boatswain

Billy R. Coggin
Vurgel I. Gay
Richard V. Golden
Leroy R. Middleton
Larry E. Smith
William J. Stewart

Operations Technician

Charles A. Converse
William A. Murphy, Jr.
William H. Snider
Adam S. Walloch
James A. Winkler

Explosive Ordnance Disposal Technician

Paul C. Kinney

Aviation Ordnance Technician

Edwin J. Connors
Dale M. Floe
Gerald W. Schmitt
Harry M. Schwaeble

Surface Ordnance Technician

Adrian L. Hanna
Edwin M. Jordan
William A. Knupple
Albin C. Leblanc
Adoplh R. Matura
Robert E. Mauldin
William H. Murray
Daniel M. Sauer
Richard H. Wicks
Melvin E. Worley

Ordnance Control Technician

Chester D. Capodilupo
James D. Chalmers
William D. Jasper
Thomas N. Jones
Robert G. Marshall
Albert L. Smith
David M. Swarner

Underwater Ordnance Technician

Ralph J. Harker
Phillip E. Kern
James O. Mustin

Aviation Maintenance Technician

Richard S. Kanaski
Grady W. Turnbow
Robert A. Zabielski

Machinist

Russel G. Ashcraft
John R. Blackstock
Henry L. Boyd
Alvia J. Dunnagan
Elmer L. Feeser
Rolf J. Gestalter
Albert J. Hermann
Stanley O. Hunter
Paul N. Johnson
Ronald W. Miller
Richard L. Patterson
Albert L. Petty
Richard D. Shaw
Carl L. Snipes
John H. Stuke
James C. Zingale

Aviation Control Technician

Grady K. Cheatham
Jerry M. Snyder

Electrician

Richard R. Allen
Ervel E. Atterbury
Richard Blair
Manfred G. Kiese
Jerry L. Lamont
Ramon A. Ymzon

Naval Communicator

Lyle N. Aardahl
Sidney C. Arnold
Charles C. Finley
Bobby G. Lathrop
Robert L. McDonald
Adrain R. Pittman
Raymond L. Reed
Edward J. Schultz
Larry G. Smith
Frank C. Sutton
Charles E. Tims
Stephen M. Udell

Aviation Boatswain

Joseph J. Breslin
Thomas A. Morrison
James G. Reese

Aviation Electronics Technician

John P. Dooley
James R. Foley
Thomas G. Gibbons
John B. Gilbert
Bobby J. Howard
Eugene K. Warner

Communications Technician

Peter J. Azzole
Frankie N. Saunders
Joseph L. Taskoski
James F. Whipple

Electronics Technician

Dennis J. Benjamin
Charles L. Box
Thomas W. Brooks
Harold M. Brown
Ralph S. Caldwell
Louis S. Caretti
Charles B. Clark
Richard E. Cloughley
Terrence J. Comfort
Jeffrey L. Coolidge
Michael W. Crawford
Darrel D. Delaney
James J. Gessl
Walter Gibson
Edward C. Goodell
Richard D. Hedelund
Thomas G. Hunter
William D. Hurd
John M. Iannetta
Jerry G. Kincade
Thomas R. Little
William R. Lowe
Clinton L. McKenzie
John E. Miller, Jr.
Bruce B. Pimm
Russell M. Safford
Donald F. Shaw
Clyde K. Stapp
Johnny S. Tomlinson

Ship Repair Technician

James R. Andrews
Garland T. Loftis
Daniel S. Lynch
William A. Lynch
Charles E. Runyan

Ship's Clerk

David J. Anderson
Hector Arcosta
Thomas L. Armstrong
Merton A. Canfield
G. H. Childress
Gary T. Crawford
Charles H. Fortier
James R. Fuller
William J. Holdcroft
Michael R. Hopkins
Eugene H. Hornung
Jimmy E. Howard
John W. Kea
John D. Kidd
James E. Mansmith
Gerald H. Prinz
Jimmie D. Pritchard
Herbert M. Sauls
Henry H. Taylor
Neil R. Totten
Jack R. Wallace

Data Processing Technician

Ronald L. Bilodeau
Richard A. Lott

Supply Corps

Adwin D. Bradford
Jerry D. Christian
Leroy A. Clayton
Joseph T. Dame
James M. Emberton
Edward M. Gundersen
Aloysius F. Kempa
James B. Kidd
Roy C. McKay
Harry W. Owen
Wendell L. Parrish
Peter J. Rehill
Alphonse M. Sgueglia
James W. Warosh
Courtland C. Weeder

Photographer

Walter E. Hamler

Civil Engineer Corps Warrant

John D. Becker
Delmar Herron

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotions to the grade indicated in the staff corps as indicated subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

SUPPLY CORPS

Lieutenant

Appleby, Michael R.
Archer, Marvin D.
Argento, Terry J.
Ayers, Robert S.
Baggett, Joseph E.
Bakaley, Stephen L.
Ball, Edgar S., Jr.
Beassie, Leslie J.
Beaty, Richard M.
Bell, Dennis E.
Bender, Danny A.
Bird, Robert R.
Blackwell, Andrew P.
Bocchino, David L.
Boecker, Theodore J.
Bohannon, Donald C.
Bolt, Steven D.
Bond, Lewis F., III
Boring, George T.
Bott, Kerry C.
Bradley, Richard E.
Byrnes, Gerald L.
Calia, John E.
Callaway, Michael P.
Camp, Robert T.
Carden, Robert J.
Carlson, James H.
Caskey, John W., Jr.
Chambers, Thomas R.
Chamberlain, Stephen P.
Chitty, Frederick C.
Clack, Jeffrey R.
Clark, Thomas C.
Clark, David W.
Cole, John L.
Colvin, Bruce A.
Conroy, Denis S.
Cotton, Robert L.
Crandall, Stephen G.
Croll, John M.
Cummins, John L.
Davis, Peter M.
Denning, Steven A.
Denning, Steven J.
DiFrancesco, Albert P.
Dmetruk, Stephen F.
Donlan, Robert J.
Engel, Steven R.
Ensminger, David S.
Etcher, John S.
Fages, Sheldon N.
Farrell, Anthony J.
Faulders, Cyril T., III
Faurie, Bruce R.
Featherstone, Harry L., Jr.
Flohr, Larry E.
Flora, James H.
Fuller, Dana A., Jr.
Gaither, Roderick
Gibbons, Lawrence B.
Gilbert, Jack A.
Gillespie, Daniel D.
Gillum, Virgil D.
Ginman, Richard T.
Giordano, Donald M.
Gordohn, Richard E.
Grant, Charles W.
Gregory, Troy R.
Griffin, James H., III
Griggs, William C.
Griggs, Joe L.
Grimes, David M.
Guerard, Franklin P.
Gulden, Gary W.
Gunia, Earl G.
Hall, Clifford R.
Haller, Brian Q.
Hammons, Thomas J., III
Harder, Melvin S., III

Hayes, Reginald S.
Hayes, John R., Jr.,
Heleniak, James F.
Henke, Louis, III
Herrington, Michael C., Sr.,
Hickey, Paul D.
Hinkel, Shelby, Jr.
Hodgkins, Henry A., Jr.
Holland, Benjamin A.
Hollingsworth, Charles L
Holt, Lonnie D.
Houlihan, Timothy P.
Howell, Arthur E., III
Huefner, James H.
Hurley, Patrick E.
Jackson, John E.
Jenkins, Michael L.
Jenkins, Walter W.
Jenkins, Gwilym H., Jr.
Joens, Steven K.
Johnson, Frederick B.
Johnson, William E.
Joslin, Richard M.
Kalourek, William T.
Keeton, Ronald J.
Kelly, Daniel C.
Kilroy, Clark E.
Kirkland, Donald E.
Kirkpatrick, Gerald E.
Knauss, Walter W., III
Lakes, Danny E.
Lambert, John R.
Lauer, Thomas H., II
Long, Wayne R.
Lorenc, Edward L.
Lowry, Robert S.
Maas, Robert D.
Madge, Norman W.
March, Earle B., Jr.
Martinec, Dennis P.
Mathew, Paul A.
Mayo, Thomas J.
McCray, James E., II
McGee, Gary O.
McKenzie, Donald R., Jr.
McLaughlin, James P.
Merritt, Karl W.
Miner, Kenneth H., Jr.
Mitchell, Kent R.
Moffitt, Michael A.
Moore, Joseph N.
Morrisset, John W.
Nichol, Eldon E.
Nightingale, Frederick C.
Nolan, Lawrence F.
Pathwickpaszyc, John C.
Pearce, John F., III
Pennington, Craig H.
Perkins, Charles A.
Perkins, George W., Jr.
Peterson, Carl R., Jr.
Pew, Curtis E.
Pierce, William B.
Proctor, Leonard L.
Randall, Bobby L.
Reardon, Robert J.
Reutemann, Edward C., Jr.
Rich, Lyle V.
Richardson, Albert C.
Ridgley, Joe L.
Robertson, James M., III
Robinson, Scott
Rogers, John W.
Rorex, Thomas A.
Rose, Robert W., Jr.
Ross, Charles A.
Royer, Frank E.
Rutledge, Dennis H.
Saunders, Daniel T.
Schlax, Thomas P.
Schmidt, William G.
Schneider, Larry J.
Schneider, Jeffery W.
Schreiber, Thomas J.
Seymour, Lyle M.
Sharrocks, Charles S., Jr.
Shiffman, Robert L.
Shirley, Richard H., Jr.
Shock, Richard W.
Shoemaker, Charles K.
Sides, Stephen L.
Siegel, Allen R.
Siembieda, Eugene J., Jr.
Simmons, John R.
Simmons, Roger S.
Slettvet, Richard M., Jr.
Smith, Thomas P.
Spratlen, Nicholas L.
Steigelman, Anthony E.
Stevens, Lawrence A.
Stilwell, Robert R.
Storm, Louis O., II
Strackbein, Edward M.
Sumrow, Ronald G.
Sunday, John L.
Taylor, Richard S.
Thomes, James K.
Thompson, John E.
Thompson, Joseph M.
Tibbetts, Joel F.
Tufts, John E.
Valade, Richard H.
Vining, Michael P.
Vinson, Charles M.
Vogelsang, James E.
Ward, John D.
Ward, James T.
Watkinson, Lyle P.
Weidemann, James L.
Wells, Randolph R.
Wenslaff, William A.
Wilcox, Thomas A.
Willis, Roger A.
Williams, Richard L.
Wimett, William T.
Winslow, Dennis M.
Woodiel, James C.
Wong, Frederick G.
Wood, Robert H., II
Woods, Kevin J.
Young, Roger A.

CIVIL ENGINEER CORPS

Ackerbauer, Blair
Mallshouse, Clare E.
Biter, Denzil J.
Bryant, Harold W.
Campbell, Bruce S.
Cherry, John M.
Christensen, Thomas H.
Cortney, Michael C.
Dean, Joseph C.
Dierckman, Thomas E.
Elsbernd, Robert L.
Foster, William W.
Glynn, William G.
Gnerlich, Robert R.
Gregory, Ronnie R.
Hall, William M.
Herning, Robert E.
Hill, Jerry D.
Hillman, Cecil M.
Hocker, Robert G., Jr.
Hyatt, Andrew J.
Key, Thomas S.
Kotz, John S.
Laboon, Thomas A., Jr.
Law, George L.
Leppert, John D.
Marcy, Hugh W.
Masler, John G., Jr.
McConnell, Craig V.
Morrow, James F., III
Pizzano, Robert C.
Pyles, Troy K.
Pabold, Bernard L., Jr.
Ramsower, David C.
Rautenberg, Robert C.
Robins, John M.
Scullion Leonard P.
Shaw, Danny G.
Simon, Lee E
Stockwell, Christopher J.
Stone, John T., Jr.
Stpeter, Harold B.
Thomas, Clarence E., Jr.
Thomson, Francis S., Jr.
Tull, Terrence W.
Turowski, Henry J., Jr.
Walker, William F.,
West, Joseph D.
Wong, Jack J., Jr.
Zachary, James M.
Zuber, David E.

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S CORPS

McConnell, Daniel D.
Radd, John D.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Agent, Selwyn K.
Baker, Gerald C.
Barber, Norman J.
Bartlett, James V.
Bauer, Peter J.
Blome, Michael A.
Bowman, Jeffry S.
Boyles, Robert W.
Broadhurst, Ronald W.
Brown, George R.
Buffington, John R.
Crabtree, Roger D.
Crafton, Lonnie D.
Dawson, Richard L.
Delong, Douglas S.
Dial, William S.
Dotto, Kenneth M.
Enright, Charles A.
Escamilla, Joel
Finke, Ronnie L.
Fristad, Arvid C.
Fry, Wendell J.
Gibson, Kenneth D.
Greenan, John E., III
Grimes, Thomas A.
Hastings, Jerry L.
Hermann, Dean A.
Hetrick, John R.
Hickey, Rodney D.
Higgins, Janet L.
Hisoire, Dennis P.
Holman, Larry D.
Hovis, Robert S.
Hughes, Francis J., Jr.
Huju, John I.
Hummel, James R.
Johnson, David E.
Joseph, William A.
Kane, Robert J.
Kieschnick, Travis L.
Knee, Dale O.
Kochis, James B.
Kolesar, Joseph T.
Kunkel, Clyde E.
Kurtich, Richard B.
Leadbeater, Warrell F.
Lemmerman, Donald J.
Lewis, Morris N.
Love, Douglas, Jr.
Malinoski, James W.
Malinky, Robert L.
Manley, Edward
Martin, Donna R.
McBride, Joseph E.
McNair, John D.
Mills, Wayne M.
Mitchell, Troy G.
Moody, Johnny M.
Morey, Arlen D.
Mullen, Michael J.
Mullin, Jack A.
Mullin, Jimmie J.
Pavlik, Robert E.
Peterson, Jack L.
Peters, Anthony J., III
Renfro, Mary A.
Ridgeway, Robert K.
Roman, Michael J.
Ruffin, Tommy L.
Ryan, Alan B.
Schick, Gary E.
Schweinfurth, Karl E.
Seelbach, Richard A.
Seible, Lawrence G.
Shannon, Kenneth R.
Shepherd, Jack W.
Sheridan, Peter F.
Siddle, David L.
Smith, Richard L.
Smith, Steven L.
Spillane, Dennis
Thompson, J. Ronald
Tingley, Terry J.
Todd, David J.
Todd, Michael L.
Tomlinson, Tommy M.
Turocy, Regis H.
Upton, Billy G.
Waggoner, Lemuel A.
Wallace, William E.
Wanamaker, John C.
Weappa, Larry R.
West, Joseph J.
Williams, Warren, Jr.
Yacovissi, Robert
Yost, Harry E.

NURSE CORPS

Ahrens, William D.
Ames, Ervin L.
Arlov, Christine S.
Bailey, Donna L.
Bessent, William M.
Bird, Meredith S.
Breeding Patricia A.
Broad, John R.
Cheeks, Jacqueline E.
Cothern, Jimmie G.
Cronin, Mary A.
Delowrey, Blance S.
Donegan, Janet M.
Dretsch, Margaret F.
Dunn, Richard A.
Eilers, Barbara G.
Ellis, Jeannine K.
Fiddler, Iris E.
Field, Marion G. Jr.
Foley, Barbara A.
Fortier, Elaine S.
Garrison, Richard A.
Gryniewski, Margaret K.
Hagen, Karen P.
Haley, Kathleen A.
Hamachek, Susan M.
Hamer, Terry L.
Hargrave, Michael R.
Head, Walter W., Jr.
Hodges, Gail L.
Hohon, Henry P.
Honeywell, Joseph L.
Jones, Donald G.
King, Susan G.
Lloyd, Thomas M.
Loftus, Margaret M.
Loveridge, Lois E.
Luck, Reginald L.
Marquart, Alison W.
Matika, Linda C. T.
McConnell, Maryann S.
Mitchell, Henry Jr.
Nickerson, Carolyn J.
Norrick, Albert J.
O'Connell, Linda G.
Petersen, Patricia L.
Peterson, Janet L.
Peterson, Peggy J.
Phillips, Donald W., Jr.
Picchi, Christine A.
Rice, Edward V.
Roberts, James W.
Robinson, Leslie E.
Roy, Terry D.
Ruschmeier, Elizabeth
Sample, Priscilla
Santos, Debra A.
Schemmer, Carol L.
Shala, Evelyn R.
Shepherd, Martha P.
Smith, Margaret L.
Smith, Susanne T.
Soileau, Joseph C.
Spangler, Catherine E.
Sullivan, Peggy J.
Trent, James E.
Walgren, Kenneth D.
Ward, Elizabeth A.
Wilkins, Karen L.
Williams, Edward I.
Wright, Mitchell P.
Williams, Edward I.

The following-named officers of the United States Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of lieutenant in the staff corps, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

SUPPLY CORPS

Devries, Christine R.
Shelton, Betty J.
Zulak, Barbara

Executive nominations received by the Senate September 4, 1974:

IN THE COAST GUARD

The following-named officers of the Coast Guard for promotion to the grade of lieutenant:

James B. Clarke
Julius B. Sadilek, Jr.
Michael R. Adams
Timothy G. Balunis
Edward A. McKenzie
James H. Davis
Klaus Adie
Carroll H. Holst
Richard E. Schmidt
Alfred P. Howland
James E. Cain
Timothy A. Thompson
Michael A. Eberhardt
Stanley E. Lehman
William T. Mahoney
John L. Sprague
Thomas F. Weber
Richard L. Harvey
Christopher A. Kiefer
James A. Kramer
Charles O. Gill
John L. Glen
Gilbert O. Montoya
Roy C. Lewis, Jr.
William F. Landry
Thomas H. Walsh
Charles E. Sibre
Joseph G. Milo
Robert T. Trainor
Kelly S. Callison
Kenneth P. Rothhaar
Alan Gracewski
James T. Clarke
Charles D. Wurster
Ronald H. Frazier
Thomas M. Gemmell
Kenneth W. Bicknell
Roger W. Coursey
Charles D. Pike
William R. Phillips
Charles C. Beck
John P. Wiese
John T. Orchard
Peter A. Tebeau
Paul H. Millewich
Donald C. Gerber
Gordon D. Marsh
Donald B. Gilbert
Stewart I. Marsh
Stephen C. Ploszaj
Richard V. Harding
Michael M. Leone
Ronald F. Silva
Daniel E. Kalletta
Bo C. Josephson
Robert W. Gulick
Robert N. Tabor
Jay E. Taylor
James T. Armstrong
Larry M. Wilson
Wayne E. Verry
Stanley J. Norman
Charles H. King
Laurance H. Howell
John G. Hersh
William J. Inmon
Kenneth R. Borden
Henry P. Libuda
Edward F. Murphy
Gregory S. Cope
Larry H. Gibson
David E. Henrickson
Bruce W. Platz
Gerald G. Kokos
James R. Riesz
Carl A. Swedberg
William E. Willis
Richard E. Cox
Tom R. Wilson
Patrick A. Turlo
Ralph D. Lewis
Donald E. Plake
David J. Ramsey
Robert C. Foley
Bryant M. Nodine
Jonathan K. Waldron
Michael A. Conway
Charles S. Harris
Wynn O. Harper
Ray W. Coye
James A. Kinghorn
Tony E. Hart
Charles D. Kroll
Kenneth R. Mass
Thomas J. Marhevko
Thad W. Allen
Dennis W. Cleaveland
James A. Sylvester
James A. Brokenik
Carl R. Schramm
Albert F. Sganga
Kenneth M. Coffland
Paul D. Barlow
Fred S. Fox
Robert J. Camuccio
Gregory D. Mucci
Norman L. Sealander
Richard X. Engdahl
Anthony Bordieri
Robert F. Gonor
Steven A. Wallace
David J. Isbell
Hallie D. Bohan
Peter A. Barrett
Norman J. Dufour
Charles S. Allen
John P. Wood
Robert P. Moore
Jon E. Rosselle
Steven J. Cornell
Brian T. Kingsbury
David F. Wallace
Thomas A. Rummel
Donald T. Wetters
Philip C. Volk
Frank J. Kline
Paul W. Ljunggren
Richard C. Sasse
Terry A. Robertson
Bradley R. Troth
Henry R. Przelomski
John M. Smith
Robert D. Alling
Don E. Bumps

James B. Willis
William M. Miller
Gary R. McCaffrey
John K. Roberts
Philip J. Cappel
Charles E. Bills
Bruce E. Lee
Rand D. Lymangrover
Robert M. Bush
Craig D. Eide
Alan R. Dujenski
Robin A. Wendt
James R. McGuiness
Daniel F. Shotwell
John R. Walters
Albert A. Joens
Robert M. Letourneau
Donald E. Estes
Melvin L. Kankelfritz
Perry W. Campbell
Robert N. Zimmer
Robert E. Carmen
Duane E. Sulerud
Milton D. Moore
Frederick F. Lieder
Roger D. Holmes
Charles K. Bell
William T. Horan
Harold B. Morton
Edward J. Park
William G. Shorter
Edson J. Reeves
Joseph H. Thompson, Jr.
Charles T. Winfrey
Clyde R. Keller, Jr.
John G. Witherspoon
David C. Nelson
Alvin A. Sarra, Jr.
William J. Seney
Robert C. Dorfler
Thomas Heald, III
John D. Leslie
James R. Nagle, II

The following-named temporary officers to be permanent commissioned officers in the Regular Coast Guard in the grade of lieutenant (junior grade):

Carroll H. Holst
Richard E. Schmidt
Alfred P. Howland
James E. Cain
Timothy A. Thompson
Michael T. Eberhardt
Stanley E. Lehman
William T. Mahoney
John L. Sprague
Thomas F. Weber
Robert N. Zimmer
Robert E. Carmen
Duane E. Sulerud
Milton D. Moore
Frederick F. Lieder
Roger D. Holmes
Charles K. Bell
William T. Horan
Harold B. Morton
Edward J. Park
William G. Shorter
Edson J. Reeves
Richard L. Harvey
Christopher A. Kiefer
James A. Kramer
Charles O. Gill
John L. Glen
Gilbert O. Montoya
Roy C. Lewis, Jr.
William F. Landry
Melvin L. Kankelfritz
Perry W. Campbell
Joseph H. Thompson, J
Charles T. Winfrey
Clyde R. Keller, Jr.
John G. Witherspoon
David C. Nelson
Alvin A. Sarra, Jr.
William J. Seney
Robert C. Dorfler
Thomas Heald III
John D. Leslie
James R. Nagle II

The following-named Coast Guard Reserve officer to be a permanent commissioned officer in the Regular Coast Guard in the grade of lieutenant:

James J. Keller

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, Sections 3366 and 3367:

ARMY PROMOTION LIST

To be lieutenant colonel

Ackley, George C., Jr., [redacted]
Acuff, Milton L., Jr., [redacted]
Adams, Edward L., [redacted]
Adams, Richard E., [redacted]
Agan, Eugene F., Jr., [redacted]
Alameda, Donald J., [redacted]
Allen, Jearald D., [redacted]
Allen, John W., [redacted]
Allen, Lamonte D., [redacted]
Allen, Nard V., [redacted]
Almon, Robert N., [redacted]
Alouf, Raymond T., [redacted]
Altenburg, Fred G., [redacted]
Amick, George L., [redacted]
Anania, Joseph, [redacted]
Anderson, Duane L., [redacted]
Anderson, James J., [redacted]
Anderson, Johnny D., [redacted]
Anger, Allan W., [redacted]
Angus, Jack E., [redacted]
Ankenbrandt, William [redacted]
Annenberg, Robert B., [redacted]
Anson, Ylo, [redacted]
Armantrout, Frank G., [redacted]
Armstrong, Donald, [redacted]
Arrington, Billy J., [redacted]
Aske, Lambert J., Jr., [redacted]
Azar, James T., [redacted]
Bailey, James A., [redacted]
Bajer, John M., [redacted]
Baker, Harry L., Jr., [redacted]
Ball, Donald A., [redacted]
Banks, William F., [redacted]
Barber, Joel A., Jr., [redacted]
Barlow, Claude T., [redacted]
Barrera, Florencio, [redacted]
Barrett, Clifford I., [redacted]
Barros, Antonio P., [redacted]
Barry, David M., [redacted]
Baxter, Robert L., [redacted]
Bean, Loring B., [redacted]
Beasley, James W., [redacted]
Beatty, Earl Leslie, [redacted]
Belkov, Philip S., [redacted]
Bell, Christopher C., [redacted]
Bell, James D., [redacted]
Benabe-Benabe, Efra, [redacted]
Benassi, William, [redacted]
Bennie, James, Jr., [redacted]
Benton, Paul L., [redacted]
Bercovitz, George E., [redacted]
Berger, William H., [redacted]
Beruvides, E. M., [redacted]
Beyer, William L., [redacted]
Black, Joseph L., [redacted]
Blackshear, T. R., [redacted]
Blalock, Harold B., [redacted]
Blien, Jack W., [redacted]
Blott, William C., [redacted]
Bobst, Jack E., [redacted]
Bogaert, Theodore J., [redacted]
Bond, Robert J., [redacted]
Boros, Edward J., [redacted]
Boyles, Robert G., [redacted]
Boynton, Walker L., [redacted]
Bradie, Michael, [redacted]
Brady, Joseph T., [redacted]
Brigham, Sanford C., [redacted]
Brochhagen, Henry H., [redacted]
Bronson, William F., [redacted]
Brooks, F. B., [redacted]
Brown, Carlton M. Jr., [redacted]
Brown, Gerard L., [redacted]
Brown, Gerard R., [redacted]
Brown, Robert K., [redacted]
Brown, Russell, [redacted]
Brown, William C., [redacted]
Brownell, Donald P., [redacted]
Bryant, Columbus, [redacted]
Bunnell, Charles R., [redacted]
Burks, Archie R., [redacted]
Burre, David J., [redacted]
Burstein, Lawrence, [redacted]
Burton, Ralph C., [redacted]
Cagnina, Frank J., [redacted]
Calhoun, John R., [redacted]
Calton, Fitzhugh L., [redacted]
Cannon, Dan B., [redacted]
Cappell, John O. III, [redacted]
Carl, William E., [redacted]
Carlson, Edwin S., [redacted]
Carpenter, Roy E., [redacted]
Carter, William C., [redacted]
Case, Richard S., [redacted]
Caso, Adolph, [redacted]
Castelli, Joseph A., [redacted]
Cates, Edward L., [redacted]
Caudill, Robert M., [redacted]
Cerullo, Louis J., [redacted]
Chambers, Charles E., [redacted]
Chambers, Lomer R., [redacted]
Champion, Kenneth W., [redacted]
Channell, Howard F., [redacted]
Chapman, Carl S., [redacted]
Charon-Rodriquez, S., [redacted]
Cherpinsky, Richard, [redacted]
Chesnutt, A. B. Jr., [redacted]
Childs, Robert E., [redacted]
Christensen, Walton, [redacted]
Chun, Lawrence K. P., [redacted]
Clang, Robert R., [redacted]
Clark, Joe R., [redacted]
Clark, Raoel H., [redacted]
Claxton, John W., [redacted]
Clayton, Lawrence G., [redacted]
Clement, John P. III, [redacted]
Clemons, Samuel H., [redacted]
Cloud, John M., [redacted]
Cobb, Leroy M., [redacted]
Cosky, Frank J., [redacted]
Cogswell, Richard J., [redacted]
Cole, Donald C., [redacted]
Collet, Robert C., [redacted]
Collins, Jack R., [redacted]
Conger, William F., [redacted]
Cook, Reuben D., [redacted]
Cooper, William R., [redacted]
Cote, Thomas E., [redacted]
Craig, Lois H., [redacted]
Creel, Mike C., [redacted]
Crumpton, Bobby R., [redacted]
Cummings, Robert C., [redacted]
Cummings, Truman E., [redacted]
Cumpian, Jose G., [redacted]
Custead, Jerry R., [redacted]
Dains, Jay D., [redacted]
Dalzell, Arthur H., [redacted]
Damon, William B., [redacted]
Dankert, Derald T., [redacted]
Davis, Frank L., [redacted]
Davis, Gene C., [redacted]
Davis, Henry M., [redacted]
Davis, Thomas G., [redacted]
Davis, William R., [redacted]
Dawson, Earl N., Jr., [redacted]
Dean, Wilson P., [redacted]
Debner, Donald W., [redacted]
Deroos, Gordon D., [redacted]
Deruve, Arthur, [redacted]
Devine, James F., [redacted]
Devine, John A., [redacted]
Dick, Sheldon L., [redacted]
Dimick, David L., [redacted]
Diperna, Anthony J., [redacted]
Disheroon, Fred R., [redacted]
Dominik, Joseph W., [redacted]
Doten, Herbert R., [redacted]
Doyle, Leo D., [redacted]
Dmytryk, Stanley G., [redacted]
Drennon, Clarence B., [redacted]
Drew, James B., Jr., [redacted]
Driscoll, Paul J., [redacted]
Duerr, Richard D., [redacted]
Duggan, Maurice, [redacted]
Dunkelberger, James, [redacted]
Durham, William H., [redacted]
Easter, Loy Dalton, [redacted]
Eberly, Dewey H., [redacted]
Echols, James D., [redacted]
Edwards, Paul R., [redacted]
Edwards, William J., [redacted]
Ehmann, Richard R., [redacted]
Ellison, William R., [redacted]
Elsea, Jac E., [redacted]
Epperson, Theo S., [redacted]
Estes, James O., [redacted]
Eusey, Donn O., [redacted]
Evans, Richard, [redacted]
Ewing, Virgil O., [redacted]
Extrand, Charles W., [redacted]
Fairbank, John Carr, [redacted]
Fantini, Joseph C., [redacted]
Farrel, Paul J., [redacted]
Faulkner, Jack S., [redacted]
Fay, James H., Jr., [redacted]
Feagley, Jack P., [redacted]
Febres-Silva, Ellis, [redacted]
Ferguson, John D., [redacted]
Ferrermena, Ramon J., [redacted]
Firth, Henry Owen, [redacted]
Fisher, George H., [redacted]
Fleming, James B., [redacted]
Flynn, S. B., Jr., [redacted]
Ford, William R., [redacted]
Forker, Olan D., [redacted]
Forkner, Frederick, [redacted]
Fouts, Daniel W., [redacted]
Fox, James D., [redacted]
France, G. M. III, [redacted]
Frasier, Raymond F., [redacted]
Frate, William A., [redacted]
Freeman, William R., [redacted]
Gaebelein, James M., [redacted]
Garbo, Salvatore J., [redacted]
Garcia, Rudolph V., [redacted]
Gardner, John D., [redacted]
Gase, Louis J., [redacted]
Gates, Philip W., [redacted]
Gause, James E., [redacted]
Gedeon, Ernest R., [redacted]
Gee, Freddy, [redacted]
George, John W., Jr., [redacted]
Gibson, Murray W., [redacted]

Gildart, Philip J., [redacted]
Gill, Norman R., [redacted]
Gilliam, Milford S., [redacted]
Glaser, Robert E., [redacted]
Gleiser, Ferman O., [redacted]
Glenn, Michael D., [redacted]
Gleue, Merlin W., [redacted]
Glover, Joe M., [redacted]
Goebel, Ernest W., [redacted]
Goff, Roy C., [redacted]
Gomulka, Stanley J., [redacted]
Gordon, Thomas B., [redacted]
Goss, Melvin L., [redacted]
Graham, Henry N., [redacted]
Green, Paul M., [redacted]
Green, Raymond B., Jr., [redacted]
Greene, Delbert M., [redacted]
Griggs, Ulysses S. J., [redacted]
Grimes, Walter H., [redacted]
Grob, Rudolph O., [redacted]
Gross, Paul J., [redacted]
Grossman, Peter G., [redacted]
Gunby, Frank M., Jr., [redacted]
Haight, Gordon L., [redacted]
Haitz, Cornelius S., [redacted]
Hammond, James A., [redacted]
Hancock, James F., [redacted]
Hand, Francis D., Jr., [redacted]
Handorf, William A., [redacted]
Hansen, George J., [redacted]
Hanson, Douglas D., [redacted]
Hara, Henry S., [redacted]
Hardy, John L., [redacted]
Hardy, William H., [redacted]
Harootunian, Harry, [redacted]
Harrell, Adam, [redacted]
Harris, Gerald E., [redacted]
Hart, Eugene P., [redacted]
Hartschuh, Donald C., [redacted]
Haskett, Martin C., [redacted]
Hatten, Richard E., [redacted]
Hawkins, Averill E., [redacted]
Hawkinson, James Q., [redacted]
Haywood, Charles C., [redacted]
Heckman, John H., [redacted]
Hering, Louis, [redacted]
Herndon, George B., [redacted]
Herring, Billie D., [redacted]
Hershbarger, Robert, [redacted]
Herzog, George A., [redacted]
Hess, Richard W., [redacted]
Hester, E. W., Jr., [redacted]
Higgins, Richard C., [redacted]
Hill, Eugene F., [redacted]
Hill, Hal E., [redacted]
Hill, John E., [redacted]
Hill, Robert W., [redacted]
Hocevar, Joseph R., [redacted]
Hohensinner, Thomas, [redacted]
Holcomb, Gary E., [redacted]
Holland, Christian, [redacted]
Holm, Jerry L., [redacted]
Holmes, James R., [redacted]
Holt, Wayne H., [redacted]
Hoover, Max M. Jr., [redacted]
Hopkins, Rodney A., [redacted]
Horton, Sidney L., [redacted]
House, David G., [redacted]
Howard, Ernest M., [redacted]
Hubbard, Charles W., [redacted]
Hughes, Paul E., [redacted]
Hull, Louis E., [redacted]
Hurdle, Lawrence W., [redacted]
Huston, Richard J., [redacted]
Ianni, Robert C., [redacted]
Inaba, Gilbert Y., [redacted]
Ishibashi, Theodore, [redacted]
Ivaska, Raymond D., [redacted]
Izumo, Hiromu, [redacted]
Jaccard, Mermod C. J., [redacted]
Jackson, Donald, [redacted]
Jackson, Ralph E., [redacted]
Jakes, James W., [redacted]
Jallins, Walter J., [redacted]
January, James D., [redacted]
Johnson, Adley E., [redacted]
Johnson, Dale E., [redacted]
Johnson, Dion, [redacted]
Johnson, Harold W., [redacted]
Johnson, Homer A. Jr., [redacted]
Johnson, James A., [redacted]
Johnson, Johnny M., [redacted]
Johnson, Joseph H. J., [redacted]
Johnson, Kenneth G., [redacted]
Johnson, Lamarr L., [redacted]
Johnson, Lloyd N., [redacted]
Johnson, Raymond T., [redacted]
Johnson, Richard A., [redacted]
Johnston, William R., [redacted]
Jones, Carlton C., [redacted]
Jones, Harry D., [redacted]
Jones, Robert L., [redacted]
Jones, William D., [redacted]
Jordon, Frederick H., [redacted]
Jordan, Lennon G. Jr., [redacted]
Juarbe-Perez, Will, [redacted]
Kaczmarczyk, Theodo, [redacted]
Kalitka, Peter F., [redacted]
Kam, Grover M. Y., [redacted]
Kates, Charles M., [redacted]
Kaufman, Richard C., [redacted]
Keadle, Jack L., [redacted]
Keene, William B., [redacted]
Kemp, Gordon A., [redacted]
Kenemer, Jack, [redacted]
Kennedy, John R., [redacted]
Kerby, Jack O., [redacted]
Kercsi, Emil F., [redacted]
Kernan, Redmond F., [redacted]
Kimura, Shigeo, [redacted]
King, Francis E., [redacted]
King, Jimmie F., [redacted]
King, Samuel M., [redacted]
King, William R., [redacted]
Kish, Andrew W., [redacted]
Knopf, Arthur E., [redacted]
Kowalski, Louis E., [redacted]
Kowitz, David D., [redacted]
Kuntz, William E., [redacted]
Kuwahara, Harold Y., [redacted]
Lacy, Richard H., [redacted]
Lamb, Heber B., [redacted]
Lang, David Jr., [redacted]
Langford, Wilbur R., [redacted]
Lareau, Paul C., [redacted]
Larkin, Francis J., [redacted]
Laroche, Joseph A., [redacted]
Larson, Robert D., [redacted]
Lau, Daniel K. M., [redacted]
Laubscher, Lawrence, [redacted]
Leach, Ernest M., [redacted]
Leck, Cleon C., [redacted]
Leverett Flynt L. J., [redacted]
Levine, Marvin, [redacted]
Leavitt, J. L. III, [redacted]
Lenard, Edward M., [redacted]
Lennon, James F., [redacted]
Lesica, John P., [redacted]
Lewis, Edward T. Jr., [redacted]
Linaberger, Charles, [redacted]
Lingo, Robert A., [redacted]
Liprie, Sam F., [redacted]
Locaputo, Michael P., [redacted]
Loman, Billy D., [redacted]
Looney, Milton A., [redacted]
Love, Kenneth R., [redacted]
Lubkin, Yale J., [redacted]
Lundgren, George H., [redacted]
Lynn, David C., Jr., [redacted]
MacDonald, Robert J., [redacted]
Magee, Edkar L. Jr., [redacted]
Magee, Ralph W., [redacted]
Makaea, George W., [redacted]
Malmer, Charles D., [redacted]
Mangels, Robert L., [redacted]
Manheimer, Ben P. Jr., [redacted]
Manley, Willis L., [redacted]
Manning, John I., [redacted]
Manus, Ralph K., Jr., [redacted]
Markey, C. J. II, [redacted]
Marrero-Aulet, Roberto, [redacted]
Martin, Jerry R., [redacted]
Martin, John F., [redacted]
Martin, Robert III, [redacted]
Martin, Robert B., [redacted]
May, John E., [redacted]
Maze, Glenn L., [redacted]
McCaskill, William, [redacted]
McClaran, Edward B., [redacted]
McColl, Alexander M., [redacted]
McConnell, James C., [redacted]
McCormack, David H., [redacted]
McCuin, Earl G., [redacted]
McDowell, James R., [redacted]
McIntosh, Thomas J., [redacted]
McKay, Jack G., [redacted]
McLean, Willard J., [redacted]
McLendon, Lem J., [redacted]
McTighe, Tomas, [redacted]
Mechling, Chris R., [redacted]
Meisenheimer, Willi, [redacted]
Meister, George T., [redacted]
Melnikov, Miles P., [redacted]
Michael, James W., [redacted]
Michael, Ralph A., [redacted]
Miegel, Allen P., Jr., [redacted]
Miller, Eugene R., [redacted]
Miller, Harold A., [redacted]
Miller, Robert M., [redacted]
Miller, William E., [redacted]
Millhollon, Joe B., [redacted]
Mills, Richard H., [redacted]
Minor, William R., [redacted]
Moffett, Tommy C., [redacted]
Mojica, Gilberto E., [redacted]
Molitor, Leo T., Jr., [redacted]
Moody, Ellis R., [redacted]
Moore, Curtis T., [redacted]
Morgan, James G., [redacted]
Morris, Otis A., [redacted]
Morrison, James H., [redacted]
Moseley, Paul L., [redacted]
Moser, Daniel H., [redacted]
Moten, John E., [redacted]
Mowry, James D., [redacted]
Mugler, Glenn P., [redacted]
Muller, Edward W., [redacted]
Munroe, Calvin W., [redacted]
Murdock, Robert B., [redacted]
Musselman, Alan M., [redacted]
Mutter, Herbert B., [redacted]
Nalley, Wayland J., [redacted]
Neil, Charles S., [redacted]
Nelms, James W., [redacted]
Nicely, James D., [redacted]
Nixon, James T., [redacted]
Obregon, Conrad J., [redacted]
Olynyk, Stephen D., [redacted]
Orbell, Raymond J., [redacted]
Orr, Billy J., [redacted]
Overend, Charles R., [redacted]
Palmer, Bobby G., [redacted]
Palmer, Cecil E., [redacted]
Palmer, Glenn H., Jr., [redacted]
Palmer, Thomas B., [redacted]
Paredes, Robert, [redacted]
Park, Russell E., [redacted]
Parker, Jesse W., [redacted]
Patrick, William S., [redacted]
Patterson, Stanley, [redacted]
Peavy, Freddie H., [redacted]
Peele, William G., [redacted]
Pelosky, Robert J., [redacted]
Pengra, Vale C., [redacted]
Penn, Donor D., [redacted]
Perez, George Louis, [redacted]
Perkins, Marvin D., [redacted]
Petersen, F. W., [redacted]
Peterson, Ralph W. I., [redacted]
Pfleghardt, Robert, [redacted]
Phelps, Paul E., [redacted]
Phillips, Benjamin, [redacted]
Phillips, Joseph A., [redacted]
Phillips, Samuel W., [redacted]
Pierce, Martin E., [redacted]
Pincock, Don S., [redacted]
Pirie, George C., Jr., [redacted]
Pisarich, Ray V., Jr., [redacted]
Polley, Richard E., [redacted]
Pope, John C., [redacted]
Poplin, Earl S., [redacted]
Porter, Kenneth B., [redacted]
Potts, Walter R., [redacted]
Poverello, Robert A., [redacted]
Powell, John S., [redacted]
Powers, Clifford L., [redacted]
Prescott, Luther E., [redacted]
Pressley, Alton B., [redacted]
Previs, Arthur L., [redacted]

Prickett, Grover C., [redacted]
Prieser, Dale E., [redacted]
Prone, Joseph G., [redacted]
Prospero-Altiery M., [redacted]
Purcell, Robert W., [redacted]
Pyle, Langston, [redacted]
Radcliffe, Robert G., [redacted]
Ramseur, Henry M., [redacted]
Randau, John A., [redacted]
Rappel, Frank R., [redacted]
Reay, Tommy L., [redacted]
Reck, Russell, [redacted]
Redock, Sanford A., [redacted]
Reed, Alfred D., [redacted]
Reed, Earle R., [redacted]
Reed, Paul M., [redacted]
Reese, Robert L., [redacted]
Rensel, George, Jr., [redacted]
Respess, Robert B., [redacted]
Reynolds, Alfred M., [redacted]
Rhoads, Robert C., [redacted]
Riccio, Donald R., [redacted]
Rice, Robert G., [redacted]
Rice, Robert N., Jr., [redacted]
Richey, Robert R., [redacted]
Riedel, George F., [redacted]
Rihn, James S., [redacted]
Ringer, Frederick, [redacted]
Rios-Rolon, Wilthro, [redacted]
Rixner, Alton J., [redacted]
Roberts, Jerry W., [redacted]
Robinson, Bobby L., [redacted]
Rocha, Manuel, [redacted]
Rodgers, Sterling M., [redacted]
Roob, Gerald L., [redacted]
Ross, George H., Jr., [redacted]
Ross, James E., [redacted]
Roybal, Frederick J., [redacted]
Ruckh, Charles W., [redacted]
Rudnick, Gerald S., [redacted]
Rudolph, Robert J., [redacted]
Rutledge, Howard L., [redacted]
Sachs, Arthur, [redacted]
Salmon, Dan A., [redacted]
Sanborn, Everett C., [redacted]
Santos, Francis J., [redacted]
Sarantos, George N., [redacted]
Sauer, James A., [redacted]
Saunders, Norman D., [redacted]
Savage, Robert G., [redacted]
Schaefer, Frederick, [redacted]
Schaefer, John O., [redacted]
Scherer, Loyd H., [redacted]
Scheuermann, Earl R., [redacted]
Schilder, Keith E., [redacted]
Schoenwald, Walter, [redacted]
Schramm, Harold A., [redacted]
Schule, Ronald L., [redacted]
Schulz, Alger W., [redacted]
Schumpert, William, [redacted]
Schutzmann, Roy L., [redacted]
Schwalbe, Everett L., [redacted]
Schwerdtfeger, Fred, [redacted]
Scott, Everett B., [redacted]
Scott, Jack H., [redacted]
Scott, Willard A., [redacted]
Seidel, Walter R., [redacted]
Seyfried, Robert E., [redacted]
Shelton, Tommy J., [redacted]
Seymour, Kenneth W., [redacted]
Shearon, Gerald D., [redacted]
Shepley, James M., [redacted]
Shetler, Robert C., [redacted]
Shudarek, Ervin P., [redacted]
Silva, Thomas J., [redacted]
Silvi, Albert H., [redacted]
Simpson, Charles E., [redacted]
Simpson, James, [redacted]
Sisk, William M., [redacted]
Skeens, Earl G., Jr., [redacted]
Skelton, Russel M., [redacted]
Smith, Bernard C., [redacted]
Smith, Charles E., [redacted]
Smith, Clarence A., [redacted]
Smith, Doyle D., [redacted]
Smith, Grover C., [redacted]
Smith, John E., [redacted]
Smith, Lynwood K., [redacted]
Smith, Robert E., [redacted]
Smith, Robert F., [redacted]
Smith, Robert S., [redacted]
Smith, Stephen T., [redacted]
Smith, William M., [redacted]
Snashall, Robert R., [redacted]
Snow, Clifford N., [redacted]
Soha, Charles R., [redacted]
Sorensen, Glade V., [redacted]
Spillers, Roger, [redacted]
Spitters, Frank, Jr., [redacted]
Spraggins, Gerald R., [redacted]
Sprague, Charles R., [redacted]
Stanley, Thomas R., [redacted]
Starr, Luther J., [redacted]
Steele, Siegfried W., [redacted]
Steiner, John W., [redacted]
Stepanovitch, Sava, [redacted]
Stockton, George K., [redacted]
Stone, C. O., Jr., [redacted]
Stone, Kenneth E., [redacted]
Stone, Patrick S., [redacted]
Strohecker, Daniel, [redacted]
Strong, Joseph R., [redacted]
Strong, Warren R., [redacted]
Suarez, Edward, [redacted]
Sudman, Robert H., [redacted]
Sulzbach, William L., [redacted]
Surman, George R., [redacted]
Suter, Paul J., [redacted]
Sweetman, James L., [redacted]
Sykes, George E., [redacted]
Taaffe, Donald R., [redacted]
Tackett, Charles M., [redacted]
Taebel, Delbert A., [redacted]
Tallat-Kelpsa, Algi, [redacted]
Tallman, Charles W., [redacted]
Taricani, Joseph R., [redacted]
Tassotti, Dante R., [redacted]
Taylor, Arnie L., [redacted]
Taylor, Burrell C., [redacted]
Taylor, John W., [redacted]
Tegtmeyer, George F., [redacted]
Tenhoff, Clair A., [redacted]
Teubert, Richard L., [redacted]
Thedieck, James J., [redacted]
Thomas, David J., [redacted]
Thomas, Jackie L., [redacted]
Thomas, Rudolph C., [redacted]
Thompson, Donald C., [redacted]
Thompson, James R., [redacted]
Thomson, John M., [redacted]
Timmerman, Raymond, [redacted]
Tinsley, Robert W., [redacted]
Tisher, Thomas H., [redacted]
Toohey, William M., [redacted]
Torrell, John J., [redacted]
Towery, Bobby A., [redacted]
Trapp, Gerald W., [redacted]
Trussell, James M., [redacted]
Turrentine, James L., [redacted]
Valenti, Anthony, [redacted]
Vallejo, Edmundo, [redacted]
Varner, Alphonso B., [redacted]
Vaughn, Edward M., Jr., [redacted]
Villacres, Jorge N., [redacted]
Viney, John A., [redacted]
Walden, Oscar D., [redacted]
Walker, Charles C., [redacted]
Walker, James E., [redacted]
Walker, Leonard A., [redacted]
Wallace, Kenneth E., [redacted]
Walsh, Harvey W., [redacted]
Walters, Thomas J., [redacted]
Warlick, Thomas W., [redacted]
Watkins, G. L., Jr., [redacted]
Watson, Richard W., [redacted]
Watts, Donald R., [redacted]
Wax, Morton I., [redacted]
Weber, Michael M., [redacted]
Weese, John D., [redacted]
Weidner, Richard E., [redacted]
Weil, Richard G., [redacted]
Wells, Henderson R., [redacted]
Wendt, Oliver H., [redacted]
Werner, Charles P., [redacted]
Wheeler, Dudley B. J., [redacted]
White, Herbert W., [redacted]
White, Lewis O., [redacted]
Whitman, Robert L., [redacted]
Widrig, Frank C., Jr., [redacted]
Wiele, William W., [redacted]
Wiest, Don S., [redacted]
Wigley, George M., [redacted]
Wiley, Alton W., [redacted]
Wiley, Arthur G., Jr., [redacted]
Wilke, Gilbert P., [redacted]
Wilkerson, W. H., [redacted]
Wilkinson, Thomas A., [redacted]
Williams, Allan R., [redacted]
Williams, David C., [redacted]
Williams, Harry K., [redacted]
Williams, Nevin R., [redacted]
Williamson, Reuben, [redacted]
Wills, Thomas J., [redacted]
Willson, Tyson, Jr., [redacted]
Wilson, Jerry C., [redacted]
Winchester, R. P., [redacted]
Winn, Jimmy L., [redacted]
Winters, Arnold L., [redacted]
Winters, Ross V., [redacted]
Woehr, William S., [redacted]
Wohlbold, Ernest M., [redacted]
Wong, Genson L., [redacted]
Woolsey, Herbert L., [redacted]
Worley, Ross E., Jr., [redacted]
Worthington, Lyman, [redacted]
Wright, Bruce T., [redacted]
Yarbrough, Robert E., [redacted]

CHAPLAIN

To be lieutenant colonel

Ballentine, Wyman W., [redacted]
Bershon, Richard Y., [redacted]
Betsill, Paul A., [redacted]
Bracy, Russell E., [redacted]
Brown, Winslow E., [redacted]
Carver, Russel J., [redacted]
Chance, Ernest L., [redacted]
Cohen, Donald L., [redacted]
Combs, Louis K., Jr., [redacted]
Downes, Thomas J., [redacted]
Dunn, Roger T., [redacted]
Durbin, Samuel E., [redacted]
Ellsworth, Arnold T., [redacted]
Fritz, Howard W., [redacted]
Graham, William H. I., [redacted]
Hess, Robert S., [redacted]
Holliday, Joseph V., [redacted]
Hollis, William R., [redacted]
Horne, Robert M., [redacted]
Huseth, Joseph L. F., [redacted]
Jaeger, James C., [redacted]
Kita, Edward J., [redacted]
Klein, Ernest C., [redacted]
Knab, Frank J., [redacted]
Knights, Ward A., Jr., [redacted]
Komschlies, C. G., [redacted]
Lieberman, Alvin I., [redacted]
Loftus, Conrad W., [redacted]
Logue, Charles D., [redacted]
Lucas, Adlail, [redacted]
McCollum, Robert R., [redacted]
Norris, Harwell E., [redacted]
Outtrim, William B., [redacted]
Person, Richard L., [redacted]
Phillabaum, Jack H., [redacted]
Phillips, Daniel P., [redacted]
Pratt, Glenn R., [redacted]
Pusey, Paul M., [redacted]
Rakestraw, John A., [redacted]
Rendahl, Roger E., [redacted]
Sauer, Walter K., [redacted]
Schkade, Raymond C., [redacted]
Schneider, Harold D., [redacted]
Singleton, James C., [redacted]
Smith, Billy T., [redacted]
Spear, Ralph S., [redacted]
Spencer, Herbert H., [redacted]
Taylor, Wallace M., [redacted]
Terry, Frederick D., [redacted]
Torer, Roland R., [redacted]
Watness, Luther O., [redacted]
York, Edwin R., [redacted]

WOMEN'S ARMY CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Hubik, Dolores H., [redacted]
Mecklem, Grace L., [redacted]
Messer, Rhoda Marie, [redacted]
Pennington, Doris V., [redacted]
Ramirez, Marie Diaz, [redacted]