United States of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 94th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

## SENATE—*Monday, October 6, 1975*

*(Legislative day of Thursday, September 11, 1975)*

The Senate met at 12 noon, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the Vice President.

### PRAYER

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

O God, our Father, may our noon-day prayer lift us above all ceremony, all words, and all symbols into the light of Thy presence. As we quiet our spirits may we learn in silence what we can never know in speaking. May we hear again in the depths of our being Thy "still small voice," more real, more vivid, more powerful than any audible speech. Send Thy light and Thy truth into us that we may be wiser than we were before we prayed. In Thy power and by Thy grace make us better than we are that we may do our part in the shaping of a better world. Send us to our tasks in the spirit of Him who was and now is the Way, the Truth, and the Life. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Journal of the proceedings of Friday, October 3, 1975, be approved.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is ordered.

### WAIVER OF CALL OF THE CALENDAR UNDER RULE VIII

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

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

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN MEASURES ON THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate turn to the consideration of Calendar Orders numbered 400 and 401.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### STATE FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE FOR WATER RESOURCES PLANNING

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 506) to amend the Water Resources Planning Act to extend the authority for financial assistance to the States for water resources planning, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965 (79 Stat. 244, as amended) is hereby further amended as follows:

(a) By deleting in section 101 the words "the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare," and inserting in lieu thereof "the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, the Secretary of Transportation, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency,".

(b) By deleting in section 105(a)(5) the words "to exceed $100 per diem for individuals" and inserting in lieu thereof "in excess of the daily equivalent of the rate prescribed for grade GS–18 under section 5332 of title 5 of the United States Code in the case of individual experts of consultants;".

(c) By deleting in section 205(a)(4) the words "to exceed $100 per diem" and inserting in lieu thereof "in excess of the daily equivalent of the rate prescribed for grade GS–18 under section 5332 of title 5, United States Code,".

(d) By deleting in section 301(a) the words "for the next fiscal year beginning after the date of the enactment of this Act and for the nine succeeding fiscal years thereafter" and inserting in lieu thereof "for fiscal years 1977 and 1978".

(e) By deleting immediately after the phrase "(c) not to exceed" in section 401(c) the words "$3,500,000 annually for fiscal years 1974 and 1975" and inserting in lieu thereof "a total of $10,000,000 for fiscal years 1976 and 1977".

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The title was amended so as to read:

"A bill to amend the Water Resources Planning Act (79 Stat. 244), as amended.

### DEBORAH J. KING

The resolution (S. Res. 274) to pay a gratuity to Deborah J. King, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

**S. Res. 274**

*Resolved,* That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Deborah J. King, widow of Ervin King, Jr., an employee of the Architect of the Capitol assigned to duty in the Senate Office Buildings at the time of his death, a sum equal to six months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

### VISIT OF HIS MAJESTY, THE EMPEROR OF JAPAN

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, the United States was fortunate last week to have the Emperor of Japan visit this country and to be the guest of the President of the United States.

I ask unanimous consent that statements made on the south lawn on October 2 on the arrival of His Majesty, the Emperor of Japan, the Emperor's speech at the White House on October 2, and also the President's speech at the banquet at the Smithsonian Institution on October 3, 1975, all be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

EXCHANGE OF REMARKS BETWEEN THE PRESIDENT AND HIROHITO, EMPEROR OF JAPAN; THE SOUTH LAWN

The PRESIDENT. Your Majesties, it is an honor for me to extend to you, on behalf of the American people, a warm and heartfelt welcome to the United States.

Mrs. Ford joins me with the greatest personal pleasure for both of us in greeting Your Majesties here today.

This first State visit for an Emperor and Empress of Japan to the United States is an historic occasion with profound importance. Japan and the United States have had a special and unique relationship since the days when Commodore Perry sailed to Japan more than 120 years ago.

Our early relations were marked by many memorable events. The United States was the first country to establish a treaty relationship with Japan, the first to station a consul in Japan, and the first to receive a diplomatic commission from Japan. That commission was received by President Buchanan in 1860 here in the White House.

During the illustrious reign of your illustrious grandfather, Emperor Meiji, Japan chose the United States as the first stop for the Iwakura mission and Japan's special envoys were received by President Grant.

After President Grant left the Presidency, he visited Japan and met the Emperor. This was in 1878, almost a century ago. Emperor Meiji said, "America and Japan, being near neighbors, separated only by an ocean, will become more and more closely connected with each other as time goes on."

These prophetic words symbolized our mutual desire to establish a sound and lasting



AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

friendship. What was a century ago a visionary goal has now become a reality for millions of Americans and Japanese. Our peoples are bound together by a multitude of institutional and personal ties.

The constant flow of knowledge, ideas and cultural influences between our two countries enriches the depth and meaning of our ties each year. It is this broad public involvement which fulfills the hopes of our early leaders.

The greetings of friendship which we exchange today represent the deep sentiments of both nations, at a time when the benefits of cooperative relations between our two countries are mutually acclaimed.

Your Majesty's visit symbolizes and strengthens the ties of friendship between our two peoples. The warm memories of my trip to Japan last fall remains vivid.

Mrs. Ford and I have happily anticipated Your Majesty's visit. We earnestly hope that your stay in Washington and your journey to other parts of the United States will be as pleasant to your Majesties personally as they are important to the history of our two great nations.

Emperor HIROHITO. Mr. President, Mrs. Ford, ladies and gentlemen:

Thank you most sincerely, Mr. President, for your gracious words of welcome. It has long been my wish to come to the United States, and the Empress and I deeply appreciate your kind invitation to pay this official visit.

We are indeed delighted to be here at this historic moment on the very eve of the Bicentennial of American independence when the American people reflect on the past and look to the future.

For me, also, this visit is a valuable opportunity to reflect on the past relationships between Japan and the United States and to its future. Our peoples withstood the challenges of one tragic interlude when the Pacific Ocean, symbol of tranquility, was instead a rough and stormy sea, and have built today unchanging ties of friendship and good will.

I feel immeasurably gratified by this happy development, and look forward with great anticipation to the future of our relationship.

Mr. President, you visited Japan last year, as the first incumbent President of the United States to do so, and impressed us deeply by your eagerness to meet and mingle with our people.

I know that your visit has contributed greatly to the mutual trust between our two peoples. Although our stay in your country is for but a brief two weeks, we hope to meet with Americans from every walk of life and to glimpse variety of American sights.

We will be happy if we, too, can contribute to everlasting friendship between our two peoples through our visit.

May I thank you again, Mr. President, for your warm hospitality. Permit me, also, to extend to all the citizens of your great country my best wishes for continued prosperity.

---

ADDRESS OF HIS MAJESTY THE EMPEROR OF JAPAN AT THE WHITE HOUSE ON OCTOBER 2, 1975

Mr. President, Mrs. Ford, ladies and gentlemen:

I wish to offer my sincere appreciation for your most thoughtful words. I am deeply moved by your warm expression of goodwill toward Japan, and the people of Japan.

Your visit to Japan last fall, Mr. President, wrote a bright and happy page in the 120-year-long history of Japanese-American relations. Ever since your visit, the Empress and I have been looking forward to this moment, when we might be with you again, Mr. President, and with Mrs. Ford for the first time.

We also thank you cordially for your gracious hospitality this evening at the White House. We are mindful that, in this House, great leaders of your country have presided since the early years of the nation, making their indelible marks on national and world history.

Our first night in the United States we spent at Williamsburg, resting from our long journey and savoring, in the calm atmosphere of that picturesque town, historic reminders of the birth of this nation. Those associations are deepened for us tonight, in your company, and in this historic House.

I recall the wise counsel which your first President, George Washington, gave the American people upon leaving the office of the Presidency in 1796: "Observe good faith and justice toward all nations. Cultivate peace and harmony with all."

This precept is still valid in today's world. It is an ideal shared by the Japanese people in their continuing efforts to cultivate peace and harmony within the international community.

It has been my wish for many years to visit the United States. There is one thing in particular which I have hoped to convey to the American people, should my visit be materialized. That is, to extend in my own words my gratitude to the people of the United States for the friendly hand of goodwill and assistance their great country accorded us for our postwar reconstruction, immediately following that most unfortunate war which I deeply deplore. Today a new generation, with no personal memory of those years, is about to be in a majority in both our societies. Yet I am confident that the story of the generosity and goodwill of the American people will be retold from generation to generation of Japanese for the rest of time.

The United States has made extraordinary contributions to the well-being and progress of mankind during the past two centuries. Today, on the eve of your Bicentennial, and amidst the shifting tides of history, the United States continues to stand for the high ideals which gave this nation birth. The American people are still contributing to further development of this most vigorous and creative society, and to the building of peace and prosperity in the world.

Mankind is now engaged in a common endeavor, the creation of a just and peaceful international community. For this lofty objective, it is my hope that Japan and the United States, as two powerful and stable nations, cooperate actively on the basis of even better understanding of each other through further dialogue, drawing strengths from the richness of our past histories and traditions.

Ladies and gentlemen, I propose a toast to the health of the President of the United States of America and Mrs. Ford, and to the American people on the threshold of your third glorious century as a nation.

---

ADDRESS OF HIS MAJESTY THE EMPEROR OF JAPAN ON THE OCCASION OF THE RETURN BANQUET AT THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION ON OCT. 3, 1975

Mr. President, Mrs. Ford, ladies and gentlemen:

The Empress and I are greatly honored to be with you this evening, Mr. President, Mrs. Ford, and distinguished guests, representing the broad spectrum of the American people.

May I take this opportunity to express anew our sincere appreciation for the cordial hospitality extended to us by the President and the people of the United States.

The Japanese-American relationship began some 120 years ago, when Commodore Matthew Perry reached our shore, to begin the process of opening Japan to the outside world. Five years later, Japan dispatched its first delegation to the United States on the mission of exchanging the instruments of ratification of our Treaty of Amity and Commerce. It is recorded that the delegation visited this Smithsonian Institution.

One of Japan's leading intellectuals at the time of my grandfather, the Emperor Meiji, was Yukichi Fukuzawa. He accompanied the delegation to the United States, aboard the escort ship "Kanrin Maru". Upon his return, Fukuzawa wrote a book entitled "Seiyo-jijo" or "Things Western". In this volume Fukuzawa described how the United States, under the "purest form of republican government", had been living up to the ideals of its Founding Fathers, and included a full Japanese translation of the Declaration of Independence of the United States. His enlightening suggestions were a source of inspiration to the Japanese people of the time who were just beginning to emerge out of centuries of isolation into the age of modernization.

Succeeding generations of Japanese and Americans have built on those early interchanges, establishing, in our time, a relationship of extensive cooperation in political, economic, industrial, academic, cultural and many other fields.

Today, as the United States is about to celebrate its bicentennial, Japan and the United States have become the nearest of neighbors, despite the vast reach of the Pacific Ocean, which separates our two countries, and despite the great distances between our respective histories, traditions, languages and cultures. Never before in history have two such distant and different peoples forged such close bonds of friendship.

I am confident that friendship, so well tested through a number of trials in the past, is an enduring one which will withstand whatever vicissitude there may be in future history.

Ladies and gentlemen, I ask you to join me in a toast to the continued health of the President of the United States of America and Mrs. Ford and to the prosperity of this great Republic.

---

ADDRESS OF THE PRESIDENT ON THE OCCASION OF THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION BANQUET ON OCTOBER 3, 1975

Your Majesties, Mrs. Ford and I are deeply honored to be your guests this evening. Japanese hospitality is always warm and most gracious, as I can testify from my visit last year to Tokyo and Kyoto.

Your kind and very thoughtful words have made a deep impression upon Mrs. Ford, myself and the American people, and it is an honor for me this evening to have an opportunity to respond.

Your Majesties' visit to Washington has been pleasant, as I have gathered from our discussions, but all too brief. Tomorrow, you leave for a journey across America. Many Americans you will meet and the places you will visit have long-standing and important connections with Japan.

I am very pleased that your Majesty will see some of our small towns as well as our great cities. The farm you will visit in Illinois is symbolic of the importance of agriculture as well as trade in American and Japanese relations.

I am particularly happy that your Majesties will visit the oceanographic research centers in Woods Hole, Massachusetts, and La Jolla, California, where some of America's leading marine biologists will have an opportunity to discuss matters of mutual interest.

Your Majesty's personal role in scientific research symbolizes the contribution that international scientific exchanges have made

to the advancements of knowledge in our two nations and to their mutual benefit.

Mrs. Ford and I are very pleased that time has been found for Your Majesty, the Empress, to meet Americans who share her artistic interest in humanitarian concerns. We are glad that you will also have time to relax and enjoy other aspects of American life, such as football on Sunday, Disneyland later, and the tropical beauty of Hawaii.

Your visit, of course, draws attention as well to the place Americans of Japanese ancestry occupy in our national life. While their numbers are not large, their contributions to American life have been most significant.

Through quiet and very diligent endeavor, Japanese-Americans have attained highly respected places in the most exalted rank of every profession, in the arts and sciences and, of course, in public affairs. The cultural heritage that they have given us has enriched American life. They are actually a living bond between our two great countries.

Your Majesty, when you assumed the throne in 1926, you chose the Japanese words "showa," meaning "enlightened peace," as the name of your reign. Those words expressed an exalted ideal and now in the unprecedented 50th year of your reign, the Japanese peoples' accomplishments and their place in the world have fulfilled your early hopes.

Your Majesties' historic visit has enhanced Japanese-American relations with a new dignity and it has made us even more aware of the benefits of peace as well as friendship between us. It has also reinvigorated our shared determination to encourage even closer ties and greater cooperation between the Japanese and the American people.

Ladies and gentlemen, I ask that you join me in expressing appreciation for their Majesties' hospitality this evening as I propose a toast to their Majesties, the Emperor and the Empress of Japan.

## ORDER OF BUSINESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, if the distinguished majority leader will be good enough to respond, I would like to inquire as to the program for this week and for the period from October 10 to 20.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am delighted that the distinguished Republican leader has raised that question because the Senate faces a difficult period in the next week ahead, and maybe in the week following.

There is, for example, the matter of the Sinai settlement, which I understand will not be reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations before Tuesday at the earliest, which means that we cannot take it up until Wednesday at the earliest. If anyone raises the 3-day rule on that occasion, I think the joint leaders should have the right to call it up at that time.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. If the Senator will yield, I would say I would join him if it is necessary in so acting.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I hope it is not necessary. I hope there is no difficulty in calling up the proposed Sinai settlement, and I hope it will be possible to achieve a consent agreement as to time because of the fact that a time factor is involved.

I would hope it would be possible also, though I must admit in all candor I am not sanguine, that the emergency natural gas legislation would be passed this week.

It is the intention to take up tomorrow afternoon the school lunch program which was vetoed by the President of the United States, providing that the veto is overridden by the House, which must consider the matter first.

Then there is a question of the Silbert nomination now on the calendar. It is my intention to speak to the interested Senators as early as possible so that if at all possible we will be able to dispose of that nomination this week.

Then there is a resolution of disapproval reported by the Rules Committee relative to a ruling made by the Federal Election Commission. I would like to get to that this week also. I hope that a time agreement could be arrived at.

I make the statements regarding time agreements covering the resolution disapproval of the FEC ruling and the Sinai settlement only because of time elements involved. It is my understanding that the resolution of disapproval must be acted on by the end of the week. I believe the Sinai agreement is in the same category.

The Senate has been put on notice that it is quite possible if we do not clear the Calendar of the most important items we will be in next Saturday, and it is very possible, if we do not dispose of the Sinai agreement, that we will be in next week.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. I would like to further comment here that, first of all, technically there are two resolutions of disapproval since the Federal Elections Commission made two rulings, the second modifying the first. It is the second to which any debate would be directed, I am sure. The resolution now differs very slightly, as far as Members of Congress are concerned, from the regulation proposed by the Commission which suggested a 2-year period of limitation on expenditures, reports and receipts for the Senate and one for the House. The resolution of disapproval favors making this effective on January 1 as to both bodies in order to treat each body equally. If we go into recess it is essential that we act upon it in the interest of all Senators. I hope that no Senator will hold us up, considering the impact on the entire Congress, although we fully respect the right of every Senator to say what he wants to in this Chamber.

On the Sinai agreement, I agree with the distinguished majority leader. That was executed in part on September 1. We have been considering it pretty much since then. We are holding hearings today and tomorrow. The committee has been, in my judgment, fairly leisurely in its consideration. They have undertaken to hold an executive session. They have agreed to vote on this matter following the conclusion of the hearing of witnesses.

If it is necessary to stay here during the recess to dispose of this matter, I think it is important enough to do it, although every Senator, I suppose, has made appointments, including this one, during that period. But the Senate business comes first. I am not being at all hypocritical about it. I just feel that we have to do what we were elected to do, what we are paid—inadequately, I may add—to do. Therefore, if necessary, we ought to stay. And, if necessary, I think we ought to go on a double-track system. I wish the distinguished majority leader would give that consideration.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I would indeed. Anything to dispose of the legislation this week, which has to be disposed of within this time period.

That is why I have expressed the hope that if there are any difficulties involved, it might be possible to reach a time limitation agreement so that we can dispose of the matter this week.

I think that, while my position is well known on the question of the Sinai settlement, in view of the declarations made by the President and the Secretary of State, we ought to give them the benefit of any doubt we might have, and be prepared to discuss and dispose of the matter of the Sinai settlement as quickly as possible.

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Finally, Mr. President, as to the Silbert nomination, that came up here more than 18 months ago. Senators have had full opportunity to acquaint themselves with the qualification of the gentleman, who was named by Judge Sirica to this post.

I would hope we could act on that also, as the distinguished majority leader has indicated. I thank him, and yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield back the time of the distinguished assistant majority leader, and also my time, unless someone wants it. Does the Senator from Nebraska want some of my time?

Mr. CURTIS. Just a minute or two.

## NOTICE OF HEARING TOMORROW ON PROPOSED CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT TO REQUIRE A BALANCED BUDGET

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, tomorrow, October 7, the Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary will hold another public hearing on the proposed constitutional change which I have offered, together with several other Senators, which would require the Federal Government to go on a pay-as-you-go basis. This proposal is to write into the Constitution a provision that the budget must be balanced every year.

It has often been said that the people back home are far ahead of Washington. I think that is true. I believe the facts are that not just a few, but the rank and file of the people of the country are alarmed over the large deficits. They believe there must be something put into our fundamental law that would require

us to keep expenditures within the limits of our revenue income.

Mr. President, the establishment of the budget procedure has been helpful. The members of the Committee on the Budget in the Senate are men of dedication. That committee has been a force for reducing our expenditures. I believe, however, that we must go a little farther. I think that we must ingrain in our fundamental law a provision that the budget must be balanced in the absence of a grave national emergency or a declaration of war.

Whenever we adopt the stance that a deficit is all right, that we will agree to a reasonable or manageable deficit for a given year, we are on a very dangerous track, because then the debate becomes, "Shall the deficit be $60 billion, or 55, or 70?"

That means that the next year a deficit that large or larger will be upon us, and we go on and on with this rapid increasing of the national debt by these large deficits. If we follow along on that track, there is danger ahead. There is just no way of managing the budget other than by a balanced budget, because there is no such thing as a manageable deficit. It goes on to greater deficits and more problems.

Mr. President, this will be the second day of hearings on this proposal. We have been favored with the testimony of some of the Nation's leading economists, who are now advocating a constitutional provision to require a balanced budget. We are also receiving the testimony of a number of Senators and Representatives, State officials, and some very distinguished people from the business world. Present plans are for this subcommittee to meet in room 2227 of the Dirksen Building.

Mr. President, I hope that Congress can catch up with the people back home, do a right about face in our approach to our budget, and show a determination—yes, more than a determination, a provision in our Constitution—to require a balanced budget.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the previous order, the Senator from Michigan (Mr. GRIFFIN) is recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

---

## THE CONFIDENTIALITY OF DOCUMENTS PERTAINING TO FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, having made my views known within the Committee on Foreign Relations, as a member, both in executive and in public sessions, I now feel an obligation to bring a matter to the attention of the Senate as a whole.

I refer to the action taken last week by the Committee on Foreign Relations in making public certain documents transmitted to the committee by the President under an injunction of secrecy.

First of all, Mr. President, let me say that I can understand the views of those who think that, from time to time, there is an excessive desire on the part of an administration to classify documents. I share the concern that, in the past, too many documents have been classified.

But I think it can be important for purposes of this discussion to separate out references to documents which relate to international affairs from those that do not. From the beginning of the Republic, there has always been recognition that documents relating to exchanges and negotiations between the heads of government are entitled to a very high degree of respect. The Congress, and particularly the Senate, which is given the power of advise and consent concerning treaties under the Constitution, has always observed the request of Presidents for confidentiality with respect to communications in the area of international relations.

I am not so much concerned about the action taken by the Committee on Foreign Relations from the standpoint of the words that were reflected in the documents. It can be said accurately that the text of the particular documents had already been published in the public press, and that almost everyone knew in advance what the documents contained.

But several consequences flow from the committee's action that deeply concern me. One is that the action has given an official standing to documents which theretofore had not been acknowledged to be official documents. Second, as much as we might disclaim in our Senate resolution that we are approving nothing but 200 U.S. civilian technicians for monitoring duty in the Sinai, it seems now that we have put ourselves in a position where, by voting on the technician question, we will be giving our tacit approval also to other Executive assurances and undertakings which have been made public.

For example, there is discussion in one of the documents about how the United States would vote in the Security Council on certain questions under particular circumstances. I see no reason why the Senate should appear to be approving, directly or indirectly, any such undertaking made by the executive branch, at least at this point.

Mr. President, I cannot help but wonder whether the action taken by the Committee on Foreign Relations last week will be pointed to by other committees of Congress as a precedent or justification for declassifying other documents in the future.

Because that might be the situation, I wish to read into the RECORD from the text of the Case Act, which was continually referred to in the Committee on Foreign Relations. I read as follows from the act—

> The Secretary of State shall transmit to the Congress the text of any international agreement, other than a treaty, to which the United States is a party as soon as practicable after such agreement has entered into force with respect to the United States but in no event later than 60 days thereafter. However, any such agreement the immediate public disclosure of which would, *in the opinion of the President* be prejudicial to the national security of the United States shall not be so transmitted to the Congress but shall be transmitted to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives under an appropriate injunction of secrecy *to be removed only upon due notice from the President.* (Emphasis supplied)

Mr. President, it should be noted that with respect to the particular documents in question the Executive was not even under an obligation to submit them under the Case Act. They were not executive agreements, technically, because they had not been signed—and signatures are contemplated. But the administration took the view that, even though Case Act submission was not required, the Executive wanted the Committee on Foreign Relations to have the information.

However, after receiving information which the Executive was not required to provide, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations then proceeded to violate the spirit and letter of its own guidelines: the Case Act. If the committee could not make public, without the consent of the President, the text of an executive agreement submitted in accordance with the Case Act, then surely—if there is any comity left between the branches—it should not make public, without the consent of the President, a document which is to become an executive agreement.

But even if the Case Act were not a restraint in such a situation, the rules of the Senate itself clearly are. I read now from paragraph 3, rule XXXVI of the Standing Rules of the Senate.

> All confidential communications made by the President of the United States to the Senate shall be by the Senators and the officers of the Senate kept secret; and all treaties which may be laid before the Senate, and all remarks, votes, and proceedings thereon shall also be kept secret, until the Senate shall, by their resolution, take off the injunction of secrecy, or unless the same shall be considered in open executive session.

That refers, of course, to an open executive session of the Senate as a whole.

Another paragraph of the rules provides:

> Any Senator or officer of the Senate who shall disclose the secret or confidential business or proceedings of the Senate shall be liable, if a Senator, to suffer expulsion from the body; and if an officer, to dismissal from the service of the Senate, and to punishment for contempt.

Mr. President, it is clear that the Senate itself has acknowledged, with respect to treaties, that only the Senate—not a committee thereof—has authority to remove an injunction of secrecy with respect thereto.

Although the Senate—not a committee—has such a power with respect to treaties—the Senate having a special responsibility under the Constitution, it is not clear that the Senate or even the Congress has such a power with respect to other documents.

As I read and interpret the Senate's own rule—except in the case of treaties—all confidential communications made by the President of the United States to the Senate shall be by the Senators and the officers of the Senate kept secret.

Mr. President, I voice this concern today because I am concerned about the action taken as a precedent, and what it could mean to future relations. How, for example, can this President, or any President, deal with the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate—or any other committee—if the President cannot as-

sume and expect that the Senate will observe and abide by its own rules?

Even more serious, I suggest, are the problems the action raises for the Executive in its dealings with other governments in the world.

Although the hour is late, I still hope the Committee on Foreign Relations may yet reconsider what it has done. I hope the Senate as a whole will take a look at what the Committee on Foreign Relations has done, and that somehow we can erase any suggestion that the action taken last week is a precedent; because it would be a most unhappy and unfortunate precedent.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the role.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

## ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business, for not to exceed 15 minutes, with statements therein limited to 3 minutes each.

## NEWPORT NEWS

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, as a Virginian, I want to express to the Senate my pride in the city of Newport News and its citizens.

This city of 150,000 completed yesterday a 3-day folklife festival as a part of the city's Bicentennial program.

An estimated 30,000 to 40,000 persons attended the event Sunday, and the 3-day total is estimated at 60,000.

I attended the revival and folk program with Mayor and Mrs. Harry E. Atkinson and had the opportunity to talk with many of those who participated in the festival and made it such a success.

The list of crafts is too long to enumerate in its entirety. But among the many were boat model making, figurehead carving, sail making, seafood preservation, blacksmithing, doll making, duck carving, gunsmithing, quilting, and toy making.

The festival of folk life was held in the Newport News Park.

Few cities in our Nation can boast of such a park system as the one at Newport News. There are 13 parks in the city comprising 8,682 acres.

The largest comprises 8,330 acres, and it was here that the festival of folk life was held. That public park has a golf course, fishing area, interpretive center, camp areas, nature trails, horseback riding trails, and arboretum-floral garden.

The city of Newport News did itself proud with its festival of folk life in the Newport News Park, and I am pleased today to salute my friends of Newport News on the floor of the Senate of the United States.

In addition, I salute the Warwick Moose Lodge of Newport News for its unique Youth Honor Day, the 13th annual one being held yesterday.

The Warwick Moose Lodge, under the leadership of George R. Oder, conceived the idea 13 years ago of paying special tribute to the young people of the community.

I have been the speaker at two of their Youth Day ceremonies and am much impressed both with the excellent work done by the lodge in this program and with the young people who are the honorees.

On 12 of the 13 occasions, the able and dedicated Representative from the First Congressional District of which Newport News is a part, Representative THOMAS N. DOWNING, has made the presentation to the honorees.

This year's honorees are: Miss Crystal C. Solomon, Miss Sharonne Lynn Kreicar, Mr. Charles Gregory Williams, and Mr. Robert Elmo Hornsby, Jr.

## ANNOUNCEMENTS BY SENATORS PASTORE, SYMINGTON, AND PHILIP A. HART NOT TO SEEK REELECTION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, it is with a sense of regret, disappointment, and sadness that I stand at the desk of the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE) this morning. The news that this colorful and extremely capable man will not seek reelection will be regretted not only by the people of Rhode Island and the people of the Nation, but the Members of the Senate as well. Senator PASTORE was a giant among us. In brains he could not be excelled, in integrity he could not be approached, and in his dedication and devotion to his family, his State, and his country he was outstanding.

When JOHN PASTORE handles a bill, it is handled in a manner that causes no concern, no worry, and no distress on the part of the leadership. He is a man who knows his subject, who is devoted to his work, and who is respected by all of us.

It is with a keen sense of disappointment that I note Senator PASTORE'S decision to join in similar declarations by the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PHILIP A. HART) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON). These Senators have contributed greatly to the betterment of their States, to a better understanding of our country, and they certainly have been distinguished Members of this body.

I am very much aware of the close attachment of Senator PASTORE to his family and the anguish it has caused him to be separated from them because of his responsibilities in this body. I am glad to note that he has indicated that he does not intend to resign before his term is completed, so that we will have the benefit for roughly 1 year and 3 months of the advice, the counsel, and the wisdom of this outstanding man.

Senator PASTORE has served in the Rhode Island Legislature—I believe they call it the General Assembly—he has served as Governor of his State, and he is now completing his fourth term, plus 2 years, in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, I take this occasion to express my deep personal loss at the announcements of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PHILIP A. HART), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON), and, most recently, today, the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE). They all have left their marks on this body, their States, and throughout this Nation. They will be missed, but they will be remembered for their many outstanding contributions in regard to the welfare of their States and the Nation. They also will be remembered for the very special, responsible, and dedicated way in which they conducted themselves as Senators of the United States.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I am sorry to hear the news reported to the Senate today by the majority leader that the able senior Senator from Rhode Island will not be a candidate for reelection.

I associate myself with the remarks just made by the senior Senator from Montana with regard to Senator PASTORE, an unusually able Senator, an unusually fine man, who will be missed tremendously in the Senate of the United States.

I also associate myself with the remarks made by the Senator from Montana with regard to two other colleagues, the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON) and the Senator from Michigan (Mr. PHILIP A. HART), who likewise have announced that they will not seek reelection. All three of these outstanding Senators will be missed greatly in this body.

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, it is with deep regret, speaking from this side of the aisle, in a most bipartisan sense, that I also received the news of Senator PASTORE'S decision.

Having spent a part of every summer, for many years, in Rhode Island, I have seen him through the eyes of his constituents. He is a man of courage, a beloved man, who, in the highest tradition of the Senate, has served the needs of his State but never has placed them ahead of the best interests of the Nation and the people of America.

Also having seen him through the eyes of his colleagues for the past 9 years, we look upon him as a man of tremendous stature, a man who can articulate a position with a depth of feeling that perhaps could be exceeded only by Everett McKinley Dirksen on those occasions when both rose to great heights to enunciate their views and put forth their positions.

I deeply regret this decision, but I also join the distinguished majority leader in paying tribute to Senator PASTORE'S services in the past and in looking forward to continuing to work with him closely during the remainder of his term.

I also join in regretting the same decision that has been reached by Senator PHILIP A. HART and Senator SYMINGTON.

Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PERCY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself, also, with the statement made by our distinguished majority leader. He has spoken of three Senators, each of whom has had long tenure in this body. I do not believe that we have to share the same philosophy, that we have to belong to the same political party, to recognize the service that has been rendered by these three Senators over long periods of years in representing their respective States. Certainly, they will be here for more than another year as Members of this body, even though they do not seek reelection next year. I wish them well for the remainder of their terms in office and certainly wish them well as they retire from this body.

I thank the Senator for yielding.

## SENATOR PASTORE'S DECISION TO RETIRE

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, this morning, in Rhode Island, my distinguished senior colleague, Senator JOHN O. PASTORE, announced to the people of Rhode Island that he will not seek reelection to the Senate at the expiration next year of his current term.

Senator PASTORE's decision leaves me with emotions of great sadness and great admiration.

I am personally sad at the prospect of my senior partner's departure from the Senate. At the conclusion of this Congress, Senator PASTORE will have served our State and our Nation with great distinction for 26 years here in the Senate. For 16 of those years I will have had the pleasure of working with him here in the Senate, and I will sorely miss his presence and his wise counsel.

This is a noble and rare action that Senator PASTORE has taken. His decision to retire comes when he is in his prime: when his extraordinary legislative abilities are at their height, when his standing as one of the most loved and respected public officials in Rhode Island history is undiminished. Had he chosen to seek reelection, there is no question but that the people of Rhode Island would have given Senator PASTORE another landslide vote of confidence.

I understand and respect the decision that Senator PASTORE has made. After more than 42 years of public service, as a State legislator, as Lieutenant Governor and Governor of the State of Rhode Island, and as U.S. Senator, he would like to spend more time with his wonderful family.

I look forward to a continued close association with Senator PASTORE, during the remainder of this Congress and through the years.

## THE INTERIM MIDDLE EAST PEACE AGREEMENT

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, the interim Middle East Peace Agreement negotiated by Secretary Kissinger is a significant achievement. The Secretary deserves our sincere gratitude for the fortitude and skill he exhibited in this endeavor. I am hopeful that Middle East historians will record this agreement as a major step toward the peace we all desire. Its support for both Israel and Egypt is a matter of gratification to all of us.

The agreement, though, has also come to take a second significance, a significance related to our own governmental system. Mr. President, there has been criticism leveled at the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations and Congress because it has not moved rapidly to approve the stationing of 200 U.S. technicians in the Sinai desert. The President's deadline of October 5 has passed and the committee only today begins to listen to public testimony. Certainly, the eyebrow of doubt might well be raised on the efficacy of our endeavor. We have taken longer to reach agreement between the executive and legislative branches of our own Government than between two adversaries, Israel and Egypt. But there has been some justification for the deliberations that have been taking place, in my opinion.

We, I believe, have been involved in the essence of our Government—the essence of our Government is process. Process is not efficient if weighed against the criteria of the minimal time to complete a task. It is not effective if it is used as a method of obstruction. But it is profoundly important, if weighed against the goal of the preservation of institutions and the division of power in this Government. By subjecting ourselves to process at the expense of time, a number of positive results have been achieved.

The Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, as it has considered the Interim Peace Agreement in the Middle East, has grappled with two major issues—how to conduct foreign policy in a democracy and what are the constitutional bounds of executive and legislative power in the formulation of U.S. foreign policy. On the first issue there has been a definitive decision. This committee believes that this country should conduct its foreign policy in a manner that will maximize the information available to the American public.

The committee, therefore, voted to disclose the agreements between the United States and Israel and the United States and Egypt. This was not done without a realization of the costs involved to the conduct of our foreign policy. It was done with the belief in mind that to withhold such information would cost our concept of democracy even more dearly.

Certainly, it was not done with the knowledge, that this Senator knows of, of any single Senator that, by so doing, we actually had breached the rules of the Senate, as has been pointed out this morning by the distinguished assistant minority leader (Mr. GRIFFIN). However, the matter was considered a crucial matter of importance to the American people. I think it is a signal that American foreign policy cannot and will not, probably be conducted in the future as it has in the past, when commitments were made by the executive branch of the Government that lock in and bind, sometimes by inference, Congress and the American people. The American people and the Congress do not want to be so bound, will not be so bound in the future, I think we will make it eminently clear in the ratifying effort that we will take with respect to the 200 technicians that we are not bound by the executive agreements that have been entered into. Those require authorization and appropriation, and that is a function reserved by the Constitution entirely to the Congress of the United States.

The second issue, the issue of the boundaries of executive and legislative power, is an issue that may never be definitely settled. It is one of the ambiguities in our Constitution that make it a great as well as a frustrating document. I am sure that a number of witnesses who come before the Committee on Foreign Relations during public hearings will directly or indirectly address this question. In recent decades the executive branch has defined its Constitional prerogatives in foreign policy as broadly as possible. This effort has not proved to be the most productive course. The observance of process over the last month, of which these hearings are a part, is an effort by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee to once again bring institutional balance and creative commentary on the formulation of U.S. foreign policy. I feel we have been effective in this endeavor and I wish personally to thank the Secretary of State for the immense personal time that he has committed to this effort.

Despite its benefits, process cannot be the sole objective of this body. The issues before us are tied to events and real problems. Time in the Middle East is of critical importance. President Sadat, who has now committed himself to the conference table rather than the battlefield, must be able to justify his course of action. He is being politically attacked, both externally and internally, for signing an agreement with Israel. He needs tangible evidence of success now. Prime Minister Rabin also has domestic political pressure that may be somewhat alleviated when the agreements are signed. Therefore, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senate, and Congress must move this week to decide on the 200 U.S. technicians.

I believe that there should be no October recess of Congress until this question is settled.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, first, in response to what the distinguished Senator from Illinois has said, the joint leadership announced this morning that if we did not finish the Sinai agreement this week, we would be in next week. I hope that the Senator from Illinois, who has been most assiduous in attending to his duties on the Committee on Foreign Relations, far more than the Senator from Montana now speaking, will do everything in his power to have that committee report out that agreement, if that is his desire, as expeditiously as possible, so that we can bring it up on the floor this week and, if possible, work on a time agreement thereto.

Mr. PERCY. I can assure the leadership and the majority leader that the Senator from Illinois will do everything humanly possible. The schedule that the Senator presented to the committee has

now been broken. I recognize that it was an impossible schedule, but sometimes, if we reach for a star, we do not always get it, but we do not end up with a handful of mud. We are going to be much farther ahead and put it on the floor a lot faster by at least attempting to adhere to a schedule.

Certainly, it is impossible to determine the course of events, and the hearings today will proceed rather deliberately and slowly. We have a long list of witnesses ahead. But the Senator from Illinois is very gratified that the leadership will not think of recessing if we do not have this approved. Looking forward to this, the Senator from Illinois has cancelled all plans for next week, taking into account that we may be here. I cannot imagine any place that is more important to be than right here, in the Senate, if we have not achieved that schedule. The Senator will take into consideration any time agreements. I realize it will be a tremendous inconvenience to many of our colleagues if we do have to stay next week. It is hoped that unnecessary rhetoric will be put aside and necessary deliberation taken into acount and that we keep right at it, this week, just as late as we possibly can. Until such time as we do reach agreement, hopefully by Friday night, I hope every Member will cooperate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time for morning business has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the morning hour be extended for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes, indeed.

Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT. Mr. President, I am in agreement that a matter of this nature should not be delayed and in general agreement with the statement that was made by our distinguished colleague from Illinois. One statement, however, that was made was that it was in the interest of the President of Egypt and the Prime Minister of Israel, that they might have domestic problems and there might even be some problems arising in those countries from outside the borders if this action is not taken. That is not something that makes a tremendous impression on me.

I believe we ought to take such time as is necessary to do what is best for our country rather than being unduly concerned by what is best for either the President of Egypt or the Prime Minister of Israel. I am sure the distinguished Senator from Illinois did not intend to leave an impression that we would be more concerned about the imprint of our action on those countries than it is upon our own country.

This is a very serious matter we are considering, and I may well vote against the stationing of our observers over there. But to me the question is what is best for the United States, not what is best for these other countries.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The Senator is correct and, as always, he has been to the point in making his views known. I appreciate his comments because I hope it will be possible, in view of the time factor involved, to arrive at a reasonable time limitation so that it would be possible to dispose of it one way or another after a reasonable amount of debate.

## ORDER FOR RECESS UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its work today it stand in recess until the hour of 9 o'clock tomorrow morning.

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

## ORDER FOR PERIOD FOR ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS TOMORROW

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow after the special orders, if any, are attended to, and the joint leaders have been recognized, there be a period of 15 minutes for the transaction of routine morning business, with a time limitation of 3 minutes attached thereto.

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

## ORDER FOR THE RECOGNITION OF SENATOR STEVENSON AT THE CONCLUSION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow after routine morning business is concluded the distinguished Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON) be recognized.

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

## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

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

## APPROVAL OF BILL

A message from the President of the United States announced that on October 2, 1975, he approved and signed the enrolled bill (S. 2270) to authorize an increase in the monetary authorization for certain comprehensive river basin plans previously approved by the Congress, and for other purposes.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Vice President 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.)

## RESULTS OF THE HIGHWAY SAFETY AND NATIONAL TRAFFIC AND MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY ACTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

From the advent of the first gasoline-powered vehicles at the turn of the century through the next six decades, this country developed a vast, flexible form of transportation basic to its economy and way of life. This development was marked by a tremendous network of roads, highways and satellite facilities, by millions of vehicles, and by millions of drivers who drove them. It also was marred by tragedy as the numbers of accidents, injuries and deaths kept pace with the rising tide of traffic. In addition it was expensive, reaching an estimated 45–50 billion dollar annual cost to society by 1970 in wages lost, medical bills, legal fees and property damage, not to mention human suffering.

In 1966 the Congress enacted the Highway Safety and National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Acts which initiated a national traffic safety effort to curb the rising numbers of traffic accidents, injuries, and deaths and, ultimately, to reduce them. These reports describe some of the many and varied programs undertaken to this end, and respond to the reporting requirements in the Acts. The volume on motor vehicle safety includes the annual reports required by Title I of the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act of 1972. The highway safety document contains information on projects initiated because of provisions in the Highway Safety Act of 1973.

It is not possible to assess the contribution of any single program to traffic safety, but the combination of safer cars, safer highways and better trained, better informed drivers is having a beneficial effect. The fatality rate (per 100 million miles driven) has been forced steadily downward from 5.7 in 1966 to 4.3 in 1973. Deaths to motor vehicle occupants leveled off in those years, despite substantial increases in numbers of vehicles and drivers on the roads, miles driven, higher speeds, greater per capita alcohol consumption, and other persistent factors adversely affecting the safety of the motoring public. Average days of bed disability also declined, indicating some lessening in the severity of injuries, which may be attributable to motor vehicle safety features. Improved highways are basic to traffic safety, as is demonstrated by differences in the fatality rates on the fully improved, versus relatively unimproved, portions of the Nation's highway system.

The effects of the fuel shortage and fuel conservation measures were the most publicized traffic safety development of 1974. The combination of reduced speeds, fewer miles driven and altered driving habits and attitudes is given primary credit for saving the lives

of 9,550 motorists and pedestrians during the year. Of these factors, the Department of Transportation considers the lowered speed limit to be quite significant. Pedestrian fatalities which had been trending upward, dropped 17.8 percent in 1974—another bright side to fuel conservation. However, there has been a recent tendency for the situation to drift gradually back toward "normal." With enactment, and enforcement, of a national 55 mile per hour speed limit, a substantial portion of the beneficial aspects of the fuel shortage should continue.

We believe that the highway and motor vehicle safety programs which make up the national traffic safety effort will continue to have a positive effect, and merit the support of the Congress, of the States and communities, of industry and of a citizenry increasingly aware that their lives may well be at stake.

GERALD R. FORD.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 6, 1975.*

## MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

At 12:40 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives delivered by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the enrolled bill (H.R. 8070) making appropriations for the Department of Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent executive agencies, boards, bureaus, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976, and for the period ending September 30, 1976, and for other purposes.

The enrolled bill was subsequently signed by the Vice President.

## COMMUNICATIONS FROM EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS, ETC.

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

PROPOSED LEGISLATION BY THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Food Stamp Act of 1964, as amended (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A letter from the Under Secretary of Agriculture transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1935, as amended, to correct unintended inequities in the determination of interest rates for borrowers, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORTS BY THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense transmitting, pursuant to law, reports relating to the frequency and performance of operational or proficiency flying duty (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Armed Services.

A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense reporting, pursuant to law, that no use was made of funds appropriated in the Defense and Military Appropriation Acts during the period January 1–June 30, 1975, to make payments under contracts for any program, project, or activity in a foreign country except where, after consultation with a designee of the Secretary of the Treasury, it was determined that the use of currencies of such country was not feasible; to the Committee on Appropriations.

REPORT BY THE SECRETARY OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on the financing of programs authorized under section 236 of the National Housing Act and section 802 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION BY THE SECRETARY OF TRANSPORTATION

A letter from the Secretary of Transportation transmiting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Intervention on the High Seas Act to implement the protocol relating to intervention on the high seas in cases of marine pollution by substances other than oil, 1973 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

A letter from the Secretary of Transportation transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Regional Rail Reorganization Act of 1973 to facilitate implementation of the final system plan by broadening the purposes for which assistance is available under title IV, and for other purposes (with accompaying papers); to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A secret letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting a report entitled "The Reserves—Can They Effectively August the Active Forces?" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Armed Forces.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION BY THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Two letters from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare transmitting drafts of proposed legislation to amend title XVIII and title XX of the Social Security Act (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF THE EAST-WEST FOREIGN TRADE BOARD

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, the Chairman of the East-West Foreign Trade Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the activities of the Board for the second quarter of calendar year 1975 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

REPORT OF THE INTERNATIONAL TRADE COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the International Trade Commission transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the Commission covering the third quarter of 1975 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Finance.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION BY THE FEDERAL ENERGY ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Energy Administration transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the Federal Energy Administration Act of 1974 to extend the expiration date of such law until June 30, 1978, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture transmitting, pursuant to law, a report regarding the disposal of foreign excess property for the year ending June 30, 1975 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF THE AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Legislative Affairs of the Department of State transmitting, pursuant to law, the fiscal year 1975 report of the Agency for International Development entitled "Disposal of Foreign Excess Property" (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE ON CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS

A letter from the chairman and vice chairman of the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations transmitting a report concerning cases the joint committee identified as of vital interest to the Congress (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORTS OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

Three letters from the Comptroller General of the United States each transmitting a report of the following titles: "Further Actions Needed To Centralize Procurement of Automatic Data Processing Equipment To Comply with Objectives of Public Law 39–306"; "The Urban Rat Control Program Is in Trouble"; and "Potentially Dangerous Drugs Missing in VA Hospitals—Different Pharmacy System Needed" (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT BY THE FEDERAL ENERGY ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Energy Administration transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relating to the marketing and distributing of refined petroleum products (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior reporting, pursuant to law, on donations received and allocations made from the fund "14X8563 Funds Contributed for Advancement of Indian Race, Bureau of Indian Affairs"; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION BY THE DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to designate a segment of the New River Gorge in West Virginia as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

APPLICATION FOR LOAN UNDER SMALL RECLAMATION PROJECTS ACT

A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Interior transmitting an application, pursuant to law, for a loan by Gila River Farms of Sacaton, Pinal County, Ariz. (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

REPORT OF THE COMPTROLLER GENERAL

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States transmitting, pursuant to law, a report and recommendation concerning the claim of the Boulder Daily Camera against United States (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORT OF THE LAW ENFORCEMENT ASSISTANCE ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration transmitting, pursuant to law, the first annual report of the Administration (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ORDERS OF THE IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION SERVICE

Two letters from the Commissioner of the Immigration and Naturalization Service transmitting copies of orders in the cases of certain aliens (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PROPOSED LEGISLATION OF THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

A letter from the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to encourage and assist States and localities to develop, demonstrate, and evaluate means of improving the effectiveness of human services through integrated planning, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

PROPOSED REGULATION BY THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

A letter from the Chairman of the Federal Election Commission transmitting, pursuant to law, a copy of a proposed regulation by the Commission (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

## PETITIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following petitions which were referred as indicated:

A petition seeking a redress of grievances from several citizens of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Government Operations.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD (for Mr. CANNON), from the Committee on Rules and Administration:

S. Res. 275. An original resolution disapproving two regulations proposed by the Federal Election Commission (together with minority views) (Rept. No. 94-409).

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

S. 2327. A bill to suspend sections 4, 6, and 7 of the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 (Rept. No. 94-410).

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session, the following executive reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MAGNUSON, from the Committee on Commerce: Richard L. Dunham, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Power Commission.

(The above nomination was reported with the recommendation that it be confirmed, subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.)

## 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. CHURCH:

S. 2473. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase the medicare inpatient hospital lifetime reserve from 60 to 120 days and to reduce the daily coinsurance charge applicable for such lifetime reserve from one-half to one-fourth of the part A inpatient hospital deductible, and for other purposes. Referred to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CHURCH:

S. 2474. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to prevent the imposition, under part B thereof, of more than one deductible with respect to expenses incurred for the purchase of any particular piece of durable medical equipment. Referred to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 2475. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to modify the charitable distribution requirements imposed upon foundations. Referred to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2476. A bill to amend titles IV, XI, and XIX of the Social Security Act to increase the Federal matching rate for purposes of reimbursement to States under the programs of aid to needy families with children and medical assistance. Referred to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. RIBICOFF (for himself, Mr. BROCK, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. PERCY, Mr. ROTH, Mr. STAFFORD and Mr. CHILES):

S. 2477. A bill to provide more effective public disclosure of certain lobbying activities to influence issues before the Congress and the executive branch, and for other purposes. Referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. PELL:

S. 2478. A bill to secure the civil rights of blind persons. Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CHURCH:

S. 2473. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to increase the medicare inpatient hospital lifetime reserve from 60 to 120 days and to reduce the daily coinsurance charge applicable for such lifetime reserve from one-half to one-fourth of the part A inpatient hospital deductible, and for other purposes. Referred to the Committee on Finance.

MEDICARE HOSPITALIZATION IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 1975

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to increase the medicare lifetime reserve from 60 to 120 days and to reduce the daily coinsurance charge from one-half to one-fourth of the inpatient hospital deductible.

Medicare now pays for up to 90 days of hospitalization during each benefit period. The part A Hospital Insurance program pays for all covered services during the first 60 days, except the initial $92 which is charged to the patient.

From the 61st through the 90th day, the medicare beneficiary has a daily coinsurance charge equal to one-fourth of the inpatient hospital deductible. This amounts to $23 per day now.

In addition, there is a 60-day lifetime reserve for individuals who require more than 90 days of hospitalization during a benefit period. Their daily coinsurance charge is one-half of the part A deductible, or $46 per day.

These measures undoubtedly provide valuable protection for the 5.6 million aged and disabled medicare patients who are expected to be hospitalized this year. But further improvements are still needed to guard against the ruinous cost of an illness requiring prolonged institutionalization.

The bill that I now introduce is designed to achieve this objective.

First, it would increase from 150 to 210 the number of covered days under medicare for individuals who are hospitalized during a particular benefit period and must also draw upon their lifetime reserve.

Second, the daily coinsurance charge for the lifetime reserve would be reduced from one-half to one-fourth of the hospital deductible.

This provision could provide major savings for persons who must utilize their lifetime reserve—in some cases exceeding $1,000.

Aged and disabled medicare beneficiaries, as well as their families, deserve improved protection against potentially catastrophic hospital expenditures, which can in a matter of weeks or months wipe out a lifetime of savings, hard work, and diligence.

Unfortunately, illness strikes with far greater frequency and intensity at a time in life when those affected can least afford it.

This is especially true in the case of hospitalization. In 1976, nearly 150,000 medicare beneficiaries are expected to be hospitalized from 61 to 90 days. And, approximately 40,000 persons are projected to draw upon their lifetime reserve after exhausting the 90 days of covered care regularly available during a benefit period. Of this total, an estimated 5,000 to 10,000 will exhaust their lifetime reserve.

The harsh reality is that the threat of bankruptcy by hospitalization is all too real for aged and disabled Americans confronted with lengthy institutionalization. And, all too often, these are the patients who can least afford it.

Many Americans today believe that medicare pays for almost all of the hospital and medical bills of the aged. But older Americans know better.

Valuable as it is, medicare still only covers about 38 percent of the elderly's health care expenditures. Major gaps in coverage still exist and must be closed.

The 10th anniversary of medicare provides an excellent opportunity to achieve this goal, as the Congress takes stock of the achievements and weaknesses of medicare.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2473

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That this Act may be cited as the "Medicare Hospitalization Improvements Act of 1975".

LIBERALIZATION OF MEDICARE LIFETIME RESERVE

SEC. 2. (A) Section 1812 of the Social Security Act is amended—

(1) by striking out "150" in subsection (a) (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "210";

(2) by striking out "150" in subsection (b)(1) and inserting in lieu thereof "210"; and

(3) by striking out "150-day" in subsection (c) and inserting in lieu thereof "210-day".

(b) The last sentence of section 1813(a)-(1) of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows: "Such amount shall be further reduced by a coinsurance amount equal to one-fourth of the inpatient hospital deductible for each day (before the day following the last day for which such individual is entitled under section 1812(a)(1) to have payment made on his behalf for inpatient hospital services during such spell of illness) on which such individual is furnished such services during such spell of illness after such services have been furnished to him for 60 days during such spell, except that the reduction under this sentence for any day shall not exceed the charges imposed for that day with respect to such individual for such services (and for this purpose, if the customary charges for such services are greater than the charges so imposed, such customary charges shall be considered to be the charges so imposed).".

(c) The changes made by this section shall become effective January 1, 1976.

---

By Mr. CHURCH.

S. 2474. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to prevent the imposition, under part B thereof, of more than one deductible with respect to expenses incurred for the purchase of any particular piece of durable medical equipment. Referred to the Committee on Finance.

ELIMINATION OF DOUBLE DEDUCTIBLE CHARGE ON MEDICAL EQUIPMENT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to prevent the charging of two deductibles for one piece of medical equipment under part B of medicare.

Enactment of medicare was a major victory for older Americans in 1965. During its 10 years of existence medicare has provided the elderly with valuable protection against the high cost of hospitalization and other medical expenses.

But important gaps in coverage still exist. And, improvements are needed on a number of fronts.

Under present law, for example, it is possible for durable medical equipment—such as a wheelchair—to be subject to two deductible charges in two different years. The net impact is that the medicare beneficiary may receive little or no reimbursement at all.

This happened to one of my constituents, an elderly arthritic who purchased a wheelchair in 1972 for $159.50.

In 1972 she paid her part B deductible—which at that time was $50—and received reimbursement from medicare at the rate of 80 percent of the reasonable charges over $50.

However, she received only a small amount of reimbursement because of two factors.

First, the medicare law provides for reimbursement on an installment basis when a patient purchases medical equipment costing over $50.

Second, this patient had no other medical expenses chargeable to the part B supplementary medical insurance program.

Then, in 1973 my constituent was subject to another deductible charge when she continued to receive her installment payments.

As things now stand, the installment reimbursement requirement plus the annual deductible charge can cause a medicare patient to be subject to multiple deductibles on the purchase of the same equipment.

To my way of thinking, the Congress did not intend for this result to occur when medicare was enacted. And, I believe that this incongruity should be corrected.

The bill that I have introduced would achieve this goal not only for those who rent medical equipment, but also for patients who purchase equipment and are reimbursed on installment basis.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2474

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That (a) the first sentence of section 1833(b) of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting "(subject to subsection (f)(3)" immediately after "are determinable) shall".

(b) Section 1833(f) of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3) The deductible imposed by subsection (b) shall, insofar as such deductible relates to expenses incurred by an individual for the purchase of any piece of durable medical equipment included under section 1861(s)(6), be deemed to have been met for any calendar year, if, for such calendar year and all preceding calendar years, there have been imposed, under subsection (b), reductions with respect to the purchase of such piece of equipment, the aggregate of which equals $60. In determining, for purposes of the preceding sentence, the amount of the reduction under subsection (b) for any calendar year with respect to the purchase of any such piece of equipment, there shall not be taken into account any expenses incurred with respect to such piece of equipment until account has first been taken of all other expenses to which the deductible imposed by subsection (b) is applicable."

(c) The amendments made by subsections (a) and (b) shall be applicable in the case of durable medical equipment purchased after December 31, 1975.

---

By Mr. CURTIS:

S. 2475. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to modify the charitable distribution requirements imposed upon foundations. Referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I am today introducing legislation to amend section 4942 of the Internal Revenue Code, which imposes certain charitable distribution requirements upon private grantmaking foundations. This bill is a substitute for S. 902, which I introduced previously on March 3, 1975.

In the Tax Reform Act of 1969, Congress added a series of provisions to the Internal Revenue Code designed to regulate the activities and financial practices of private foundations. One of these code provisions—section 4942—generally prohibits private grantmaking foundations from accumulating rather than distributing their income for active charitable purposes. To preclude private foundations from circumventing this antiaccumulation rule by investments in assets producing little or no current income, section 4942 requires private foundations to distribute annually an amount equal to the greater of their actual annual income or their so-called minimum investment return, which is defined as a specified percentage of the net fair market value of their investment assets. This specified percentage was originally set at 6 percent for 1970, and, for later years, the Treasury Department was directed by statute to set the specified percentage by reference to post-1969 changes in money rates and investment yields.

With more than 5 years of experience behind us, it is apparent that there are two significant shortcomings in the minimum investment return provision. First, the initial specified percentage of 6 percent has, as I predicted in 1969, proved to be too high. I think that experience has demonstrated that a figure of not more than 5 percent, which the Committee on Finance in fact recommended in 1969, would have been more appropriate. A second basic deficiency of existing law concerns the delegation of authority to the Treasury Department to prescribe an appropriate percentage rate for individual years after 1970. Testimony before the Finance Committee's Subcommittee on Foundations indicates to me that the existing statutory standards are inadequate and that, despite efforts to do so, development of a workable set of standards may not be feasible.

My bill seeks to remedy these two problems for future years by simply setting the specified percentage at 5 percent and repealing the authority of the Treasury Department to vary that rate from year to year. This new provision would apply only to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1975. The provisions of existing law would remain fully applicable to 1975 and earlier years.

I am hopeful, Mr. President, that we may act on this bill on a reasonably expeditious basis. Prompt action is necessary since, not later than May 1, 1976, the Treasury Department will be required to promulgate a new percentage figure. For these reasons, Mr. President, I solicit both prompt and favorable consideration of this bill.

---

By Mr. JAVITS:

S. 2476. A bill to amend titles IV, XI, and XIX of the Social Security Act to increase the Federal matching rate for purposes of reimbursement to States under the programs of aid to needy families with children and medical assistance. Referred to the Committee on Finance.

WELFARE—THE FEDERAL SHARE

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Social Security Act in order to increase the Federal share of payments of the States for medical assistance and aid to dependent children. A companion measure has been introduced

in the House by Congresswoman BELLA ABZUG and 45 cosponsors.

Mr. President, this is vital to the critical situation of the cities, not only New York City but many others in the country, as pointed out by Secretary Simon.

Under present law the Federal share for the cost of these programs is based on a formula which takes into account the per capita income in each State. This share ranges from 50 percent to approximately 80 percent, and New York is one of 12 States which receive the minimum 50 percent. This formula is based, on the belief—which I view as mistaken—that States with high per capita income are best able to meet their own welfare costs. In reality, among the States which receive the minimum Federal share are some—New York, California, Massachusetts, Illinois, Michigan, New Jersey—which have the greatest poverty burden, far out of proportion to the Nation as a whole. This is due in large part to the migration of unskilled persons from the rural areas of the country to the industrialized States. Our problem in this area can be traced to national factors and, at the very least we should be treated equally with the States which do not bear as much of the burden.

While this proposal would go a long way toward eliminating inequities in the treatment of States by the Federal Government, I believe the long-range solution is federalization of the welfare programs not already encompassed by SSI, the new Federal program for the aged, blind, and disabled, and I intend to introduce such comprehensive legislation in the near future.

I intend somewhat later in the week to introduce an amendment to this bill which will deal with the vexing problem of how to clean up the welfare rolls which I think has to go as a companion piece with what I am proposing.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2476

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That this Act may be cited as the "Uniform Federal Welfare and Medicaid Assistance Act of 1975".

SEC. 2. (a) Section 403(a) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "October 1, 1958" in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1976".

(b) Section 403(a) of such Act is amended by striking out paragraphs (1) and (2) and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"(1) in the case of any State, an amount equal to 75 per centum of the total amounts expended during such quarter as aid to families with dependent children under the State plan (including expenditures for premiums under part B of title XVIII for individuals who are recipients of money payments under such plan and other insurance premiums for medical or other type of remedial care or the cost thereof); and"

(c) Section 403(c) of such Act is further amended by striking "or (2)" in the sentence following paragraph (5).

(d) Section 408(c) of such Act is amended by striking out "clause (A) of ".

SEC. 3. (a) Section 1903(a) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "January 1, 1966" in the matter preceding paragraph (1) and inserting in lieu thereof "January 1, 1976".

(b) Section 1903(a)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "the Federal medical assistance percentage (as defined in section 1905(b), subject to subsections (g) and (h) of this section)" and inserting in lieu thereof "75 per centum".

(c) Section 1903(g)(1) of such Act is amended by striking out "Federal medical assistance percentage" wherever it appears and inserting in lieu thereof "percentage specified in subsection (a)(1)".

SEC. 4. Sections 1118 and 1905(b) of the Social Security Act are repealed.

SEC. 5. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective January 1, 1976.

---

By Mr. RIBICOFF (for himself, Mr. BROCK, Mr. JAVITS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MUSKIE, Mr. PERCY, Mr. ROTH, Mr. STAFFORD, and Mr. CHILES):

S. 2477. A bill to provide more effective public disclosure of certain lobbying activities to influence issues before the Congress and the executive branch, and for other purposes. Referred to the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. President, today I am introducing the Lobbying Act of 1975 on behalf of myself and Senators BROCK, JAVITS, KENNEDY, MUSKIE, PERCY, ROTH, STAFFORD, and CHILES. I ask unanimous consent that a summary of the bill be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the end of my remarks.

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

Mr. RIBICOFF. The legislation I am introducing today is an effective, fair, and workable lobbying reform bill. Such legislation is long overdue.

Senators BROCK, JAVITS, KENNEDY, MUSKIE, PERCY, and STAFFORD have all introduced lobbying bills of their own this year. I am grateful that each one of them has chosen to be a cosponsor of this bill. They have all significantly contributed to the legislation.

Earlier this year the committee held a total of 3 days of hearings on legislation to reform the present lobbying laws. The witnesses at the hearings all agreed that reform of the present lobbying law was essential. The 1946 act is too limited in scope, too vague in its wording, and too weak in its enforcement authority. A 1970 House report described the present act as a thoroughly deficient law. A report the General Accounting Office prepared this year for me similarly emphasized the inadequacies of the present law. The report stated that in one recent reporting period 48 percent of the lobbying reports filed were incomplete, and 61 percent were received too late. Yet, the Justice Department has investigated only five complaints of violations of the law since March 1972. In the 29 years since the lobbying law was passed there has been only one successful prosecution for violation of the law. The report of the General Accounting Office concludes that—

The Department of Justice does not monitor the registration or disclosure requirements of the Act or evaluate the effectiveness or compliance with Act.

Lobbying serves a very useful role in the decisionmaking process. Without it Congress would be deprived the information and the variety of viewpoints it should have. But the ineffectiveness of the current law has cloaked the lobbying process in unnecessary secrecy. Neither the Congress nor the public have any accurate picture of the lobbyist's activities. For Congress to operate effectively and for the public to understand the legislative process, and to participate in it as effectively as possible, basic information about lobbying must be public.

The Supreme Court recognized the need for disclosure of lobbying activities in its opinion reviewing the 1946 act. In that case, entitled United States against Harriss, Chief Justice Warren said of lobbying that—

Full realization of the American ideal of government by elected representatives depends to no small extent on their ability to properly evaluate such pressures. Otherwise the voice of the people may all too easily be drowned out by the voice of special interest groups seeking favored treatment while masquerading as proponents of the public weal.

The Lobbying Act of 1975 will tell the Congress and the public what interests are making significant efforts to influence the legislative process, what issues they are attempting to influence, and how much money they have spent in the effort to do so. The bill would give a comprehensive picture, for the first time, of the lobbyist's efforts to influence an issue before Congress, including his efforts to generate grass roots support for a particular position. At the same time, the bill is carefully drafted to insure that no one will be deterred from fully participating in the public debate on any matter by unnecessarily broad or detailed lobbying laws.

Under the bill's provisions only an organization, or an individual retained by someone else to lobby for him, could be a lobbyist. The bill defines organization to include both businesses, labor unions, and public interest groups. The bill thus avoids sweeping into its coverage the individual citizen who wishes to communicate his views on any issue to Congress. Such a person would not be a lobbyist under the law no matter how often he exercises his constitutional right to petition his government for a redress of grievances.

With respect to direct efforts to influence Congress, an organization is a lobbyist under the bill's provisions only if it attempts to influence an issue before Congress by talking to a Congressman or his staff on 12 or more occasions in a 3-month period. Organizations are thus excluded if their lobbying efforts are too infrequent to have any significant effect on Congress. An additional provision provides that if the officials of an organization converse only with the Senators or Congressmen who represent them, the organization will not, just because of these contacts, become a lobbyist.

At the same time, the bill does guarantee that any organization that lobbies Congress in a sustained fashion will be a lobbyist. By basing the definition of a

lobbyist on the number of contacts the organization makes with Congress, the bill provides a clear standard which will allow any organization to easily tell whether or not it is a lobbyist. The bill relies on the number of contacts to define a lobbyist, rather than the amount of money spent by the lobbyist on lobbying, because such a contacts test most accurately reflects the extent and impact of the organization's lobbying activities. Furthermore, the bill's definition of a lobbyist as one who makes 12 contacts provides a test any organization may apply without the extensive bookkeeping required by a test based on the amount of money it spends on lobbying.

An individual who is employed by an organization to lobby for it would not himself be a lobbyist, although his activities would be likely to make the organization he works for a lobbyist. An individual would be a lobbyist in his own right only if he receives money from someone else for the specific purpose of attempting to influence an issue before Congress, and communicates with the Congress on one or more occasions in an effort to influence an issue before Congress.

The bill recognizes that a lobbyist may also try to indirectly affect an issue before Congress by persuading a large number of other people to express their views to Congress. In order to judge how representative such views are of the general public, Congress must know whether the letters it receives reflect the spontaneous expression of the public's feelings, or whether they have been generated by the lobbying efforts of a special interest. Since the executive branch as well as Congress may receive such letters, the bill also covers efforts by lobbyists to mobilize public support or opposition for any action a Federal agency may take.

Such indirect lobbying efforts are covered if the solicitation reaches 500 or more members of the general public and the solicitation costs more than $200 to prepare and distribute. Additional provisions require an organization to register as a lobbyist if it organizes a nationwide grassroots lobbying campaign by requesting a number of its affiliates at the State and local level, or its own employees, to communicate with Congress or the executive branch.

The bill does not make members of the public who themselves communicate directly with Congress about purely executive agency matters lobbyists. Coverage of such activities raises special problems because of the extent and variety of the contacts. The committee intends to look at this matter carefully during its forthcoming hearings on lobbying legislation. In addition, Senator KENNEDY's Subcommittee on Administrative Practice and Procedure presently has under consideration S. 1289, which requires Federal agencies to keep a public record of the most important contacts between Federal officials and outside parties. This bill, which I cosponsored, may prove to be a very sensible, alternative way to assure full disclosure of which interests seek to influence important executive agency decisions.

Organizations or individuals who do engage in substantial lobbying efforts will have to file reports that will give Congress and the public an accurate picture of their lobbying activities. The reports a lobbyist will file will disclose each issue the lobbyist worked on, and the method it used to try to influence Congress.

At the same time, the bill's reporting requirements will not weigh the lobbyist down with unnecessarily extensive reporting requirements. To avoid cumulative or unnecessary filing, the bill does not require each individual who works as a full-time employee of an organization which is a lobbyist to also file as a lobbyist. A local organization that does nothing but solicit its members at the request of a national organization would not also have to file as a lobbyist, but the report filed by the national organization would have to include information about the solicitations made by its affiliates.

The exact type of information a lobbyist must file is carefully tailored to fit each particular kind of lobbying activity involved. For example, an organization will have to estimate the total amount of money spent on all its efforts to directly lobby Congress during the period. It will not have to itemize the amount of money spent in directly trying to influence any particular issue before Congress. On the other hand, an individual or an organization which lobbies on behalf of someone else is required to file more detailed financial statements about the amount of money his client pays him for his services. Any lobbyist who engages in an indirect lobbying campaign on any issue will have to file a full report on the amount of money spent on that campaign.

The bill requires the lobbyist to list any officer, director, or paid employee who directly spoke to a Federal officer on one or more occasions in an effort to influence a particular issue before Congress and to identify the issue involved. On the other hand, it does not require the lobbyist to file an individual record of each conversation the lobbyist had with any Member of Congress or his staff.

The bill gives the enforcement authority to the General Accounting Office. The agency successfully administered the Federal Elections Campaign Act for several years and has the necessary personnel and experience to enforce this new law. The General Accounting Office will have the full investigative and administrative powers, and the range of sanctions it needs to do an effective job. Informal procedures will be used as much as possible and court sanctions will be largely civil and injunctive in nature.

In short, the Lobbying Act of 1975 is both a strong and balanced bill. On the one hand, it guarantees the right of Congress and the public to know how lobbyists are attempting to influence the decisions of government. On the other hand, it protects the constitutional rights of every citizen to petition his Government for a redress of grievances.

I plan to hold additional hearings shortly on this bill, as well as the other lobbying bills that have already been introduced.

Committee action on this much-needed legislation will follow as quickly as possible after these hearings are completed.

The summary follows:

SUMMARY OF THE LOBBYING ACT OF 1975

An individual may be a lobbyist under the bill's definition only if someone else retains him to lobby in some capacity other than as a full-time employee. An organization may be a lobbyist if it is paid to lobby on behalf of someone else, or if it engages in a substantial amount of lobbying on its own behalf.

The bill does not make any other individual or organization a lobbyist. Thus, it in no way affects the individual citizen who expresses his personal views to Congress on any matter, regardless of the extent of his activities.

Any organization or individual who is a lobbyist must register with the Comptroller General and file quarterly reports with the Comptroller General. The bill authorizes the Comptroller General to enforce the bill's provisions and establishes sanctions for any violations.

DEFINITION OF A LOBBYIST

For an "individual" to be a lobbyist he must be retained for money by someone else. Only independent contractors and similar types of individuals retained to perform a specific lobbying task are included within the definition. An individual who engages in lobbying activities as a paid employee of the organization on whose behalf he lobbies would not have to file a report as a lobbyist, although his activities would be likely to make the organization a lobbyist. In that case, his name would appear on the report as one who did lobbying for the organization. To be a lobbyist the individual must also directly communicate one or more times with Congress during any three month period about an issue before Congress. This bill terms such a contact with Congress "a lobbying communication". An individual would also be a lobbyist if he is paid to urge 500 or more other persons during the same period to communicate with Congress or an executive branch agency on any issue before it. This is termed "a lobbying solicitation".

In addition to an individual, an organization may also be a lobbyist. The bill defines "organization" broadly to include businesses, labor unions, and voluntary membership organizations.

An organization becomes a lobbyist if it engages in lobbying communications or solicitations on its own behalf or on behalf of its members in any of the following three ways:

(1) Engages orally, and on its own behalf, in a total of 12 or more lobbying communications with Congress during any 3-month period. However, communications between a local businessman on behalf of his company and the Senators and Congressmen who represent the State where the businessman lives do not count for purposes of determining whether an organization is a lobbyist. If a local businessman just communicates with his Senators or Congressman about problems affecting his company, neither the company nor the businessman would be a lobbyist regardless of the number of times he talks to his Senators or Congressman.

(2) Expends $200 or more in any 3-month period to make solicitations urging 500 or more other persons to communicate with any member of Congress about a particular issue, or urging 500 or more persons to communicate with any executive branch official about any issue under consideration in the executive branch.

(3) Solicits 50 or more of its own employees or 12 or more other organizations with which it is affiliated to communicate with any member of Congress about a particular issue, or solicits the same number of people to communicate with any Executive branch official about any issue under consideration in any agency.

An organization can also become a lobbyist if it is retained by some other person to engage in the same lobbying activities that would make an individual who is retained for pay a lobbyist.

DEFINITION OF LOBBYING COMMUNICATIONS OR SOLICITATIONS

Since the definition of a lobbyist is largely based on the number of lobbying communications or solicitations certain individuals or organizations make, the definitions of lobbying communications and solicitations are an essential part of the bill.

A lobbying communication includes, except for certain specified exemptions, any direct communication with members of Congress or their staff, in order to influence any issue before Congress. The term "issue before Congress" covers the entire range of matters considered by Congress including bills, resolutions, nominations, hearings, or investigations.

A lobbying communication also includes any direct communication between a lobbyist and a Federal agency official where the lobbyist tries to get the Federal official to express a particular position before Congress. Similarly, it includes any direct effort to get a member of Congress to influence the decision of any matter under consideration by the executive branch.

A lobbying solicitation arises whenever a person requests other persons to write or otherwise communicate with Congress about an issue before Congress. Similarly, the term includes any effort by a person to get others to write or otherwise communicate with the executive branch about any issue before the executive branch.

Certain efforts to influence an issue before Congress or the executive branch are specifically excluded from the definition of lobbying communications or solicitations. The exclusions cover:

A communication or solicitation by an individual acting solely on his own behalf for redress of personal grievances or to express his own personal opinion.

Requests for information about the status, existence, or effect of a bill or other issue before Congress.

Communications or solicitations by a Federal officer or employee of the executive branch, or communications or solicitations by a Member, officer, or employee of Congress.

Testimony or subpoenaed information submitted to a congressional committee.

Communications or solicitations by State or local officials, by candidates for Federal, state, or local offices, or by National, State, or local political parties.

Communications or solicitations (other than advertisements) appearing on television or in newspapers or other publications distributed to the general public.

REGISTRATION AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

An individual or organization which meets the definition of a lobbyist must register annually with the Comptroller General.

The registration must contain basic information about the identity of the lobbyist, list any individuals whom the lobbyist expects to pay to do lobbying, and generally describe the subject matter of the types of issues before Congress or the executive branch which the lobbyist expects to seek to influence, and the means the lobbyist expects to influence such types of issues. The lobbyist must also disclose the identity of any other "organization" which financially supported his lobbying activities during the past year, and each "individual" who provided more than 5 percent of the lobbyist's funds for lobbying during the past year.

In the case of a lobbyist who is retained for money, the registration will include the identity of the person who retained him, and a description of the financial terms under which the lobbyist was retained. If the lobbyist is a voluntary membership organization, such as a trade association or a public interest group supported by its members, the registration would disclose the approximate number of persons who are members, as well as a description of procedures the organization follows in establishing its position on particular issues.

In addition to registering with the Comptroller General, a lobbyist will have to file reports every three months describing his lobbying activities. The precise information which the lobbyist must provide in the quarterly report will vary depending on the exact nature of the lobbyist's activities. For example, the bill requires less detailed financial data from an organization which lobbies on its own behalf than from an individual who is retained by a client to lobby on a particular issue.

REPORTS OF LOBBYISTS RETAINED FOR PAY TO LOBBY DIRECTLY

A lobbyist retained by any other person to lobby for him by engaging in one or more lobbying communications must—

(1) disclose the identity of the person on whose behalf he is acting and how much money he was paid by such person for his services in connection with each issue;

(2) identify the issues he worked on for each client and the lobbyist's position on the issue;

(3) list any individuals who in turn were paid by the lobbyist to make one or more lobbying communications during the period; and

(4) provide a general description of any lobbying "solicitations" concerning an issue before Congress which were made by the lobbyist for the person who retained him and which are not otherwise reported.

REPORTS OF ORGANIZATIONS LOBBYING FOR THEMSELVES

Any organization which is a lobbyist because it engages on its own behalf in 12 or more oral lobbying communications must—

(1) identify each issue which it sought to influence by making one or more lobbying communications;

(2) disclose the identity of each officer, director, or employee of the organization who orally engaged in one or more lobbying communications, along with a description of the issues on which he worked;

(3) disclose the identity of any affiliated organizations the lobbyist solicited concerning an issue before Congress, along with a description of the particular issue involved;

(4) provide a general description of any lobbying "solicitations" concerning an issue before Congress made by the lobbyist not otherwise reported; and

(5) estimate the total expenses incurred by the organization in connection with all its lobbying activities during the 3-month period.

The lobbyist would not have to itemize the amount spent on particular issues or estimate the particular amounts spent on salaries, overhead, or the like.

REPORTS OF LOBBYISTS THAT SOLICIT

Any lobbyist that solicits 500 or more other persons, 50 or more of its employees, or 12 or more of its affiliates on a particular issue before Congress or the Executive Branch, and meets, where applicable the $200 expenditure test must—

(1) provide a sample of any form letter, written advertisement, or other similar written material used to solicit 500 or more people; a transcript, if available, of any advertisement used to solicit orally 500 or more people; and a description of the content of other solicitations used by the lobbyist;

(2) identify each issue the lobbyist sought to influence by soliciting the requisite number of persons and the lobbyist's position on the issue;

(3) estimate the total number of persons solicited in connection with each issue, including the number solicited by written means in each state, and identify any affiliate which helped make the lobbyist solicitations, along with an estimate of the number of persons solicited by such affiliate.

(4) estimate the total expenses incurred by the lobbyist in connection with each issue it worked on during the period by soliciting the requisite number of persons; and

(5) if the lobbyist was retained by some other person to engage in the solicitations, the amount of money received by the lobbyist from such person in connection with each issue.

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO ALL LOBBYISTS

Each quarterly report filed by each lobbyist would also have to include an identification of the lobbyist, and a record of any gift or loan to a Congressman or his staff exceeding $50 in value which was paid for by the lobbying organization, or by an individual lobbyist on behalf of the person who retained him.

ENFORCEMENT

The bill authorizes a civil penalty of not more than $10,000 for each violation of the law. Criminal violations are only authorized where any person knowingly and willfully violates the law or files fraudulent information.

The General Accounting Office will have primary responsibility for civil enforcement of the new law. The Comptroller General is authorized to investigate possible violations and to correct any violations it discovers by informal methods, by cease and desist orders issued after an administrative hearing or through civil litigation in court. The Comptroller General may also refer any apparent civil violation of law to the Department of Justice for action. If the apparent violation is criminal in nature, the Comptroller must in every circumstance refer the proceeding to the Department of Justice for prosecution.

Each lobbyist and each person who retains a lobbyist is required by the bill to maintain financial and other records on which the information filed with the Comptroller General must be based. The Comptroller General will have the authority to inspect such records when necessary.

The Comptroller General is also given authority to prepare necessary regulations, develop forms, render advisory opinions when requested, and to issue subpoenas. The Comptroller General is given responsibility for making the registrations and reports public, and preparing special preliminary reports on a lobbyist's activities upon the request of a Senator or Congressman. After each 3-month period the Comptroller General will be required to publish in the Federal Register a report based on the registrations and reports filed with it summarizing all the lobbying activities that occurred pertaining to a specific issue and all the lobbying activities of persons who share an economic, business, or other interest in common.

EXAMPLES OF WHO WOULD BE A LOBBYIST

The following are examples of which individuals and organizations would be a lobbyist under the bill's provisions:

(1) An individual citizen, concerned about the safety of children's toys, journeys to Washington and talks on her own behalf to staff assistants in the offices of 80 different Congressmen or Senators, including 20 from her own state. The citizen "is not"

a lobbyist because she is simply expressing on her own behalf her personal concern about a matter.

(2) An individual who is personally concerned about an environmental issue buys with his own funds an advertisement in the newspaper urging the public to write Congress in support of a particular environmental bill. The individual "is not" a lobbyist since he is using his own money to express his own personal view on an issue before Congress.

(3) An individual lawyer is retained by a company to obtain an amendment to a tax bill pending in committee. In connection with the services provided his client, the lawyer drafts proposed wording, and discusses the wording with the staff of the appropriate Committee. The lawyer "is" a lobbyist.

(4) Employees of a national company call Congressional committees on 20 occasions during a quarterly filing period in order to determine whether the committee has scheduled hearings on certain bills, and whether the Committee has reported certain other bills out of Committee. In addition, the company president testifies before the Committee on a particular bill. The company engages in no other communications with Congress. The company "is not" a lobbyist since the bill excludes from its coverage the specific types of communications in which the company engaged.

(5) The president of an organization who is concerned about the possible effect of a pending bill on his business travels to Washington and speaks about the bill on behalf of the organization to his two Senators and the Congressman representing the district in which his business is located. He talks a total of 15 times to his representatives or their staff assistants. Since the businessman only speaks to his own Senators and Congressmen he "is not" a lobbyist.

(6) Three separate individuals employed by an organization call congressional staff aides a total of 40 times during a quarterly filing period in an attempt to secure passage of amendments to three different bills. On a fourth issue the company instructs 15 plant managers to write their own Congressmen on the issue, but it makes no other effort to influence Congress. While none of the individuals would be a lobbyist, the organization "is" a lobbyist since together its three employees orally engaged in over 12 lobbying communications. The 15 letters sent by the plant managers do not count in determining whether the company is a lobbyist, but since the company is a lobbyist for other reasons, it would also have to report its interest in this fourth issue.

(7) A company with a special problem urges various executive branch officials on 10 different occasions to support legislation to resolve the problem. The company also talks on 10 different occasions during the same three month period with members of the appropriate congressional committees or their staff. Since the communications with the executive branch were on legislation pending in Congress, they are lobbying communications for purposes of determining whether the company is a lobbyist. Since the total of all oral lobbying communications exceed in this case 12, the company "is" a lobbyist even if it did not communicate with Congress on any other matter during the 3-month period.

(8) A national trade association seeking to gain passage of a bill before Congress sends a letter to 5,000 of the leading businessmen in the country urging them to write, or to talk personally, with their Congressmen in support of the proposal. The cost of writing, printing, and mailing the letters was $2,000. Since this solicitation reached more than 500 persons and cost over $200 to prepare and send, the organization "is" a lobbyist.

(9) A local historic preservation society worried about the possible destruction of an old federal courthouse spends $100 to prepare and distribute a flyer on the street to about 700 people urging them to write the Chairman of the appropriate Committee urging action to save the courthouse. Since the flyer cost less than $200 to prepare and distribute, the local historic preservation society "is not" a lobbyist.

(10) A national trade association directly communicates with Congress only when it wants to know the status of certain bills, but on four occasions it writes letters to the 50 companies that are members of the trade association and urges them on each occasion to write their own Congressmen in opposition to a particular bill pending before Congress. This solicitation by a trade association of more than 12 affiliates means it "is" a lobbyist.

(11) The Washington office of a company with 10,000 employees located in five States writes its 500 top management officials and requests them to travel to Washington to talk to their Congressmen and Senators about a bill directly affecting the company. Because the company solicited more than 50 of its own employees, it "is" a lobbyist. The individual employees who travel to Washington to see their Congressmen "are not" lobbyists.

(12) A professional association concerned about the possibility that an executive branch agency may propose a certain regulation of great importance to its members spends $300 to distribute a solicitation urging the 500 individuals who are members of the organization to write the agency in opposition to the idea. Since the organization urged more than 500 persons to communicate with an executive branch agency about a matter before it, and spent more than $200 to do so, the organization "is" a lobbyist.

Mr. MUSKIE. Mr. President, I wish to join in support of the proposal to increase public disclosure of Federal lobbying activities which the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut and chairman of the Committee on Government Operations has offered today.

For several years, the Senate Committee on Government Operations and other committees in the House have initiated efforts to strengthen the existing Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act.

In July, Senator JAVITS and I joined in introduction of a proposal which would have improved existing law by extending its coverage to a greater number of those people who are actively engaged in lobbying but who are not now required to report their activities. The proposal offered today is similar in many respects.

A major weakness in the present law is the lack of authority to enforce its provisions and to investigate violations. Our proposal would establish that authority in the General Accounting Office and I am pleased to note that the measure offered today adopts that procedure.

Finally, our measure would not impose lobby registration requirements on those individuals who petition their Government in their own behalf or organizations who contact their own representatives in Congress for assistance.

It is essential that any lobby legislation adopted by the Congress not only open up the processes of government to the people but that it also foster, and not inhibit, the first amendment rights of each citizen to petition his Government for a redress of grievances.

While we may not have yet reached the ideal balance between those competing interests, I am encouraged by the direction of this proposal and hope that in the next few weeks we can invite the studied opinion of constitutional scholars on this critical issue.

It is important that the Committee on Government Operations and the Senate act in the near future on proposals to change the present law or we may again pass through another Congress without achieving long-needed lobby reforms.

The existing act is an invitation to avoidance and its limited coverage encourages public suspicion about lobbying activities—even about the vital services offered by many organizations which provide an important flow of information to the Congress.

It is time that we substitute that law with one which can better inform Americans about the way the legislative process works and which will encourage them to take a more active role in presenting their views to their representatives.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. President, I am pleased to cosponsor the bill introduced today by Senator RIBICOFF, and I look forward to early action by the Senate on this important measure. The senior Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) and I have sponsored lobbying reform bills in the past three Congresses, including S. 815, introduced earlier this year, and we are pleased to join with Senator RIBICOFF in giving our support to the measure he is introducing today. Although there are certain areas where we hope the bill will be strengthened as it moves through committee and the Senate, we believe that the new bill is an important step forward, and we feel that Senator RIBICOFF has made a major contribution to the current debate.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a joint statement by Senator KENNEDY and myself supporting the bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

JOINT STATEMENT OF SENATORS EDWARD M. KENNEDY AND ROBERT T. STAFFORD COSPONSORING NEW LOBBYING REFORM LEGISLATION

We commend Senator Ribicoff for his major initiative in introducing new lobbying reform legislation, and we are pleased to be able to cosponsor it.

In past Congresses, each of us has introduced separate lobbying reform bills. Earlier this year, with improved prospects for Senate action on the issue, we joined forces to introduce S. 815, combining the major provisions and approaches of our prior bills into a single comprehensive measure.

By his action today, we believe that Senator Ribicoff, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Government Operations, has significantly increased the chances that comprehensive lobbying reform legislation will be approved by Congress this year, and we are pleased to be a part of that effort.

Our current Federal lobbying laws are a scandal and a national disgrace. They are a generation out of date, relics of the past that are totally ineffective in dealing with the ways of modern lobbyists. Vast amounts of influence money are spent for lobbying today in secret ways and for secret purposes. Too often, lobbying, which ought to be a noble calling, is accompanied by the appearance of corruption and special dealing.

The time has come to close the gaping loopholes of our current laws and bring them up to date. Congress and the American public are entitled to know the way our laws are made. And they are also entitled to vigorous enforcement of the laws affecting lobbyists.

Lobbyists have a legitimate and vital role to play in the legislative process, but it is a role that must be played in the sunshine of public view, not the shadows of favoritism and secrecy.

We see this new legislation as a "consensus" bill with broad appeal to all supporters of lobbying reform. The new proposals differ in a number of respects from certain provisions in our own legislation in the Senate. For example, we believe that the legislation should be expanded to include provisions for identification of Senators and Congressmen contacted by lobbyists, and that lobbying of the Executive Branch should also be covered.

Nevertheless, we believe that the present bill is a large step forward, perhaps the most important step so far toward achieving basic lobbying reform.

Now that the campaign financing law is on the books, we believe that lobbying reform should become the number one priority in the continuing effort in Congress to improve the quality of government and make it more responsive to the people. We look forward to working with Senator Ribicoff and the other cosponsors of this bill to achieve the prompt enactment of this reform.

---

By Mr. PELL:

S. 2478. A bill to secure the civil rights of blind persons. Referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BILL OF RIGHTS OF THE BLIND

Mr. PELL. Mr. President, today I am introducing legislation which would secure for all blind persons the civil rights necessary to guarantee full and equal utilization of transportation and business services, housing, and accommodations.

This legislation was first suggested to me by Mr. Albert R. Piccolo, who is a member of the legislative committee of the Rhode Island chapter of the National Federation of the Blind. In suggesting that this approach would be of value, Mr. Piccolo wrote:

This legislation would undoubtedly prevent the frustration, disappointment, and discouragement which quite frequently is the result of our efforts to obtain employment, to secure adequate housing, to gain admission to colleges and technical schools, and to use the various means of transportation and public accommodations. These cherished privileges, which are taken for granted by most citizens, if denied to us, can cause unnecessary hardship, a lack of opportunity, and an inability to travel freely and independently.

This eloquent statement points to the frustration which blind persons experience in securing adequate housing, in obtaining access to transportation, and in enjoying free access to places of public accommodation. This legislation, which is similar to that introduced by Congressman BOB WILSON, would prohibit such discrimination. In addition, it calls upon the President to proclaim a "National White Cane Safety Day" each year.

The blind and visually handicapped of our Nation are a great resource to us, and we cannot afford to allow them to remain out of the mainstream of normal, day-to-day life, and its opportunity for personal achievement and success.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed in the RECORD.

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

S. 2478

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

SHORT TITLE

SECTION 1. This Act may be cited as the "Bill of Rights of the Blind Act".

POLICY AND FINDINGS

SEC. 2. The Congress hereby finds and declares that the denial to blind persons of equal access to places or facilities of public accommodation and transportation, to business establishments, and to housing has the effect of impairing the interstate commerce of the United States, both by constructing the free flow of goods and persons and by preventing blind persons from achieving their maximum potential independence and productivity. To remedy this inequitable and unproductive condition, it is the polcy and purpose of this Act to utilize the full authority of the United States Government to secure the civil rights of blind persons from unfair discrimination in accommodations, transportation, business, and housing.

PROHIBITIONS

SEC. 3. (a) No common carrier by air, rail, water, or motor vehicle, or other mode of public transportation, engaged in or affecting interstate or foreign commerce, shall refuse to accept as a passenger any person because of such person's blindness, or because of such persons' use of a dog guide or other guidance instrumentality, nor shall any such blind person be required to pay an additional or special fee for the transport of such dog guide or other guidance instrumentality.

(b) No owner or operator of any place of public accommodation, as defined by section 201(b) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000a(b)), or of any public facility or building covered by title III of such Act, or of any facility or building belonging to the United States or its territories, or the District of Columbia, shall refuse to admit or serve any person because of such person's blindness, or because of such person's use of a dog guide or other guidance instrumentality, nor shall any such blind person be required to pay an additional or special fee for the admission of such dog guide or other guidance instrumentality to such place of public accommodation or to such public facility or building.

(c) No owner or operator of any housing facility or accommodation subject to the provisions of title VIII of the Act of April 11, 1968 (82 Stat. 81, 42 U.S.C. 3601 et seq.), shall refuse to admit any person, as a tenant or otherwise, because of such persons' blindness, or because of such person's use of a dog guide or other guidance instrumentality, nor shall any such blind person be required to pay an additional or special fee, other than a security deposit for damages, for the admission of such dog guide or other guidance instrumentality.

(d) In addition, no person shall engage in any subterfuge, device, or covert strategy for the purpose of achieving indirectly any of the forms of discrimination prohibited by subsections (a), (b), and (c).

WHITE CANE SAFETY DAY

SEC. 4. The President of the United States shall take suitable notice of October 15 as White Cane Safety Day. He shall issue a proclamation in which:

(1) he comments upon the significance of the white cane;

(2) he calls upon the citizens of the Nation to observe the provisions of the White Cane Law and to take precautions necessary to the safety of the disabled;

(3) he reminds the citizens of the Nation of the policies with respect to the disabled herein declared and urges the citizens to cooperate in giving effect to them;

(4) he emphasizes the need of the citizens to be aware of the presence of disabled persons in the community and to keep safe and functional for the disabled the streets, highways, sidewalks, walkways, public buildings, public facilities, other public places, places of public accommodation, amusement and resort, and other places to which the public is invited, and to offer assistance to disabled persons upon appropriate occasions.

SANCTIONS

SEC. 5. Any person, firm, corporation, or association who shall violate the provisions of this Act shall be liable to the blind person or persons involved for damages caused thereby, for punitive damages not to exceed $10,000, for each violation, and for reasonable attorneys' fees and other costs of litigation. In determining the extent to which punitive damages shall be imposed, the court shall consider the extent to which the offense is part of an ongoing, repeated, or intentional practice, the extent to which such blind person is thereby deprived of the opportunity to lead a full and productive life, the number of persons adversely affected, and such other factors as the court may deem relevant.

(b) Suits for damages or other legal, equitable, or declaratory relief may be maintained in the appropriate United States district court without regard to the amount in controversy or to the diversity of citizenship of the parties. No such action shall be brought later than three years after the date of occurrence of the violation.

(c) Nothing in this Act shall be construed to supersede the laws of any State or territory, or of the District of Columbia. No person shall recover under this Act for harms resulting from actions or conduct which constitute violations of this Act, if recovery has been had under the laws of any State or territory, or of the District of Columbia, relating to discrimination on the basis of blindness, for the same actions or conduct.

(d) It shall be a defense to a claim under this Act that—

(1) the claimant, at the time he sought entry, access, or service, did not have his guide dog or other guidance instrumentality under reasonable control; or

(2) that the claimant was disorderly, abusive, intoxicated, or was excluded from entry, access, or service for other good and substantial reasons not in conflict with the policies and purposes of this Act.

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 6. As used in this Act, the term—

(1) "blind person" means a person whose central visual acuity does not exceed 20/200 in the better eye, with corrective lenses, as measured by the Snellen test, or a central visual acuity greater than 20/200 but with a limitation in the field of vision such that the widest diameter of the visual field subtends an angle not greater than twenty degrees:

(2) "dog guide" means a dog which is fitted with a special harness or collar suitable as an aid to the mobility of a blind person, which has been specifically and adequately trained to serve blind persons, and which is in use by a blind person as an aid to his travel, movement, or safety; and

(3) "other guidance instrumentality" means an animal or device specifically and adequately trained or designed for use by

blind persons as an aid to personal travel, movement, or safety.

## ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

S. 702

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. MCINTYRE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 702, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to increase the estate tax exempton from $60,000 to $100,000.

S. 1111

At the request of Mr. HUGH SCOTT, the Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1111, the performance royalty bill.

S. 2290

At the request of Mr. TAFT, the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2290, a bill to establish a Consumer Protection Study Commission in order to study the desirability and feasibility of establishing various administrative courts and transferring to such courts the adjudicatory licensing, and rulemaking functions of various regulatory agencies, and for other purposes.

S. 2386

At the request of Mr. TAFT, the Senator from Utah (Mr. GARN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2386, a bill to deny Members of Congress any increase in pay under any law passed, or plan or recommendation received, during a Congress unless such increase is to take effect not earlier than the first day of the next Congress.

S. 2450

At the request of Mr. TAFT, the Senator from Tennessee (Mr. BAKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2450, a bill to amend the National Security Act of 1947, as amended, to include the Attorney General as a member of the National Security Council.

SENATE RESOLUTION 144

At the request of Mr. BURDICK, the Senator from Colorado (Mr. GARY W. HART) was added as a cosponsor of Senate Resolution 144, to urge the restoration of the status of amateur athlete for the late Jim Thorpe, and for other purposes.

## SENATE RESOLUTION 275—ORIGINAL RESOLUTION REPORTED DISAPPROVING TWO PROPOSED REGULATIONS OF THE FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

(Placed on the calendar.)

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD (for Mr. CANNON), from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported the following original resolution:

*Resolved*, That the regulation proposed by the Federal Election Commission pertaining to accounts used to support the activities of Federal officeholders, transmitted to the Senate under date of July 30, 1975, is disapproved.

SEC. 2. The regulation proposed by the Federal Election Commission pertaining to accounts to support the activities of Federal officeholders, transmitted to the Senate under date of September 30, 1975, is disapproved.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Senate is directed to transmit a copy of this resolution to the Chairman of the Federal Election Commission.

## NOTICE OF HEARING ON ACT TO ESTABLISH A UNIFORM LAW ON THE SUBJECT OF BANKRUPTCIES

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. President, I wish to announce that an open public hearing will continue for the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery on S. 235 and S. 236, two acts to revise the bankruptcy laws of the United States. The hearing will be held on October 8, 1975, in room 6202, Dirksen Senate Office Building, commencing at 10 a.m.

The Commission on Bankruptcy Laws of the United States has recommended sweeping changes in the bankruptcy law. These recommendations are reflected in the provisions of S. 236. The National Conference of Bankruptcy Judges has also recommended substantial changes in the present bankruptcy law. These changes are reflected in the provisions of S. 235.

Those who wish to testify or submit a statement for inclusion in the record should communicate as soon as possible with the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judicial Machinery, 6306 Dirksen Senate Office Building; telephone 224–3618.

## ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

## UNISEX AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. MCCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled, "Unisex and the Public Schools," by Mr. Russell Kirk, which appeared in the August 15, 1975, issue of National Review magazine.

I also ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a letter I have recently received from a friend and constituent, the Honorable Thomas F. Butt, chancellor and probate judge of the 13th Chancery Circuit of Arkansas, with which he transmitted the article and made comments thereon.

The article is indeed thought-provoking, and I recommend its reading by my colleagues and all patrons of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

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

STATE OF ARKANSAS,
13TH CHANCERY CIRCUIT,
*Fayetteville, Ark., August 18, 1975.*

Hon. JOHN MCCLELLAN,
*U.S. Senate,*
*Washington, D.C.*

DEAR SENATOR: Enclosed herewith is a thought-provoking and alarming "piece" by Russell Kirk, from the August 15, 1975, "National Review" magazine, on the proposed HEW regulations to repeal the sexual laws of nature.

I commend this to your attention, because it appears only the Congress can curb the bureaucrat-sociologists in their zeal to make everybody equal—literally.

I do wish Congress would cut off at the pockets about 90% of social welfare funded programs; we'd be out of recession—inflation in 6 months, or well on the way, if this were done.

Sincerely,

THOMAS F. BUTT.

P.S.—In the matter of $403,000,000 overpayment by HEW to welfare recipients, two comments: (1) Someone, from Caspar Weinberger (or successor) on down should be held accountable: Nearly ½ billion dollars isn't chicken feed: (2) Per news reports, HEW does not plan to recover these sums, on ground would be too costly to justify effort. A suggestion: Why not "dock" further payments to those who received too much, by the amount of the respective overpayments? Presumably, if bookkeeping audit has disclosed overpayment, similar process would show to whom and how much the overpayments related to.

THOMAS F. BUTT.

UNISEX AND THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS

(By Russell Kirk)

Unisex marches on. Early in June the federal bureaucracy, in the name of Mr. Gerald Ford and Mr. Caspar Weinberger, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, conferred upon us a document of 54 small-print columns entitled "Nondiscrimination on Basis of Sex: Education Programs and Activities Receiving or Benefiting from Federal Financial Assistance." These are regulations compelling educational institutions which receive federal funds to treat girls as if they were boys and boys as if they were girls.

Immediately after issuing this ukase, Secretary Weinberger resigned his secretaryship and fled to California. President Ford has expressed no contrition for promulgating these decrees from the throne, but he may yet be sorry. Congress can undo these requirements, quite as Congress undid the seatbelt interlock system. Already, encouraged by howls from constituents, Congress has postponed for a year execution of these new rules.

The federal document, however, is not nearly so extreme as the anti-feminine feminists, or libbers, would like. It grants certain exemptions and stops short of censoring textbooks (at the federal level, anyway) for "sexist bias." Aye, reaction as yet has not been wholly stamped out at HEW: paragraph 86.61 actually admits that in rare circumstances the authorities may recognize "sex as a bona-fide occupational qualification": chiefly, it is not forbidden to consider "an employee's sex in relation to employment in a locker room or toilet facility used only by members of one sex." Tories!

The follies of this HEW manifesto have been widely criticized already. Many people are unaware, however, of the yet sillier antics of certain "Sex Bias Task Forces" which are endeavoring to bully departments of public instruction and public schools in the several states. I have at hand information about such Women's Lib pressure in Minnesota and Michigan; had I time, doubtless I could make a collection of similar propaganda materials from other states. Early this year a "Sex Bias Task Force" delivered a report to the Minnesota State Board of Education, and just before the federal decree was published, the "Task Force to Study Sexism in Michigan Schools" presented a similar report to the Michigan State Board of Education.

In Michigan, three dissenters from the strident Report (all of them women) protested against the arbitrary methods and extreme conclusions of the Task Force to which, somehow, they had been appointed. "The Task Force was a farce, with poor attendance, and little discussion," said one. Another woman called the Michigan Report "insidious and subversive," declaring that the real aims of the militant Libbers are these:

"Girls are to be taught karate and other

means of self-defense, but also their muscles are to be developed. Most importantly, girls are to be taught to masturbate, and lesbianism or homosexuality is to be taught in the schools. Further, lesbians are to be used as counselors in schools, and youngsters are to be counseled in alternative lifestyles."

Lest you think that these criticisms emanate from the infamous Little Old Lady in Tennis Shoes, let us turn to the Minnesota Report, of very similar character. A copy of the Minnesota Sex Bias Report was sent for comment to Dr. Rhoda L. Lorand, a clinical psychologist and psychoanalyst in New York City, whose writings are widely published. Dr. Lorand was disgusted.

Were the Minnesota Board of Education to adopt the program drawn up by the Sex Bias Task Force, she declared, the result would be "the promotion of lesbianism, the downgrading of the institution of marriage, of motherhood, childrearing, the nuclear family, the advocacy of single parenthood and communal living, as well as contempt for all occupations and qualities traditionally recognized as feminine." Dr. Lorand proceeded to analyze the Minnesota Report in some detail; here I can offer only brief extracts from her study:

"Putting pressure on boys and girls to behave like the opposite sex is placing them under a great strain because these pressures are at odds with biological endowment. Therapists have begun to note the confusion and unhappiness resulting from the blurring of gender-identity. Conflicting pressures between environmental and instictual drives hinder the development of a firm sense of identity as a male or female (an intended goal of Women's Lib), lacking which the individual cannot acquire stability, self-esteem, or clear-cut goals.

"Moreover, it is taking all the joy and excitement out of life. Girls are made to feel ashamed of their longings to be courted and cherished, to be sexually attractive, to look forward to marriage, motherhood, and homemaking. Boys are made to feel ashamed of their chivalrous impulses. Feelings of protectiveness toward a girl and of manliness cause them to feel guilty and foolish, resulting into a retreat into passivity, while the girls end up unhappily trying to be sexual buddies to the boys. This unisex drive had its beginnings in the hippie movement and has been greatly intensified by all the publicity given by the communication media to the demands and accusations of the feminists (who really should be called masculinists, since they despise everything feminine)."

Amen to that, boys and girls. And amen, too, to certain remarks last December by Dr. Terrel H. Bell, the United States Commissioner of Education. Dr. Lorand quotes him, and I have quoted him in one of my syndicated columns.

"Parents have a right to expect that the schools in their teaching approaches and selection of instructional materials, will support the values and standards that their children are taught at home," said Commissioner Bell. "And if the schools cannot support those values, they must at least avoid deliberate destruction of them."

For my part, I should like to see some deliberate destruction of Sex Bias Task Forces. State boards of education should reject with cold contempt such pronunciamentos as these "Reports" of Minnesota and Michigan. These baneful follies are the productions of a small handful of female freaks, unrepresentative of American women's convictions generally, but noisy and aggressive.

## THE SINAI AGREEMENT

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, when Secretary of State Kissinger visited Cincinnati recently, he spoke at length on the subject of the Sinai agreement and was extremely well received there. I believe it would be interesting to the Senate to hear of the mail resulting from that visit.

Prior to the visit, I had indicated to the press that my mail, while not very heavy, was running about 10 to 1 against the Sinai agreement. Since that visit and since the newspaper comment on my earlier survey, a review of my mail received during the week of September 18 through September 25, revealed 186 letters in favor of the proposed Sinai agreement and 35 letters against. Many people in favor of the agreement mentioned that they were prompted to write because of my earlier report, and a number indicated that they had changed their previous position after listening to, or reading, the remarks of the Secretary.

## STEPHEN J. WEXLER

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I rise today in tribute to a friend and associate who was tragically taken from us in an accident last weekend. He was Stephen J. Wexler, counsel to the Subcommittee on Education of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee.

Although a young man, Steve had already made his mark. He was active in the development of some of this country's most important education legislation. His work on the Elementary and Secondary Education Act Amendments and the Higher Education Amendments of 1972 was recognized and appreciated by his colleagues here in the Senate and by educators throughout America.

In recent years, I had many opportunities to work with Steve in the field of education. I found him a tremendously well-informed person, and I found him willing to share his expertise freely and enthusiastically. Not only did he have a feel for what should be the substance of legislation, but he understood too the procedures of the legislative process, and this made his advice doubly valuable.

Steve was not only an adviser to Senators. He was a friend. He was a witty, personable, and altogether delightful person to be with, and I speak not just for myself but for my colleagues in saying how deeply he will be missed.

Mr. President, I extend my deepest condolences to Steve's young family. While no words or assurances can offset their grief at a time such as this, they will be able to look back with pride—real pride—on the contributions that Steve made to the improvement of education and, therefore, the improvement of life, in our country. The land in which his young son will mature is a better place for Steve's many important contributions.

## YOU PAY FOR WHAT YOU GET

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, it is often said that there is no such thing as a free lunch. This is certainly true and that truth is often painful, as the city of New York is finding out. The government, no matter how big or affluent, cannot live beyond its means indefinitely. Eventually those "free" educational and welfare benefits, those inflationary wage increases and those frivolous new programs have to be paid for.

The fact that nothing is free is as true of Government regulation as it is of Government spending programs. Consumers are beginning to realize that, in addition to the direct taxes they pay each year to support Government social welfare programs, they also pay hidden taxes in the form of higher costs for the goods and services they need as in indirect result of Government regulation of business.

Mr. President, the Business Roundtable has presented a series of messages in the Reader's Digest which discusses different aspects of our economic system. The most recent article "You Pay for What You Get," points out that money from Washington or new safety devices for your car or measures to reduce industrial pollution all cost money and the bill for them eventually lands in the lap of consumers. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Reader's Digest, October 1975]

YOU PAY FOR WHAT YOU GET

The city of New York awoke from a disastrous dream last spring. For decades it had lived beyond its means. Many of its citizens had come to believe they could get something without paying for it—"free" college educations; huge welfare benefits; wage increases for city employes double and triple those in the federal government; extravagant, fiscally unrealistic pensions.

Result: The city found itself $750 million short of meeting its current operating expenses, and was forced to pay close to $2 billion yearly on its past debts. "No other city in the United States has provided such a range of free services and diversions," reported one news magazine.

The only problem was, those "services and diversions" were not free at all. In fact, the most elementary economic truth is: *Few things are really free.* We must always pay the piper when the dance is over.

In our personal lives, this pay-the-piper principle seems so logical, so matter-of-fact, that we seldom question it. Whether we're offering a child piano lessons, buying an air conditioner or choosing steak over hamburger, we weigh the benefits to be derived, and we expect to pay the price.

But somehow we seem to abandon this logic when we venture upon "social goals"—from poverty programs to health care to aid to education. The two most common signs of public departure from economic reality are the statements, "Let the government pay for it," and the currently popular "Tax the big corporations—let *them* pay for it." But who really does pay? Let's examine just one case.

The Union Carbide plant at Alloy, W. Va., which produces ferro-alloys for the steel and aluminum industries, used to be known as "the world's smokiest factory." It poured out 91,900 tons of particles a year, more than that emitted by all of New York City. In 1971, Union Carbide began to take steps to meet a clean-up schedule developed with state environmental officials—and today the air is clear over Alloy. Thanks to a vast complex of environmental equipment that requires almost as much room as the plant itself, emissions have been reduced by 97 percent.

What has the Alloy clean-up cost? Union Carbide spent $33 million for the elaborate anti-pollution devices. Operation and maintenance of the system cost more than $3 milion a year. As a result, plant operating

costs have risen more than 10 percent. Who will pay this cost? The company initially, certainly. But ultimately the clean-up has to be reflected in the prices of alloys for high-strength and specialty purposes, and for aluminum products. Eventually, all of us, in buying goods made from steel and aluminum, will feel the economic impact.

Most would agree that the clean air was worth the cost. Yet in setting each new social goal, we, as the people who ultimately pay, must ask ourselves: Are the benefits worth the costs?

Such decisions are easily resolved at the personal level. (Is the extra room on the new house, the tape-deck for your car, worth the extra dollar outlay to you?) But when it comes to social goals, we may not be fully aware of the facts, mainly because the decision-making is in the hands of our surrogates—Congressmen and regulatory-agency officials.

Whether the decisions they make for us are wise or unwise is ultimately decided by the voters—although it may take a long time. But whether these decisions will cost us money has already been immutably decided by economic reality. Americans, for instance, have spent an estimated $2.4 billion extra on their automobiles since 1972 to accommodate various government-mandated combinations of wires, lights and buzzers to force them to buckle their seat belts. Ordered "on behalf of" the public, these devices proved to be overwhelmingly unpopular and the law requiring them was finally rescinded by Congres as a "social goal" not worth the cost.

As you read this, other bills for social goals—many of which we may find admirable—are being totted up. We will pay for what we get, so we must be sure that as a nation we want, need and can afford them.

In the steel industry, for example, we must be prepared for the possibility that new, stiffer government anti-pollution standards will cause steel-industry costs to increase by $25 to $30 a ton over the next eight years. Other costs—energy, raw materials and labor—will also drive prices up. The companies will bear the brunt initially, but *we consumers* will finally pay. (Steel men don't print their own money; they make it by selling their products.) Part of the increased cost of a new car or refrigerator will go toward clearing the air over Chicago, Baltimore, Pittsburgh or Birmingham—wherever steel is made.

Or consider, for instance, the effect of a proposed federal regulation to require tire manufacturers to mold coded information regarding traction qualities, tread resistance, and resistance to generation of heat into the side of each new tire. Some companies estimate that this regulation will add at least 75 cents to the retail cost of each tire. In other words, according to the manufacturers, if you buy four tires, you will pay $3 for both symbols you can't understand and additional testing that will add nothing to the safety already required by previous regulations. Presumably, astute consumers will bone up on traction, wear and heat-generation information before they buy their tires. We must ask ourselves: Is this regulation really worth the cost?

Another example: flammability standards for upholstered furniture suggested by the Consumer Product Safety Commission. The regulations, aimed principally at cigarette-caused fires, are expected to increase prices of upholstered sofas and armchairs by up to 25 percent. The furniture industry fears that the standards could eliminate about 75 percent of fabrics now made for upholstery. If we, through our surrogates, decide that it is correct for the government to impose such flammability standards, then we must be prepared to pay the cost the next time we buy a couch. And we may not like the feel or look of the newer, nonflammable fabrics.

What all this means is that we, as part of a complex and interrelated economy, cannot merely wish for or advocate some benefit for a "remote" part of our society. We must also be prepared to accept a part of the financial burden. Are we prepared to pay higher electric bills when we ask a utility in our area to provide more generating capacity with less harm to our environment? Are we committed to reducing auto emissions and increasing auto safety to the extent that it may add as much as $1000 to the price of our cars?

Only when we realize our fundamental financial role in the laws passed and regulations promulgated by our public officials, will we be sure to set wise and realistic goals.

## DIRECTOR OF NIA SHOULD BE NAMED NOW

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the Research on Aging Act became law on May 31, 1974, after a long struggle.

Public Law 93-296 established a National Institute on Aging at the National Institutes of Health. The new institute is responsible for conducting and supporting biomedical, social, and behavioral research and training relating to the aging process.

Congress took this action because aging research had a low Federal priority.

Consequently, our Nation knows far too little about the aging process, even though a substantial portion of our health care costs goes for care of older persons.

There are now 22 million persons in the 65-plus age category. Within the next 50 years the number of older Americans will almost double, to 40 million.

In terms of sheer numbers, then, we should be more concerned about the reasons for aging.

But there are other important factors as well. For example, research conducted by the National Institute on Aging could probably help more people to live productively for longer periods.

Yet, the administration has failed to name a director for this important position, although the Research on Aging Act was enacted into law 16 months ago.

This inaction is totally inexcusable, in my judgment, and must be corrected at once.

Obviously, the new Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—Forrest David Mathews—is not personally responsible for this inordinately long delay. He has been in office now for less than 2 months and has responsibility for a vast agency.

But, it is my hope that he will soon name a director of the National Institute on Aging. This action is needed now if NIA is to have direction and perform its mission.

Recently, I wrote the new Secretary of HEW and urged that the director be appointed promptly.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this letter be printed in the RECORD.

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

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING,
*Washington, D.C., October 1, 1975.*

Hon. FORREST DAVID MATHEWS,
*Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On May 31, 1974, the Research on Aging Act was signed into law. The Act established a new National Institute on Aging to conduct and support biomedical, social, and behavioral research and training relating to the aging process.

However, the Administration has not yet named a director for the new Institute—although 16 months have elapsed since the enactment of this legislation. I fully realize that you are not personally responsible for this lengthy delay, since you were confirmed only recently. Nonetheless, I hope that one of your early acts in that capacity will be to name an N.I.A. director. This action, it seems to me, is essential if the Institute is to fulfill Congressional intent.

For these reasons, I would appreciate a report on the status of this appointment and information on your other plans for N.I.A.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

FRANK CHURCH,
*Chairman.*

## NATIONAL CAPITAL AREA COUNCIL, BOY SCOUTS OF AMERICA, HOLD MINIJAMBOREE

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, each of us in the Senate knows of the tremendous contributions the Boy Scouts of America have made and continue to make toward the development of good citizens in our country. Today, more than 6 million boys and adult leaders belong to the Boy Scouts of America, following the motto of "Be Prepared" and learning good citizenship through cooperation and hard work.

As part of this goal, National Capital Area Council, Boy Scouts of America, held a minijamboree on October 3, 4, and 5. The jamboree was located near Washington on route 301. The Scouts were involved in many activities and I am sure that all those in attendance gained better insight into the many abilities and talents of our Nation's Boy Scouts.

I would also like to take this opportunity to commend the many adults who willingly give of their time to assist the Boy Scout effort. Without these dedicated professionals, the Boy Scouts of America would not hold the enviable reputation it does today. They are certainly helping to lay a solid foundation upon which another generation of Americans can fulfill their citizenship responsibilities.

## SPANISH GOVERNMENT THREAT TO THE BASQUE PEOPLE

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, from around the world voices of protest have been heard this week over the execution by the Spanish Government of five men accused of terrorist activities. I add my voice to their number.

But I would go much further. It is important for us to realize that these executions are not an isolated incident but only the most obvious act in a pattern of repression against the Basque people particularly. Behind the grim headlines lies the reality of years of persecution of the Basque minority and a recent step-up of terror and torture by the Government.

I call the Senate's attention to a report made public at the United Nations Wednesday by Amnesty International, a worldwide human rights movement independent of any government, political faction, ideology or religious creed. Amnesty International works for the release of men and women imprisoned anywhere for their beliefs, color, ethnic origin, or religion, provided they have neither used nor advocated violence.

In July of this year Amnesty International sent a mission to Spain to investigate allegations of torture reported to have occurred during a 3-month period in two of the four Basque provinces. Despite the refusal by the Spanish Government to allow access to some of the prisoners who allegedly suffered the worst torture, the mission obtained conclusive evidence of the following:

First. Massive illegal detentions took place in the two provinces, probably of several thousand persons;

Second. The mission received convincing evidence that torture was systematically used against a minimum of 250 Basque detainees. One victim told of 30 sessions of torture in 21 days of continuous imprisonment; and

Third. Three major police forces participated in the torture of the Basques and regularly circumvented Spanish law by transferring prisoners from one province to another, holding them without cause and rearresting prisoners.

The report is tough reading—a description of cruel tortures intended not only to extract confessions and information from their victims but to intimidate the Basque people in every possible way. But it is important that we understand the lengths to which the Spanish Government will go to suppress the Basques.

In the light of this evidence, we in the United States should do more than protest. We should seek to avoid complicity in the suppression of the Basques through support of the Franco government. Our Government should do everything possible to separate itself from these acts of the Franco regime. In the months and perhaps years ahead, when the Generalissimo seeks to maintain the present form of government even after his passing, let us hope we are sufficiently wise to avoid either the illusion or the fact of support for the conduct I have just discussed.

The execution which took place last week may be only the beginning. Fifteen more Basques are expected to go on trial and at least three are expected to receive death sentences. While we may wish to respect the internal laws of other countries in criminal matters, when human rights are so flagrantly abused as in Franco Spain it is time to speak out. The Spanish Government should recognize that the international outcry expresses the universal desire for civil liberties and human dignity. When citizens of a country such as Spain are prevented through fear from expressing themselves in an open society, it is time for us to speak on their behalf.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of Amnesty International mission to Spain be printed in the RECORD.

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

REPORT OF AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL MISSION TO SPAIN

I. INTRODUCTION

In July 1975 Amnesty International sent a mission to Spain to investigate allegations of torture reported to have occurred during the three-month state of exception (estado de excepción) in the Basque provinces of Vizcaya and Guipúzcoa, which was in effect from 25 April to 25 July 1975. A state of exception in Spain is one step short of martial law, being a temporary abrogation by the government of six civil rights theoretically guaranteed in the Fuero de los Españoles (Charter of the Spanish People): the rights to free expression, to privacy of the mail, of assembly and association, habeas corpus, freedom of movement and residence, and freedom from arbitrary house search. The most serious of these abrogations in creating the pre-conditions for torture is the suspension of the right of habeas corpus. Under the Fuero de los Españoles, a detainee has the right to be brought before judicial authorities within 72 hours of detention. But under a state of exception, a detainee can be held for an indefinite period without access to a lawyer and without appeal to the courts. With the detainee beyond the help of lawyers, the courts or anyone else, the police are at liberty to do with him or her what they wish.

The declaration of the state of exception should be seen within the changing context of governmental policy with regard to the expression of political opposition in Spain. The poles of this policy are suggested by the February 1974 and the June 1975 speeches by Prime Minister Don Carlos Arias Navarro. The first speech pledged support for a limited degree of popular participation in an evolving democratic process. This pledge of liberalization, had it been effected, should have led, for example, to the introduction of a new law of association, thus possibly allowing the formation of independent political parties.

The promises of the February 1974 speech have not taken tangible form, however, and in June 1975 the Prime Minister explicitly reversed his earlier statement of intentions. Among other things the second speech promises (1) a harsh law to combat communism in any manifestation; (2) national unity, to be maintained in the face of separatist movements; (3) national continuity, to be guaranteed by the re-constitution of the monarchy; and (4) peace, to be protected by the government and the security forces.

Government policy toward the Basque provinces is further complicated by the strong nationalism of a people who have a distinct language and culture. The Basques exercised for generations a limited autonomy within Spain in the form of administrative privileges conceded in special charters (fueros) by Spanish monarchs, but largely withdrawn during the nineteenth century. Vestiges of these administrative privileges survived into the twentieth century, but they were abolished in Vizcaya and Guipúzcoa in 1937 after the provinces capitulated to General Francisco Franco, whose "New Spain" brought them under the centralized rule of the administration in Madrid.

The Spanish government's official reason for declaring the state of exception in Vizcaya and Guipúzcoa was the violence initiated by the Basque separatist organization ETA (Euzkadi Ta Azkatasuna, "Basque Homeland and liberty"), specifically the assassinations of four policemen in the four months preceding the state of exception. However, the security forces' retaliatory violence against the general Basque population, including the use of torture, was widespread and indiscriminate. The torture and other acts of official intimidation were aimed not only at dismembering ETA but also at intimidating other Basques from support for ETA and from any aspirations to Basque autonomy.

Documentation of this zealous repression and of the abuses of human rights during the state of exception is provided in this report in the hope that the Spanish government will hold its own security forces accountable for violations of Spanish law and of the Fuero de los Españoles.

*The Allegations*

During the state of exception, Amnesty International received numerous allegations made by both Basque and independent sources (lawyers, journalists and others familiar with the Basque provinces) that the following violations of human rights had occurred and that these violations were both deliberate and frequent:

1. Massive detentions, altogether numbering in the thousands, usually followed by interrogation, often by maltreatment and in most cases by release within a few days, thus indicating the probable innocence of those released and leaving room in the police stations and Civil Guard barracks for new detainees.

2. Illegal transfers of detainees from the two Basque provinces not under the state of exception (Alava and Navarra) into Vizcaya and Guipúzcoa, thus in effect extending the geographical area under the state of exception.

3. Abuses of the judicial process either by re-arrest on the executive authority of the provincial civil governor following release by a magistrate, or by removal of detainees from police stations or Civil Guard barracks directly to prison.

4. Widespread, systematic and severe torture of detainees in all four Basque provinces, but particularly in the two provinces under the state of exception.

*The Mission*

In order to investigate these allegations independently, Amnesty International sent a delegate, the American attorney Thomas Jones of Washington, DC, to visit Madrid and the Spanish Basque region from 19 until 29 July 1975 and make appropriate inquiries. While in Madrid, Mr. Jones was joined by Dr. Burkhard Wisser, professor of philosophy in Karlsruhe, Federal Republic of Germany, for discussions at the Spanish Ministry of Justice and with the Papal Nuncio and the Dean of the Junta de Gobierno of the Spanish Lawyers' Association.

In addition, Amnesty International instructed the mission to seek clarification of the Spanish government's intentions regarding the renewed use of the death penalty both in civil and in political cases throughout Spain. (A copy of Amnesty International's appeal to the Spanish government against the use of the death penalty is appended to this report.)

Amnesty International sought the assistance of the Spanish government in investigating these allegations. On 11 July and again on 16 July, Secretary General Martin Ennals formally requested permission from the Spanish Ministry of Justice for an Amnesty International delegate to visit specific prisoners in Basauri Prison, near Bilbao (Vizcaya province), whose names were known to Amnesty International and who had allegedly been tortured prior to their transfer to Basauri Prison. On 21 July, Mr. Jones and Dr. Wisser visited the Ministry of Justice in Madrid to repeat this petition and to present a list of names of 32 prisoners whom they requested to interview. They expressed their willingness to extend their stay in Spain, if necessary, beyond the termination of the state of exception so that the interviews could be arranged. They also offered to select a smaller number from the list for interviews. Nevertheless, on 23 July, the Ministry of Justice officialy refused the request.

Amnesty International regrets that its

delegates were not given the opportunity to test some of the most damaging allegations of torture that had been made against the Spanish security forces. Permission to visit even a few of the prisoners in Basauri Prison would have been a sign that the Spanish authorities were willing to have these allegations fairly tested, and either verified or discredited, by an impartial, independent observer. No such sign has been forthcoming.

II. THE NATURE OF THE EVIDENCE

The Amnesty International mission collected evidence (1) from lawyers whose clients were tortured and who visited their clients in prison and took testimony from them, (2) from witnesses to the torture of others, and (3) from victims of torture who have been released from custody and (in some cases) whose scars were still visible. More than 50 lawyers and victims and witnesses of torture were heard. Cases cited in their report are indicated as indirected testimony if they came from interviews with those in the first category. Otherwise the cases came from the direct testimony of witnesses and victims of torture.

The weight of this report rests on personal interviews with 15 victims of torture—a comparatively high number, in view of the prevailing fear of reprisals in the Basque region—and on the corroborating testimonies of those who had witnessed torture and who gave direct testimony about an additional 30 cases. The ages of these particular 45 victims of torture ranged from 17 to 72, many of them being in their twenties. Among these 45, there were 11 women and 34 men. The majority came from the working class.

It has been necessary to maintain the anonymity of all victims and witnesses of torture throughout the report in order to protect them not only from possible rearrest, but also against reprisals by the extreme right-wing vigilantes who commit acts of violence with apparent impunity against Basques. (See page 11 for an analysis of the relationship between these vigilantes and the police.) All of the witnesses and victims of torture who met with the mission expressed the desire to remain anonymous, and most desired that the details of their stories be treated with the greatest caution in order to prevent their identification. As a consequence, this report sometimes omits parts of testimonies, such as exact dates on which a person was arrested, the town in which the person resides, or other very specific details that would readily identify the speaker. (Amnesty International possesses the full, unabridged testimonies.) Although some details have been omitted, no facts have been altered and no details changed. Amnesty International regrets that circumstances dictate this policy of anonymity.

III. THE FINDINGS

Despite the refusal by the Spanish government to allow access to some of the prisoners who allegedly suffered the worst torture, the Amnesty International mission obtained conclusive evidence of the following:

1. Massive detentions did take place in Vizcaya and Guipúzcoa provinces, although Amnesty International is unable to give verifiable figures for the number of persons detained during the state of exception or the number of prisoners still in custody. Certainly the unofficial estimates of several thousand detentions given by lawyers appear to be more realistic than the official figures given on 27 May 1975, when the government announced that 189 people had been detained in Guipúzcoa and Vizcaya provinces since 25 April, of whom 90 had subsequently been released.

Amnesty International has received reliable information that upwards of a thousand people were detained in each of the two provinces, that no fewer than 300 were held longer than 72 hours in Vizcaya and that no fewer than 200 were held longer than 72 hours in Guipúzcoa. All of the victims interviewed by the mission had been held longer than 72 hours by the security forces. It is also likely that at the close of the state of exception there were about 120 prisoners in Basauri Prison (Vizcaya province), which is twice its normal capacity. Amnesty International is not able at this time to make a reliable estimate of the prisoners still in Martutene Prison (Guipúzcoa province) or in the Civil Guard barracks and police stations of the two provinces, or of the number of prisoners transferred to prisons outside the Basque region.

2. Five of the torture victims interviewed by the mission had been illegally transferred into Guipúzcoa or Vizcaya for the purpose of circumventing the Spanish citizen's right to be brought before a magistrate within 72 hours of detention. In each case, the individual was tortured in the province where arrested and then transferred into one of the two provinces affected by the state of exception before the expiration of the 72-hour limit.

3. During the state of exception provincial civil governors ordered (a) the rearrest of detainees after their release by a magistrate and (b) the removal of detainees from police stations and Civil Guard barracks directly to prison. In effect, this form of administrative detention circumvented the judicial processes, on the one hand arbitrarily nullifying the decisions of magistrates and on the other hand preventing the presentation of complaints of torture before judges.

4. The mission received personal and direct evidence of the torture of 45 Basque detainees. The mission further received credible and convincing evidence that torture was systematically used against a *minimum* of 250 Basque detainees (and possibly against many more who were not known to the contacts interviewed by the mission) in the provinces of Vizcaya and Guipúzcoa during the state of exception and was used frequently in Alava and Navarra provinces. Every victim interviewed by the mission was subjected to at least one session of interrogation and torture a day: some were tortured during as many as five sessions a day. Sessions lasted from half an hour to an estimated six hours. One victim told of 30 sessions of torture in 21 days of continuous imprisonment.

5. The three major police forces participated or collaborated in the torture of Basques: the *Policia Armada* (regular armed police), whose jurisdiction is the urban areas; the paramilitary *Guardia Civil*, with jurisdiction in rural, coastal and frontier regions; and the *Brigada Politico-Social*, the special security police.

6. The methods of torture included severe and systematic beatings with a variety of contusive weapons, falanga (beating on the soles of the feet), burning with cigarettes, near drowning by being submerged in water while suspended upside-down, enforced sleeplessness, and forms of psychological stress, including mock executions, sexual threats, threats to relatives and the technique known as *el corrojo* (the frequent fastening and unfastening of bolts on the cell doors in order to keep prisoners in perpetual fear that the torturers have returned).

7. The reasons for the torture were (a) to extract information and confessions that would enable the security forces to crush or severely weaken ETA, whose members had murdered four policemen in the four months prior to the state of exception, and (b) to intimidate the general Basque population into submission to the central administration and to the non-Basque security forces. Partly because the security forces are not Basques, generally do not speak Basque and therefore have no natural roots among the local population, they cannot readily rely on ordinary techniques of gathering information. Consequently they turned during the state of exception to the use of massive detentions and systematic torture in order to elicit the required information and confessions from those few knowledgeable detainees in their custody. When detainees had no knowledge to bare, the emphasis lay on intimidation of the tortured detainees and in turn of the general Basque population—intimidation that became anarchic vengeance provoked by two further assassinations of policemen in early May.

IV. THE METHODS OF TORTURE

The most common form of torture used by the Spanish security forces against Basques has been severe and systematic beatings all over the body and with a variety of contusive weapons:

1. "I was thrown to the floor, kicked, clubbed. They had a wooden rod about a meter long, and a club wrapped in rubber with metal bands around it."

2. "I was in the police station a total of some 20 days. I was beaten with an electric cable, about a meter long, with two centimeters of copper surrounded by rubber or plastic. I was beaten worst on the shoulders, the back of the neck and the chest."

3. "Blows were falling from all sides, some from fists, others from what looked like a whip, except that it had a ball or knob on the end, about 40–45 centimeters long."

4. "They beat my husband in the Civil Guards barracks in Guipuzcoa with hard rubber tubes used for butane gas. He was bruised from the buttocks to his feet." (This incident occurred several months prior to the state of exception.)

5. "I lost consciousness twice and they woke me by throwing water on my head. On the last day, they . . . beat me with a crowbar."

6. "They took me to the police station in [name of town omitted], where they handcuffed my hands under my knees and beat me for some four hours with wooden poles and flexible wooden clubs with knots in them made from a holly tree. They also whipped me."

7. Indirect testimony from a lawyer about a client: "I could see marks, bruises on both arms. He had bruise lines caused by blows from what he described as iron, steel and wooden bars, as well as clubs both round and square. They also used a cane made out of bone—apparently it was very handsome."

8. "They began to beat me with an iron bar wrapped in rubber, about 60 centimeters long. They hit me in the back, in the chest, over the heart. It's a blow that shakes you to the core."

Falanga (beating of the soles of the feet, causing pain to the skeletal and nervous systems) was common, as were beatings on the sexual organs, the shins, back, stomach, kidneys and head. One prisoner had his head thrust against the wall by his interrogators some 20 times until his forehead was cut and "swollen like an egg". The feet and buttocks of others were black with bruises. One witness referred again and again to a particular victim he saw as looking like a cadaver, "his face yellow like a dead man".

It is striking among many of these cases that there was a combination of beating and painfully protracted calisthenics. "When one group of police tired of beating me, another would come in. They made me do deep knee bends for one and a half hours while they were beating me," said one man. A young woman said that she had been beaten while forced to do hundreds—perhaps 500—deep knee bends: "It leaves no marks, but it hurts horribly." "The second interrogation lasted about two hours," said another man, "and I was beaten in the same way with the same whips by five or six policemen. This time my hands were handcuffed under my legs, and while squatting, I was made to walk as they beat me." This "duck walk" (*el pato*) was interpreted by one victim of it as an effort

to "minimize" and humiliate him (*para minimizarle*).

Women received especially humiliating treatment from their male interrogators. One witness told the mission of a girl whom the policemen stripped naked and whose pubic hair they shaved. The same witness (a man) saw cigarette burns on the arms of another girl who told him that she also bore scars from cigarette burns on her breasts. (One of the policemen assassinated was known as *El Pitillo*, "the cigarette butt".) The women torture victims were so sadistically beaten and humiliated that it was not easy for them to come forward to meet the Amnesty International mission. Some did, however, and they told of sexual threats, including sterilization, of being made to walk naked in the police station, of being manhandled in front of male friends to force information from the men and of insults that are (above all within the mores of Spanish society) so degrading as to be a form of psychological torture.

The torturers at the central police station in Bilbao had the services of a doctor (or someone they called a doctor). He examined torture victims, patched them up, bandaged their ribs or recommended hospitalization. His chief role was to advise the police on how long it would take for the torture victims' bruises to disappear: "After the first week they left me alone. On [date omitted] and again on [date omitted] I was examined by a man dressed like a doctor. The police asked him how long it would take for the bruises and marks to go away, so they could tell how long to keep me at the police station. In my case the 'doctor' said 10 days."

Many of the victims of torture who were interviewed referred to the technique of el bueno, that is, the good policeman, who acts as the prisoner's friend. His function in the ordeal is to regret the need for brutality, offer favours to the prisoner, and pretend to oppose the resumption of torture—all in an effort to win from the prisoner the desired information or confession. Comment on the predatory cynicism of such ploys is unnecessary. Psychological stress was intensified by mock executions (several of those interviewed had had pistols to their heads and the trigger pulled on a blank cartridge), by threats of rape or torture of relatives, by sounds of screaming from other torture victims, and most damaging of all, by the technique known to the prisoners as cerrojos—the frequent fastening and unfastening of bolts on the cell doors that kept prisoners awake for days and almost constantly in fear that another session of torture would soon begin. (For further direct testimony from witnesses and victims of torture, see Appendix A).

V. INTIMIDATION

a.) Official Intimidation—

"Their only credentials were machine-guns and pistols," commented one released prisoner who had been seized and assaulted at home by the police during the night. Under a state of exception the security forces do not need a warrant or any authority but their own to enter a house, search the premises and detain the inhabitants. This pattern of violent entry was commonplace during the state of exception.

Virtually no member of the security forces in the Basque provinces is a Basque. Few policemen understand the Basque language, and in order to gather information about opposition activities they rely either on a not particularly effective network of local Basque informers, or else, as was true during the state of exception, on massive arrests, random brutality and excessive repression, including torture.

The ubiquitous nature of the repression is illustrated by the random checks in the streets and other public places of identity cards, which all Spanish citizens must carry. One example of the intimidation engendered by such procedures will suffice. When the police entered a public bar in Bilbao to check identity cards, the commanding officer blew his whistle to announce the raid. An elderly Basque man responded by shouting in Basque a cry common to the bull ring. The commanding officer knocked the man to the floor and viciously kicked him. Those people whose identity cards bore Spanish names were allowed to leave. Those whose cards bore Basque names were forced to the floor.

Intimidation also took the form of action against local parish priests. The police confiscated at least two sermons that were published in June and detained priests accused of writing or distributing them. In addition, fines of up to 50,000 pesetas (about $400) were levied against priests who alluded in their sermons to repression under the state of exception, and often the community or parish paid the fine. (Similar fines are increasingly used against priests throughout Spain.) Repetitive fines imposed economic pressure on the priests and their parishioners, and if they were collectively unable to pay this form of tribute, the parish priest remained in custody.

(b.) Vigilante Intimidation

Extreme rightwing vigilantes, usually identified as members of the *Guerrilleros del Crito Rey* hitherto operating mostly in Madrid, have recently become active in the Basque region as well. Amnesty International has no evidence that the vigilantes have caused any deaths in the Basque region. But they have undertaken an effective campaign of terror against relatives and sympathizers of Basque separatists, as well as against priests and lawyers who have dared to defend civil rights. They have dragged a defense lawyer from his house and beaten him; assaulted whole families who have relatives in ETA; beaten a 72-year-old priest in his parish library outside Bilbao; and bombed, burned or machine-gunned dozens of houses, offices and commercial establishment owned or operated by Basques with either separatists or civil rights aspirations.

The Amnesty International mission was not asked to investigate the activities of the vigilantes or the alleged links between them and the police. Nevertheless, some second-hand information was forthcoming which Amnesty International regards as reliable.

The clearest evidence of police complicity in the vigilante activities is the fact that not one investigation or arrest is known to have taken place following vigilantes' attacks on persons or property. Furthermore, as several Basques stated to the mission, the vigilantes (whether from the area or outside the area) would need the help of the police or their informants to pinpoint their targets.

Virtually every person interviewed by the mission expressed fears of retaliation by the police or the vigilantes—fears that would seem to be fully justified. The Amnesty International delegate saw the machine-gunned windows of lawyers' offices. In the early morning of 28 July, a public bar in Vizcaya was bombed and nearby a priest's car was machine-gunned and bombed, thus indicating that the termination of the state of exception has not put an end to the vigilantes' activities. The *Guardia Civil* had forceably cleared the streets of the town and had detained the owners of the car that was bombed on charges that they had allowed "subversive songs"—i.e. songs in the Basque language—to be sung in the bar.

VI. TORTURE UNDER SPANISH LAW

An official at the Ministry of Justice in Madrid stated unequivocally to Amnesty International's representatives that torture is unacceptable to decent men, that it is immoral and degrading to both victim and torturer, and that torture is both prohibited and punishable as a criminal offence under Spanish law.

In the preliminary section of the Fuero de los Españoles (Law of 17 July 1945), the Spanish state "declares, as the governing principle of its actions, respect for the dignity, integrity and freedom of the individual . . ." In the Enjuiciamiento Criminal (Law of Criminal Prosecution), Article 389 states that the witness shall not be asked deceitful or rhetorical questions, nor shall any coercion, deceit, promise or contrivance be used to force or induce the witness to make a particular declaration. Article 393 reads as follows: "When the interrogation of the accused is of prolonged duration or the amount of questioning is such that the accused loses the composure of mind necessary to answer the remaining questions, the interrogation should be brought to an end to allow the accused time to rest and recuperate. The duration of the interrogation must always be indicated in the statement of the accused." Article 394 states that "the examining magistrate who infringes the rules laid down in the above article or those in Article 389 will be disciplined except in cases where he is to be disciplined for greater offences." It is thus evident that under Spanish law the use of maltreatment or coercion by the authorities is a criminal act.

Spanish law provides that allegations of torture by police during interrogation can be brought before the courts in a number of ways: by the victim when he is brought before the juez de instrucción, under normal circumstances within 72 hours of his arrest; by a member of his family making appeal to the judge for an investigation; by any Spanish citizen, using the procedure known as a llamada por acción popular, a kind of citizen's complaint; and, finally, by the courts and public prosecutors themselves when evidence of torture comes to their attention.

In any of these cases, it is incumbent upon the competent tribunal to investigate the allegations with the help of a forensic doctor's report on the medical condition of the victim. Where there are signs of torture, the courts have the power to hold an investigative hearing and to recommend action to the public prosecutor. It should be noted that a *llamada por accion popular* case has been brought by 49 lawyers on behalf of the well-known priest, Father Anastasio Erquicia.*

In spite of this laudable theoretical spectrum of legal safeguards against torture and coercion, these legal guarantees were nullified in practice by police action and judicial inertia during the state of exception. Moreover, there is strong evidence, as a number of Spanish lawyers told the Amnesty International mission, that torture is used systematically whenever the individual does not

---

*The Spanish periodical *Cambio 16*, in the 18 August 1975 issue, published an account of the case of Father Erquicia after his release from hospital. Torture is not explicitly mentioned, but the enigmatic quality of the article that results from the obvious omissions about torture indicates the limits of what can be said on the subject in Spain: "I stayed in the police station for 24 hours: what I can confirm is that I entered it in good health and that I had until then never suffered from any serious illness, my state of health always having been excellent. That day, at three o'clock in the morning, I began feeling dizzy. I was in the cell with four other persons, and I asked for medical attendance. These were hours of great tension; the preceeding night the policeman Llorente had been murdered.'

" 'Tasio' lost his sense of time and remembers only his arrival at the hospital. According to the four doctors who attended him, he was brought [to the hospital] . . . in a very serious condition because of a kidney injury, which required dialysis treatment for a period of 19 days."

immediately confess voluntarily. At the root of this systematic violation of basic human rights is an inquisitorial legal system that accepts confession as fundamental proof and in which torture is frequently used to obtain that confession.

Furthermore, a number of Spanish lawyers stated that, apart from the massive, indiscriminate arrests and torture, a state of exception is not altogether exceptional. This is because cases regarded by the police as serious are usually subject to military jurisdiction, under which the right of *habeas corpus* within 72 hours of detention does not apply, and because of judicial reluctance to interfere with the police. Thus, for example, the law guarantees judicial scrutiny of police requests for search warrants. Nevertheless, according to Spanish lawyers, in the Basque provinces judicial approval of such requests is virtually automatic in every case. In other words, even under normal circumstances, any Spanish citizen in the Basque provinces may, at the discretion of the security forces, find machine-gun carrying policemen searching his house at 3 am.

It is certainly true that during the state of exception the judiciary did not rigorously oversee police activities or adequately defend detainees' rights under Spanish law. Magistrates either failed altogether to investigate allegations of torture lodged with them by detainees or their lawyers, or if they initiated inquiries, they did so only after enough time had elapsed for bruises and scars to disappear.

VII. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Amnesty International respectfully appeals to the responsible Spanish authorities to investigate Amnesty International's findings of the abuses of legal procedures and of the massive and systematic use of torture in the Basque provinces during the state of exception, with a view toward compensating and rehabilitating the victims of torture and toward bringing to justice those who may be proven guilty of these abuses and those senior police officers who had the responsibility to prevent them. The urgency of this appeal is increased by the persistent reports of torture elsewhere in Spain. (See Appendix B.)

The massive number of detentions, the illegal transfers of detainees into Vizcaya and Guipúzcoa, the disregard for the proper judicial procedures, the violent entry into private houses, the apparent cooperation between the security forces and vigilante groups, and above all, the deliberate and systematic use of torture—these abuses violate accepted international, including European, legal standards. Indeed, if Spain were a member of the Council of Europe, these manifest violations of the European Convention on Human Rights would be sufficient to bring a case against the Spanish authorities before the Commission of Human Rights and the Court of Human Rights.

Unfortunately, the new decree law approved by the Spanish Cabinet on 22 August 1975 increases the likelihood that such abuses as occurred in the Basque provinces during the state of exception will become more frequent throughout Spain. Under the new law the security forces throughout the country will be allowed to hold a detainee for 10 days (rather than a limit of 72 hours, as stipulated by the *Fuero de los Españoles*) without bringing him or her before a magistrate. Warrants will not be needed for house searches. In addition, newspapers face penalties of up to three-months' closure if they "defend" communism, anarchism or separatism. Most severe of all is the new *mandatory* death penalty for all those who are convicted of killing a member of the security forces. *The new law creates for a period of two years a situation that is in many respects a national state of exception: it abrogates for all Spanish citizens some of the fundamental guarantees of the* Fuero de los *Españoles.*

In accord with the findings of this report (see above, Section III), Amnesty International respectfully makes the following recommendations to the responsible Spanish authorities:

1. In that the torture of detainees almost always occurred prior to charges being made against them, if charges were made at all, Amnesty International recommends that the protection offered by the United Nations Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners and the Enjuiciamiento Criminal be made effective for all persons deprived of their freedoms, whether charged or not.

2. In that when torture occurred, it occurred almost always during the unlimited period between the moment of detention and the detainee's appearance before a judicial authority, Amnesty International recommends the prompt appearance of a detainee, and in any case not later than 24 hours from the time of detention, before a judicial authority, even during periods of emergency.

3. In that provincial civil governors, using a form of administrative detention, committed detainees to prison who never appeared before a judicial authority, Amnesty International recommends the immediate release of any detainee not brought before a judicial officer within 24 hours of detention.

4. In that provincial civil governors committed detainees to prison despite the previous release of these detainees by judicial officers. Amnesty International recommends that detention beyond 24 hours be solely on the order of a judicial officer.

5. In that torture occurred largely in the police stations and Civil Guard barracks during interrogation, Amnesty International recommends the removal of the detainee to custody independent from the investigating police force after he or she is brought before the competent judicial authority.

6. In that torture, threats and coercion were used during interrogation, Amnesty International recommends the inadmissibility in any proceedings of any statement by an arrested or detained person unless it was made voluntarily in the presence of his or her counsel and before a judicial authority.

7. In that prisoners from provinces not under the state of exception were illegally transferred into Vizcaya and Guipúzcoa. Amnesty International recommends that detainees should remain within the jurisdiction of the judiciary in the province where arrested until the competent judicial authority in that province has ordered (and only with good and sufficient cause) the detainee's transfer to custody in another province.

8. In that the agents of torture were members of the three major national police forces, Amnesty International recommends that the senior police officers of these security forces be held accountable for illegal actions committed by their forces during the state of exception.

9. Amnesty International also recommends that henceforth all members of the police and related agencies receive proper education and training in the principles described in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.

10. In that several doctors, or individuals who were referred to as doctors, advised the police on the length of time required for detainees' bruises and scars to disappear, Amnesty International recommends that the appropriate Spanish medical associations investigate the role of doctors in police stations, Civil Guard barracks and prisons, with a view toward disciplining those among their colleagues who participated in torture and with a view toward the enforcement of the concept of medical custody of a detainee or prisoner as long as direct supervision of his or her well-being is required.

11. In that numerous detainees incurred physical injuries during detention, many of them severe injuries, Amnesty International recommends that full medical documentation be kept on all detainees, especially on those captured in civil conflict, and in all cases that these documents be made available to lawyers and doctors of the prisoner's choice.

12. In that torture can have long-term physical and psychological effects on those who suffer it, Amnesty International recommends that the Spanish authorities provide for the financial compensation and medical rehabilitation of all victims of torture in Spain.

13. In that the death penalty is a violation of the right to life and of the right not to be subjected to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment, Amnesty International recommends the immediate abolition of the death penalty in Spain, even when imposed under the conditions stipulated in the decree law of August 1975.

14. Amnesty International further recommends and respectfully urges unwavering adherence to the letter and spirit of the Fuero de los Españoles, which guarantees "respect for the dignity, integrity and freedom of the individual".

## STEPHEN J. WEXLER

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, I join my colleagues on the Labor and Public Welfare Committee and the entire Congress in expressing my sadness over the loss of Stephen Wexler. As counsel to the Education Subcommittee during my 7 years as a member, Steve contributed his valuable insight and expertise on important legislative issues to the subcommittee membership on both sides of the aisle.

Steve was well known and respected throughout the education community. In addition to playing a major role in two comprehensive extensions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Steve was instrumental in the drafting and enactment of the Higher Education Amendments of 1972. College students and their families all over the Nation owe Steve a debt of gratitude for his major contribution in initiating the basic educational opportunity grant program which has opened the doors of post-secondary education to many young people.

I will miss Steve's knowledgeable counsel and warm friendship. On behalf of Claire and myself, as well as my staff, I extend my deepest sympathy to Steve's wife, Elizabeth, and the entire family.

## THE FUTURE OF PRIVATE PENSION PLANS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the annual Institute of Gerontology conference—conducted jointly by the University of Michigan and Wayne State University last month in Ann Arbor—took a futuristic approach in examining "The Economics of Aging: Toward 2001."

But the conferees also focused on the existing condition of our Nation's income maintenance programs.

This year the conference had extra timeliness because 1975 is the 40th anniversary of social security and the 100th anniversary of the first industrial pension plan in the United States.

As chairman of the Senate Committee on Aging, I am vitally concerned that our

public and private retirement programs continue to be built upon sound and equitable principles.

This is a major reason that the committee is now conducting hearings on "Future Directions in Social Security."

The recent gerontological conference contributed to this dialog by bringing together outstanding leaders from business, labor, government, and the academic community.

Many issues were discussed in detail, including the future role of private pensions.

For example, Mr. Bert Seidman, director of the Department of Social Security for the AFL–CIO, and Mr. Robert Paul, chief executive officer of Martin E. Segal, Co., provided excellent assessments of the private pension system.

Mr. President, I commend these statements to Members of the Senate, and ask unanimous consent that their written presentations on "The Future of Private Pension Plans" be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE FUTURE OF PRIVATE PENSION PLANS

(By Robert D. Paul)

One in ten Americans is now at an age commonly considered the time of retirement and should be able to look forward, as did King David in the Old Testament, to a "good old age, full of years, riches and honour." Some of our citizens, however, have found old age not a time of riches and honor but of penury and neglect.

Ours is a society in which work confers status as well as income. And youth—despite a rapidly aging population—is both admired and aped. Grey hairs no longer connote wisdom and experience or automatically command respect.

Nevertheless, despite countervailing forces, there is a trend—relatively recent historically—to guarantee, if not riches, at least a modicum of economic security to men and women who leave the nation's work force at the age of retirement. And, it is to our developing private pension system that I will address my attention here today—leaving the problem of achieving for the aged the honorable estate they deserve to others at this conference.

Security in old age was primarily a family concern prior to the industrial revolution. Farm households could and did support three, and sometimes as many as four, generations under one roof. A rural economy provided a range of productive functions encompassing every family member from the oldest down to the very young child.

With the growth of an industrial, urban society, the family was gradually fragmented. A person's participation in the work force depended on nonfamilial ties and spanned only a segment of his life, especially as life expectancy increased. Security for those who could no longer engage in gainful employment became a matter of profound concern—and increasingly occupied the attention of institutions other than the family. Chief among these are industry and government.

GROWTH OF PRIVATE PENSION SYSTEM

The first industrial pension plan in the United States was established by the American Express Company—later to become the Railway Express Agency—just one hundred years ago in 1875. During the following half century more than 50 railroads established either formal or informal pension plans. The railroad industry was in the forefront of providing pensions for old age and disability until the 1929 depression. Major railroad unions also established pension plans to which members could contribute. By the late 1920's over 80 percent of the railroad industry's work force was covered by private pension plans.

In 1900, there were less than 20 private pension plans in industries other than railroads, but ten years later the total reached nearly 100. This number more than doubled by 1920 with approximately 150 new plans in such industries as public utilities, steel, oil, banking and insurance. Manufacturing companies were generally somewhat slower in establishing such plans. For the most part, they were still relatively new companies without the problems of prospective retirement common to a stable work force.

The enactment, in 1921, of the Revenue Act provided tax exempt status to stock bonus and profit sharing trusts, and this status was extended to pension plans in 1926.

At the onset of the depression in 1929, there were 397 private pension plans in operation. Eighty-seven of the 200 largest companies in the country provided old age and disability benefits. Approximately 3.5 million workers or 10 to 15 percent of the nation's nonagricultural work force were covered by pension plans; this figure grew to almost 4 million by the end of the 1930's.

After 65 years of rather slow development, the pension plan idea finally took hold in the 1940's when a variety of factors combined to foster its rapid growth. Of these, the most dramatic was the imposition of wage controls and excess profits taxes during World War II. These measures provided strong incentives for companies to establish pension plans. Since companies were unable to compete for labor with higher wages, they offered pensions in lieu of pay to attract and keep employees. Profits that would otherwise have been heavily taxed were used to fund pension plans. Contributions to pension funds were already tax deductible, and during this period Congress acted to exempt pension fund earnings from federal taxation as well.

In 1948, the National Labor Relations Board ruled that pensions were eligible for collective bargaining providing still further impetus to the growth of the private pension system. This was reinforced during the Korean War by the reimposition of wage controls and excess profits taxes.

The number of private pension plans grew from 12,925 in 1950 to 313,406 in 1972. Private pension plans cover approximately 30 million workers or almost half the private non-farm work force. Their assets increased from $52 billion in 1960 to an estimated $200 billion in 1975, making pension funds one of the largest sources of capital in the economy.

PENSIONS TODAY—PROBLEMS AND CHALLENGES

Today, the American private pension system has evolved to a point where it includes employees of most large companies. Noteworthy is the fact that the system is for the most part noncontributory for participants. However, it must also be remembered that 30 million non-farm workers—primarily those employed by medium and smaller sized firms—have no pension coverage at all.

The pattern of pension coverage varies both by industry and by occupational group. Among industries, communications and public utilities cover 82 percent of their employees; mining companies, 72 percent; and durable goods manufacturing, 63 percent. In manufacturing as a whole, 50 percent of employees are covered by private pension plans. Among service workers only 24 percent are covered, and a scant 7 percent of the nation's farm workers have any pensions whatsoever.

Also significant are those differences related to employer size. Over 90 percent of the industrial work force in companies with 500 or more employees is covered by pension plans. However, in companies with under 100 employees, less than 30 percent are covered. Nearly half of the industrial labor force, exclusive of farm and domestic workers, is employed by small companies. Interestingly, there is at least a statistical relationship between unionization and pension coverage. Over 80 percent of union workers are covered by pensions, which is almost double the percentage for non-union workers.

It is not surprising, given the number of employees now covered by the private pension system, the increasing amount of pension plan assets and their growing significance in the savings and capital structure of the nation, that the federal government should seek to exercise some control. And, in 1965 a committee appointed by President Johnson recommended that federal standards be imposed on the private pension system.

In the 1960's a flow of complaints from plan participants began to be voiced concerning certain specific private pension plans, a relatively small number in all. Most of these complaints stemmed from the fact that both management and labor generally gave higher priority at the outset of a plan to the interests of older, longer-service workers than to those of younger employees. Thus, more emphasis was placed on creating a capacity to make payments to those relatively near retirement age than to funding service credits for younger workers.

*1. The Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974*

Worker dissatisfaction, perhaps more than any other factor, led to enactment of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA). This legislation involved some of the most complicated technical issues ever to come before Congress. A host of special interest groups were actively concerned in its consideration, as were four major legislative and three nonlegislative congressional committees. The results of their labors is several hundred closely printed pages—a law whose total impact it will take years to assess.

Nevertheless, the effects of the new law, the basic aim of which is to protect the pension rights of employees, are already being hotly debated. This is not surprising. A private pension system with minimal federal intervention has suddenly become one with extensive regulation.

Key features of the law are the vesting standard (the nonforfeitable rights to a pension), the continuation of vested benefits even if the plan should fold, the high standards for fiduciary conduct, the disclosure provisions designed to apprise participants of their status, and the participant's right to bring court action in certain cases. Other features include the new funding standard and the requirement that participants be offered a joint and survivors annuity.

Some critics believe the Act does too little for participants while others believe it does too much and that the regulations imposed will stifle initiative in private pension planning.

That ERISA will involve additional costs to employers is unquestioned. The anticipated magnitude of these costs is already causing some alarm. One regulation in the law stipulates that companies must compensate for poor pension plan investment returns over the past half-dozen years. Market losses they have sustained must be paid back into the fund—out of corporate revenues if the market does not continue to improve.

It is entirely possible, therefore, that faced with burdensome costs, companies and unions will deemphasize pensions, turning instead to alternative forms of compensation or fringe benefits. Such a development and its potential impact on the entire private pension system and on the possibility of extending its benefits to the uncovered half of the nation's work force is uncomfortably

clear. It would indeed be ironic if the new law, conceived to protect Americans in their old age, was instead to stifle the growth of the private pension system both with regard to numerical coverage and liberality of benefits. Too many people are unaware that there is a trade-off involved. The nature and magnitude of this trade-off will become more apparent in the next few years.

*2. Economic instability*

Passage of ERISA last year coincided with both inflation and recession. And the current pressure of pension costs is undoubtedly more directly attributable to this economic instability than to the new law. The value of all private uninsured pension funds dropped by 15 percent in 1974. Morgan Guaranty Trust, one of the largest managers of corporate pension funds, reports a drop in the assets it manages from $23.6 billion to $17.8 billion—or approximately 25 percent. Losses such as this are proving an alarming drain on company profits, and some security analysts are now recommending that the size of a company's pension bill be considered a significant factor in determining its value as an investment.

A continuing high rate of inflation can have an insidious and potentially disastrous effect on the private pension system—especially when the investment returns on pension funds fall so precipitously. Fund managers have traditionally looked to the yield on invested reserves to cover any inflationary rise. To date, this yield has covered such rises as long as they were in the 2 to 2½ percent range.

If in the next decade the rate of inflation is 5 to 10 percent, however, pension plans of the types now generally in effect will need investment returns of 10 to 13 percent a year to maintain a company's cost at a level percent of payroll. It is questionable whether there are enough such investment sources.

A spiraling Consumer Price Index tends to create not only demands for wage and salary increases at least as great as the increases in costs of living but also demands for pension increases high enough to maintain purchasing power after retirement. A fair number of public employee pension systems has already added post-retirement cost-of-living increases to pension, and major private pension plans have also begun to grant such supplements. Thus far, most private-plan cost-of-living additions have been made on an ad hoc basis; they are limited to the life of the collective bargaining contract. Practically, however, it is difficult to envision the elimination of these supplements once they are granted.

If pensions are increased 0.5 or 0.6 percent per unit rise in the CPI—a reasonable expectation—then at present rates of inflation the amount of an average pension will double well before the pensioner reaches the end of normal life expectancy. Thus, inflation presents a problem of great magnitude to both the pension fund manager and the potential pensioner.

A persistent high level of unemployment presents another problem for the private pension system. The largest number of complaints against private pensions prior to the enactment of ERISA came from individuals who, despite years of work, were still not qualified for a pension. In recent years, prior to ERISA, more liberal vesting provisions had been secured in many industries through collective bargaining. And as has been noted the pension reform law has reinforced this trend by setting forth specific standards for vesting.

The protection provided by these standards, however, will be substantially diminished if a sizable segment of the work force is unemployed repeatedly and for long periods of time. Clearly, a healthy private pension system requires sustained high levels of employment in order to function equitably.

*3. Demographic and social patterns*

In addition to the recent spate of economic woes and the exigencies of the new pension law, there are other pressures on the private pension system that will have a profound impact, especially on projected costs. Most far reaching of these pressures are those created by demographic changes in our society.

A little over one hundred years ago in 1870 only 2.9 percent or 1.2 million of the total U.S. population of 40 million were aged 65 or over. According to the 1970 census, there were 20.1 million people in the 65 and over age group out of a total of 200 million or slightly over 10 percent.

One of the primary reasons for the rapid growth in the number of older Americans is increased longevity. Since 1900 the average life expectancy at birth has increased from 47 to 70 years. Current actuarial tables indicate that men who reach the age of 65 may expect to live an additional 15 years, while women will live almost 20 years.

The median age of U.S. citizens peaked somewhere around 1950. And then the first post World War II generation literally swamped the generation born in the prewar period. In 1973, there were 109.5 million U.S. inhabitants under 30 years of age and 69.5 million between the ages of 30 and 59. This enormous postwar generation is now beginning to enter the labor force; and by the year 2020, it wil reach retirement age.

After the postwar baby boom, the birth rate leveled off and today experts foresee a relatively steep decline during the next few years, steeper than had previously been anticipated.

Developments involving the birth rate, longevity, and the size of the aged population, all combine to increase the ratio of retirees to workers. This ratio is expected to climb from 30 for every 100 workers to about 50 for every 100 workers by the year 2030.

Another factor influencing the pattern of our private pension system is the trend toward early retirement. Until relatively recently, most workers continued to work until they were physically unable to continue. The policy of compulsory retirement at age 65 only gained widespread acceptance in the 1950's. And it was only in the late 1960's that the possibility of early retirement—except for reasons of poor health—was even considered. Now, less than a decade later, retirement prior to age 65 is becoming increasingly common.

During the past two decades most pension plans were amended to permit early retirement, but the retirement benefit was severely reduced and not many people could afford to retire before 65 years of age. In the 1960's however, a number of developments took place which made early retirement more attractive to both employees and their employers. These included:

(1) An increase in normal and early retirement benefits;

(2) Amendment in 1961 of the Social Security Act extending to men the right to reduced benefits at age 62 (women acquired this right in 1956);

(3) Negotiation of several important contracts providing supplements to the standard actuarially reduced early retirement benefits, and of other contracts providing full accrued retirement benefits based only on length of service without regard to age; and

(4) Changing attitudes toward work which make the transition from productive employment to retirement more socially acceptable.

In 1972, just over half of all persons receiving Social Security retirement benefits and two-thirds of all new claimants were under 65. And these retirees were not all government employees, utility technicians and executives, but auto, steel and rubber workers as well.

*Challenges confronting private pension system*

It is reasonable to assume, if present demographic and social trends continue, that by the year 2000 nearly 15 percent of the population will be of retirement age and total assets of private pension plans—plus those covering state and local governments—will be about $4 trillion.

The very magnitude of these figures prompts one to question the viability of our present private pension system. Is it economically sound? Does it fulfill desirable social objectives? Is it providing the maximum security for American retirees at a reasonable cost? Does it conflict with or complement the Social Security system? What, if any, changes should be made in the system as presently constituted?

The soundness of the system depends, as does that of other institutions and structures, to a large extent on the economic health of the nation. As has already been indicated, prolonged inflation or recession will sap its strength.

According to a Bureau of Labor Statistics report 144 of the 149 major pension plans that it regularly summarizes showed significant change between 1970 and 1974. Owing to improvements in pension formulas, often spurred by the rising rate of inflation, the "projected normal retirement benefit" provided by these plans increased on the average by 29 percent. However, because consumer prices rose 30.4 percent, the "real" projected monthly benefit declined 1.4 percent.

Lagging benefit levels is a potentially serious problem. It is really not feasible to tie pensions to the cost of living in a period of high inflation unless all other items in the economy are similarly tied. The overall rise in the Consumer Price Index and the decrease in the purchasing power of the dollar are national problems and can only be dealt with effectively on a national level.

An individual company cannot cope with the CPI alone. Indirect compensation and compensation for time not worked—health insurance premiums, pensions, Social Security, unemployment insurance, workmen's compensation, vacations, holidays—already take upwards of 30 percent of the payroll dollar.

Overwhelmingly, Americans consider the provision of adequate income for our retired citizens not only an eminently desirable social objective, but as an essential element of national policy. However, in assessing this social objectives, it must be stated that many Americans question the desirability of early retirement. A second study by Louis Harris conducted for the National Council on Aging shows that more than one-third of the nation's 21 million elderly were forced to retire and would have liked to continue working. Of the people surveyed who do hiring and firing for business, 87 percent admitted that employers discriminate against the aged and 37 percent said they disagree with mandatory retirement because of age.

More than 200 suits have been filed by the Labor Department under the Aged Discrimination and Employment Act since its enactment in 1968, forcing companies to pay for pension and health benefits lost by workers improperly retired. And the Department attributes recent pressure for early retirement to the economic slump. This view is echoed by the National Council on Aging, whose executive director states: "We use our elderly to solve our unemployment problem—a lazy way to deal with the question of full employment."

Widespread agreement exists that private

pension plans will be progressively liberalized in the future, although some people advocate that the system be preempted by the Social Security system.

Our pension system flowed during a period of wartime prosperity, while Social Security was established in response to the depression that preceded it. Both systems are rooted in the desire to provide security for the aged and both have widespread popular support. Both seek to answer a similar need, but in uniquely different ways—and it is my view that they complement each other and that this inherent duality reflects the variety and strength of the American nation.

Social Security has both an insurance and a social function. It is insurance insofar as all covered persons—and all U.S. employees are covered—pay stated premiums for stated benefits, and social insofar as in relation to premiums the benefits are much higher for low-wage than for high-wage earners. Private pension plans are of a totally different order.

There is also a different contribution-benefit relationship under the two systems. Social Security benefits are supported by taxes and by employers and employees. The taxes collected currently are intended to be sufficient to pay the benefits currently falling due and to maintain a reserve of about one year's future payments. Essentially, it is a pay-as-you-go system. In view of the federal government's power to tax, this is entirely satisfactory. However, it does mean that the liability for benefits accruing for present workers is being passed on to future generations. For this reason, predictions of an ever-dwindling work force can be and often are viewed with alarm.

On the other hand, under private pension plans, the employer is now required to accumulate pension reserves sufficient to pay for all future benefits should the plan be terminated. At the very least, the employer is expected to pay each year the full cost of benefits accruing for that year, plus an amount necessary to amortize unfunded liabilities over 30 or 40 years.

Maintenance of a private pension system, in conjunction with Social Security, has the virtue of allowing over 300,000 plans, each tailored to the unique characteristics of the industry, area, employer organization and collective bargaining history of a particular employee group, to fulfill specific needs. This freedom to adjust to the economic priorities of different groups of employees and employers, and this flexibility of choice in levels and kinds of benefits, are elements that only private pensions can provide. They are not present under Social Security, or other government mandated systems.

Another feature that distinguishes the private from the public system of retirement insurance is its growing importance in the capital structure of the country. The private pension system's growing reserves provide a very important source of capital for our economic expansion.

Pension fund reserves were $2.4 billion in 1940. By the end of 1960, they had grown to $52 billion. In 1972, they reached nearly $170 billion, and in 1974, $193 billion. While pension plans may not be all important in our total capital market, they are important in major segments. Pension fund holdings of total corporate bonds exceeded 50 percent from 1966 to the present. Over the same nine year period, pension funds have doubled their relative holding of stocks. Although this holding is still rather small, it does not mean that pension funds have a small influence in stocks, however. As a matter of fact, from a cash flow viewpoint, pension funds are *the* major factor in the stock market.

In addition to supplying an increasing amount of investment funds, the private pension system can act, to some extent, as an economic stabilizer. Unlike Social Security taxes, pension plan contributions generally can be reduced in tight money periods and increased when the employer's cash needs are less pressing.

Rather than let either one of our two major retirement systems replace the other, it seems eminently desirable that they be coordinated in some rational way. This coordination of private plans with Social Security is commonly referred to as "integration." And, today, most employers do design their retirement plans for salaried employees in a way which recognizes that retirement income is being provided to employees under Social Security and that Social Security pension benefits are related to earnings up to a certain level.

Integration usually takes one of two approaches—offset integration or excess integration. Under offset integration, gross plan benefits are reduced by a portion of the employee's Social Security benefits. Under excess integration, a plan provides proportionately greater benefits with respect to earnings which are not covered by Social Security. Both approaches can be designed to provide automatic or nonautomatic integration.

Integration allows for the achievement of a stated income objective in retirement. And a private plan should be permitted to limit benefits, especially as the level of Social Security benefits increases, so that combined income does not exceed disposable pre-retirement income. The special advantages of both Social Security and the private pension system should not be abandoned for some ideological argument for overall uniformity. Social Security can continue to provide basic amounts of pension income on a fairly uniform basis for all retired citizens, while supplementary security income can be provided by the private pension system.

The one flaw in this seemingly serene picture of secure retirement for all Americans is that a sizable number of our citizens—half of the nonagricultural workers of the nation and most of the agricultural workers—do not have access to this supplemental income.

Prior to passage of ERISA, I advocated that any pension legislation be addressed primarily to the 30 million members or more of the private sector work force without pension plan coverage. I envisioned a federal legislative requirement that every private nonagricultural employer provide a basic fully funded, fully vested, fully portable pension. Since the passage of ERISA, this plan has become largely academic.

Now, however, other suggestions are being put forth, proposals to amend the pension reform legislation to encourage the expansion of private pension plans to uncovered employees—or at the very least, not to discourage the seemingly inexorable trend toward growth of the private system. One such suggestion is to give small employers a financial incentive to form pension plans. It envisages tax deductions for contributions to pension plans on the part of those employers in the 22 percent tax bracket. Such employers would also be subject to more liberal eligibility and vesting provisions or would be given direct tax credits for contributions to a plan.

It can be safely said, I think, that proposals along these lines will have to be seriously considered; for unless something is done to bring the so far forgotten half of the working population into the private pension system, that system, despite its many virtues, may be in jeopardy.

---

### Labor's Perspective on the Future of Private Pension Plans

(By Bert Seidman)

I am really not going to react to Robert Paul's excellent paper. I don't find very much to disagree with in what he said. I think that he has given us an excellent outline compressed in very few words—a great deal of information and I am simply going to talk about some of the same subjects from a somewhat different perspective.

I would like to begin by calling to your attention the fact that the nation's basic retirement income system, social security, as well as its supplemental system, private pensions, are both undergoing great stress today. Some of the fundamental principles and traditional practices of these systems are being questioned.

It is a great temptation for me to give you my analysis of where we stand in the social security system, and what I think ought to be done, both for making sure there is adequate financing and that we have benefits at a proper level for all the people who are covered by the system. I say this because I am at least as much interested in the social security system as I am in our supplemental retirement income system, that is, private pensions. But my assignment today is not social security, it is private pensions, and so I will refer in only a fleeting way to social security.

Some of the problems which have been recognized and emphasized, to my mind unduly emphasized, in social security involve the same forces which are buffeting the private pension system. We hear a great deal about how social security is foundering and about the lack of proper financing for social security, both in the short term and the long term, about the impact of demographic changes on social security, about the impact of the current combination of inflation and depression on social security. These same forces are greatly affecting the characteristics and the future prospects of our private pension system and yet you see no headlines about the problems of private pension plans. Nobody is talking about this. You only see rare references to it. But those who are directly concerned with the private pensions system, particularly those who are concerned with the administration and the financing of the system, are well aware of this.

There is all this talk about how in the year 2025, or whenever it is going to be, we will have a much smaller proportion of people in the active labor force to people who are retired, and the impact that this is going to have on the social security system.

I think that when the year 2025 comes we will find that this proportion is not what some people are forecasting, but whatever it is, it will have the same impact on the private pension system as it does on social security.

We have heard about the impact of the recession and inflation on social security, but this has had a much greater effect in the short term on the private pension system.

There are people who criticize the social security system because of its investments in government bonds. Some say we could get much higher benefits if we were to invest social security funds in less conservative directions. Well, the private pension system does not involve this conservative financing. All too many of the private pension funds have been invested in mutual trusts and you know what has been happening to them recently.

We have also heard from some of the participants in this conference some very provocative papers with respect to some of the fundamental principles of the social security system. Well, I think probably to an even greater degree people have been questioning not so much the fundamental principles, but some of the practices which we have had in the private pension system. This questioning has culminated, at least for the time being, in the law that Bob Paul referred to and which was signed by the President on Labor Day last year.

The private pension plans in this country are now affected to varying degrees by the new pension reform law. Though I will be talking about some of the serious problems involved in the new pension reform law, I want to stress that we in the AFL–CIO consider this a very beneficial law for protecting

the rights of workers in the pension and the health and welfare systems. That is why the AFL–CIO vigorously and enthusiastically supported the enactment of the law and that is why we are anxious to see that it is administered as effectively as possible.

But I can't refrain from also saying that it is an extremely complex law. In part I think it is unduly complex because of a very worthy effort by those concerned with the lack of protections for workers, to try to dot every "i" and cross every "t." Their desire to make sure that the protections were in the law itself and not just in the way in which it was administered are certainly to be praised. So you have a law of some hundreds of pages which I for one find extremely difficult to read, much less to understand, and I have tried to do both.

You have a law which is extremely complex, extremely difficult to understand, which now governs the private pensions systems and in some respects the health and welfare plans, which are covering thousands of firms and millions of workers in this country and which will require substantial changes in many of these plans. All this clearly will have a very considerable impact on the future of private pension plans in the United States.

Now I want to return for a moment to the respective roles of social security and private pensions in this country. To my mind, and this is certainly the view of the AFL–CIO, social security is and should remain our basic retirement income system. It should continue to be universal and it should provide a decent retirement income, based on the previous income of the worker, to all who depend on it. I think we should remember that the private pension system developed essentially because of the inadequacy of social security. Workers, seeing that despite the best efforts of organized labor and others to obtain improvements in the legislation, they were unable to achieve adequate retirement income under the social security system, turned to collective bargaining as a pragmatic way of filling in the chinks and achieving a higher level of income.

But private pensions can only supplement social security and they do not do so for large numbers of workers. The most that they can do in the future, as they do now, is to supplement social security. Therefore, it seems most important that whatever improvements we can make in the private pension system should not detract in any way whatsoever from the need to have a basic, universal, social security system, which will provide a decent level of living for all workers covered by it, whether or not they are covered and to whatever degree they are covered by private pension plans.

Today the private pension plans cover very few of those who are already retired. In fact, only about one-third of those retiring now are covered and the private pension system is not likely to cover even half the retirees for some years to come. Indeed, today only one out of every two workers is covered by a private pension plan.

We have heard a lot of discussion in this conference and elsewhere about the so-called regressivity of the financing of social security. The private pension system is financed on a much more regressive system. It does not have the inherent strength of spreading the risk of a social insurance system. Instead the resources for financing private pensions must come out of each company, each corporation, each firm, whether it is strong or weak financially. What this tends to mean is that in private pensions, unlike social security where at least the benefit structure is progressive, you have just the opposite system. Private pensions have to be financed by the individual enterprise. The weaker individual enterprises, which pay the lowest wages, can finance, if they can finance anything at all, only the lowest level of pensions. So the workers who have the lowest wages have lower pensions; not just actual lower pensions in dollar amounts, but also relatively lower pensions—relative to their previous income—than the workers who have the good fortune to be covered by financially stronger companies.

Another important difference between social security and private pensions is that while we can inject some elements of integration and uniformity into our social security system, the benefit levels and all other aspects of private pension plans vary tremendously. There are probably no two private pension plans that are alike in their financing, in their benefit structure, in who is entitled to benefits and when, etc. So, I repeat, while we should do everything possible to improve the private pension system, it is never going to be anything more than a supplement to our basic retirement income system in this country, social security.

If we look, then, at the private pension system as a supplementary system to social security, what is its future?

In large part the future of the private pension system will be determined by the new legislation and the modifications that I am sure we will be making in that legislation over the years. It will also be determined by our ability to manage our economy well enough in the future so that we will be able to finance a decent level of private pensions.

When we look at the new law, the Employment Retirement Income Security Act—usually called ERISA or just the pension reform law—it is important to recognize what the law does *not* do as well as what it does. There are two things that it does not do that are very important. One, it does not require that plans be set up. It regulates plans that exist or that may be set up in the future, but it does not require that every employer have a private pension plan. Secondly, it does not set benefit levels. It doesn't say that benefits have to be at a certain level or at a certain percentage of previous income.

It does deal with safeguarding the money in the plans. It does this by the fiduciary requirements that Bob Paul talked about. While they are extremely complicated, what they essentially boil down to is first, that the funds should be managed the way a prudent man would manage the investment of his own funds—the so-called "prudent man principle." I guess that is sexist, but we haven't talked about the prudent person in this particular regard. Secondly, it essentially says in great detail that there is to be no hanky-panky. I won't go into all the details of this, I couldn't begin to.

The law deals with how the money is to be accumulated, the so-called funding standards. It also regulates how the money is to be paid out, that is, the vesting standards.

What information must be given to participants, beneficiaries, and the government are detailed. And, finally, what happens if there isn't enough money to make the payments or if a firm goes bankrupt or out of business (what used to be called "reinsurance"), now comes under the Pension Benefit Guarantee Corporation.

The pension reform law preempts all state laws in this field so that we have a national, rather than a state-by-state, system of regulation. In this respect the pension reform law is more like social security than like unemployment insurance or workers' compensation, which, as you know, are administered on a state-by-state basis.

As a result of this law virtually every plan in the country will have to be revised in one way or another. I just happened to be looking at the July 21st edition of a trade publication called *Pensions and Investments*. Their editorial was titled "Documentation Demanded in ERISA." This editorial said every decision, every discussion, every action, (by administrators or by trustees of plans) should be thoroughly documented by every fiduciary to protect against suits charging breach of fiduciary duty. Now this is something that every fiduciary of these thousands of plans is going to have to keep in mind.

From the same issue an article about a survey of 300 lawyers begins, "rewriting legal documents for defined benefit pension plans under ERISA creates a document that is about fifty percent new," and these are, of course, very detailed documents. Then there are a couple of articles that deal with investment and it says "the nation's pension fund managers have avoided investing in the residential mortgage market more out of habit than for economic reasons" and of course, while the mortgage market has been affected, particularly new mortgages, during the period that the stock market has gone down, it is a more conservative type of investment than the stock market. Another article says "this pension fund investment manager who stayed fully invested in stocks during the 1973–74 bear market was not doing his job as he should have."

Well, the point of all this is that, while this was the business of the fiduciary, the administrator or the trustee of the fund before, now all of this has to be dovetailed into the requirements of the law and if the wrong kind of investment is going on for the plan and it is not developing sufficient funds, it is not going to be able to meet the funding requirements of the law. So the plans are going to have to be revised in many different ways and they are already undertaking these revisions.

I don't have any crystal ball with respect to the future of private pension plans in this country, but I would just like to throw out a number of possible changes that are ahead, particularly as a result of the impact of this legislation.

In the first place there is, and I think this will increase and then die down, a period of a great uncertainty, perhaps bordering almost on chaos, as the trustees and administrators of these pension plans try to understand and adjust to an extremely complex and detailed law. This insecurity will be heightened by the inevitable slowness of the administrative process made worse by one feature of this law that I didn't mention—that is, it has a hydra-headed administration.

Primarily because the law was being considered in two different committees in the Senate and two different committees in the House, there was a great deal of controversy over where the law should be administered. The Ways and Means Committee in the House and the Senate Finance Committee are kind of the patrons of the Treasury and the two labor committees are patrons of the Labor Department. The AFL–CIO thought that since the law was to protect workers, its administration should be "housed" in the Labor Department. But the only way this jurisdictional dispute could be resolved was to give the administration of the law to both the Internal Revenue Service and the Labor Department. The people in these two departments are just getting to know each other. They had had very little contact with each other until now, and they are approaching the legislation from very different vantage points as you might expect; they are not finding it very easy to come to agreements. And when you add having to build up staffs practically from scratch, especially in the Labor Department, you can imagine the problems. The government would be moving slowly even if it were administered by a single department but you can see why guidelines and directions are coming out with glacial speed rather than whatever the opposite of glacial speed is.

This creates a great sense of insecurity because there are items in the legislation which people don't understand on which they need clarification and assistance. You have to bear in mind that while there are some huge corporations with all kinds of resources that are administering these plans, there are also some union trustees of plans, small plans, who are doing the job on a volunteer basis. They now suddenly realized that they're liable in various ways and they are naturally uneasy.

Another way in which the law has an impact is that although most plans now have some vesting provisions, most do not conform to the law's ten or fifteen years as the maximum period of employment for vesting. There are variant alternatives that can be chosen. In any case the result of these new vesting standards is clearly that more workers will get pensions when they retire. More workers will be getting pensions also because there will be more plans, continuing a long term trend toward the setting up of more plans, and because more workers will be assured of pensions under their provisions and also because we now have the Pension Benefit Guarantee Corporation. So the law's vesting and funding requirements will mean that more workers will get pensions, but because more workers will get pensions, in some cases those who get pensions may be getting smaller pensions than they would have gotten if fewer workers had received pensions. In other words, there are trade-offs involved in this. A third change that we can expect is a more general effort to adjust the pension payments to the increase in living costs. We now have indexing in social security, in supplemental security income and in other types of programs. Most pension benefits, however, are not indexed to living costs. But, as I said, I think we'll see the trend toward such cost-of-living clauses expand.

I also think that pensions of more workers will be geared to their earnings immediately before retirement rather than career earnings. At the present time both in our social security system and in our private pension systems the benefits are geared to the average earnings over the working life of the individual rather than those just prior to retirement. There is no question about the fact that workers would have much greater security if they knew that their pension benefits would be geared to their earnings just prior to retirement rather than career earnings. I think we can expect to see and we certainly will push for such changes both in social security and in the private pension plans.

In addition, I think that pension plans will, as they are already doing to some extent or some of them are doing, try to meet the gaps in social security for early retirees. There is a trend toward having higher pension benefits for early retirees during the years they are receiving no payments or reduced payments from social security. I think that effort will continue. I believe that unions will press for investment of at least a proportion of pension funds in social projects, especially in housing. Here I think we will have to remember that questions will be raised as to whether this meets the fiduciary requirements. In other words, if a union can invest in moderate or low rent housing at low interest rates or in luxury housing at high interest rates, which meets the fiduciary obligations of the pension reform law? We would like to think that there is enough flexibility in the pension reform law so that the union can do what's best for its members, taking into account the *whole* picture. But I am sure that questions will be raised.

We have to face up to the possibility that unless there is a sympathetic realistic and flexible administration of the law fewer trade union leaders will be willing to serve as trustees, particularly at the local level. We certainly hope this will not happen, but it is a possibility.

There is no question about the fact that the new law will affect collective bargaining. It will affect it directly by establishing certain minimum standards which will no longer be subject to collective bargaining. The union doesn't have to fight for these standards because they are in the law. It will affect, of course, the whole bargaining package because the employer will claim that if I have to put this money into pensions I can't put it into something else. While this may not be a serious problem in some industries, in low wage industries, such as the service industries, the garment industries, the textile industry, etc. it could create some very serious problems in terms of other gains not in the pension field that unions seek to make through collective bargaining.

The law has established some broad principles and I think this is extremely important. The mere fact that this law has been enacted establishes the principle that pensions are not a gratuity to be given by the employer at a whim, that they are subject to regulation and that they are part of the compensation that the worker receives and is entitled to. The pension plans, as both Bob Paul and I stressed, must now meet certain minimum standards and I think that there is no question that pensions are here to stay as a supplement to social security.

---

## RABBI JACOB B. AGUS

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, this past weekend, October 3–5, the Baltimore community honored a very special man—Rabbi Jacob B. Agus. For the last quarter century, Rabbi Agus has served as spiritual leader of Beth El Congregation in Baltimore. But the contributions of this extraordinary person extend beyond his official duties at Beth El, for over the years Dr. Agus has been recognized as one of the world's great scholars and interpreters of Judaism.

As teacher, author, and speaker, Dr. Agus has led all of us to a greater knowledge of the role of Judaism and all religion in today's world. He has, through his entire life, encouraged the development of an open mind, with the ability to look beyond the moment. Further, he has applied the timeless wisdom and traditions of the past to the problems of the present, and helped Jews and non-Jews alike better understand the future.

In his distinguished career, Rabbi Agus has written seven books and innumerable magazine and journal articles. Additionally, for 12 years, he served as consulting editor for articles on Judaism and Jewish history for the Encyclopedia Britannica. Dr. Agus also collaborated with Arnold J. Toynbee in that author's work, "Study of History."

I join with his many friends and admirers in saluting Dr. Agus for his many contributions to mankind. Baltimore and Maryland are indeed fortunate to have such a man in our midst.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an article which appeared in the Baltimore Jewish Times of October 3, 1975, be printed in the RECORD.

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

### A MAVERICK RABBI

(By Gary Rosenblatt)

Beth El's Rabbi Jacob Agus has never been afraid to speak his mind on controversial issues, from Zionism to Soviet Jewry.

Dialogue is a key concept to Rabbi Jacob Agus—whether it be the type of interfaith dialogue through which he has developed an international reputation as a scholar or the informal breakfast dialogues he has with the regular members of Congregation Beth El's minyan each weekday morning.

The proper, neatly dressed 64-year-old rabbi at first seems a bit out of place seated at the long table in Beth El's large kitchen. But when his 15 or 20 congregants begin asking him questions over coffee, eggs and bagels, he eases into the role he is obviously most comfortable with—teacher and educator.

The questions on a recent Thursday morning ranged from the intricacies of keeping kosher, to the shaking of the lulav to the differences in theologies between Orthodox, Conservative and Reform Judaism.

In his slow, soft-spoken style, the rabbi answered each question in kind—the serious ones with a source reference, usually the Bible, and the less serious ones with a touch of dry humor.

Later, as he sat behind his desk in his large, booklined study, he noted the importance of the informal breakfast sessions. "People are more open to learning when you have developed a personal relationship with them," he said.

It is clear that Rabbi Agus has developed such a relationship with his congregants who are honoring him this weekend for his 25 years of service as spiritual leader of Beth El.

But one cannot help notice how much more relaxed he is among his books—they seem almost an extension of him as, often in our conversation, he turns in his swivel chair to pick out a book devoted to a question we have touched on.

The inherent irony is that this man, who has served in the rabbinate for more than 40 years, was urged almost at the outset of his career to give up the profession by a well-meaning rabbinical leader.

"It was the Spring of 1935," Rabbi Agus recalled, "and I had been at my first pulpit, in Norfolk, Virginia, for a year. I was in Philadelphia for a convention and I met with this man, who was a great Jewish leader, and he told me that the rabbinate was not a profession for a talented scholar because, he said, in 25 years the synagogue would be an extinct institution.

"He felt that the combination of Jewish self-hatred and the flight of the young would spell the end of synagogue life. But I had the opposite feeling," says Rabbi Agus, "and I decided to continue."

He went on to Harvard (while serving a small congregation in Cambridge) where he received his masters and doctoral degrees in the history and philosophy of religion. He also received a first-hand lesson in anti-Semitism there and it came as a shock to him.

"At that time, in the late 1930s, German literature was of great importance at Harvard, and German literature was poisoned with anti-Semitism. Even the progressive, intellectual community was infested with anti-Semitism—these professors were wonderful saints personally but they espoused the rhetoric without really thinking about it."

It was in this situation, as a graduate student, that Agus put into effect what was to be his dialogue philosophy: to combat ignorance through scholarship, to point out the textual errors and misconceptions which often led to anti-Jewish distortions.

"I often played the role of mediator between the professors and the students," he says.

After completing his work at Harvard, Agus spent a year expanding his dissertation into a book, *Modern Philosophies of Judaism*, the first of many he was to write. He then took a pulpit in Chicago for two years and went on to Dayton, Ohio from 1942 to 1950 before coming to Beth El as its first spiritual leader.

It was only natural that Rabbi Agus be chosen to head the newly formed Conservative congregation since he was a leader of the liberal wing within the Conservative movement. Although ordained at an Orthodox institution, Yeshiva University in New York, Agus was even at that time "committed to a nonliteral interpretation of Revelation," as he puts it. "I found Conservative Judaism to be the stage of synthesis between the Orthodox thesis and the Reform antithesis."

By 1942, he says, there was "a definite rift" between his and the Orthodox position. "I saw it coming," Rabbi Agus notes. "The Rabbinical Council of America (an Orthodox group) had an official inquest after my first book was published."

Agus joined the Rabbinical Assembly (a Conservative group) in 1944 and chaired its Ideology Commission for many years. "The official break, though, came in 1950 when a Responsum on the Sabbath that I wrote for the Conservative movement concluded that it is a mitzva to come to shul on Shabos even if you have to ride."

Throughout his career, Rabbi Agus has led the movement for scholarly interfaith dialogue between Christians and Jews and it was he who was chosen to rewrite and edit more than 1,000 articles dealing with Judaism and Jewish history for the *Encyclopedia Britannica*. The project took 12 years.

In light of the various criticisms of interfaith discussions, Rabbi Agus is eager to defend its merits and quick to charge that "it is stupid of those who criticize" ecumenism as being non-productive.

"When I was a rabbi in Dayton, Ohio in the 1940s there was a Ku Klux Klan center in Troy, a nearby town, and the KKK was headed by a minister. I went to talk to him and we met a number of times and I ended up teaching him a lot of Jewish history. As a result, he became a local authority on Jews, became a friend of the Jews, and went around lecturing on the Jewish dialogue."

The rabbi cited several others—including productive personal conversations with Cardinals of the Catholic Church and instigating changes in key Latin prayers—as proof that progress can be made. He believes that Christianity is still quite ignorant of Judaism and its beliefs.

Picking up on his reference to the fact that, within Judaism, the labels Orthodox, Conservative and Reform are "more valid now than ever before," I asked if there was a similar need for dialogue among Jewish leaders.

"A requirement for successful dialogue is that there be a degree of civility," was the immediate reply. "In my experiences of dialogue between Jews there has been a total lack of civility."

So Rabbi Agus has devoted his energies to explaining Judaism to the Christian world, including historian Arnold Toynbee, whom many Jews consider to be an anti-Semite. Those charges stem from Toynbee's reference to Jews and their culture as a "fossil of the Syriac civilization" and designation of the Arab refugees as "the new Jews."

"I consider Toynbee one of the greatest saintly persons," says Rabbi Agus, who has served as a consultant to Toynbee on Jewish matters. (Some of his letters to Toynbee are printed in the 12th volume of the historian's *Study Of History*.)

The rabbi once invited Toynbee to lecture at Beth El but the officers of the congregation vetoed the invitation.

But then Rabbi Agus has never been afraid to take unpopular positions. He became disenchanted with leaders of the Zionist movement during the years just prior to statehood because he felt they were promoting terrorism.

Even today he feels that Israel occupies too great a role among world Jewry. "The role of Israel in the course of time will sink into its proper place," he says, noting that "the influence between Israel and the Diaspora should flow more evenly in both directions."

He also feels that, rather than being responsible for the new Jewish awareness, Israel has detracted from it. He argues that many people have devoted their energy towards Israel at the expense of exploring their Jewish identity.

On the subject of Soviet Jewry, Rabbi Agus has criticized the leaders of the Soviet Jewry movement in America for concentrating their attention on the small percentage of Jewish activists rather than on efforts to re-kindle the practice of Judaism in the Soviet Union.

"We have been acting as if the activists in the Soviet Union are the only Jews there worth caring about," the rabbi says. "We must recognize the fact that 90 per cent of the Jews in Russia will remain, and instead of making a case against the Soviets as being anti-Jewish, we should try to work with the Catholics and the Greek Orthodox in making the Kremlin adopt a more liberal attitude toward religion so that religious life—including Jewish life—could continue."

The rabbi says that leaders in the Soviet Jewry movement are re-thinking the entire issue and are now beginning to look at this approach more seriously than they did when he and others first suggested it.

"It is within the spirit of detente," says Rabbi Agus, who was opposed to the "Jewish tie-in" with Sen. Henry Jackson because "his political interests run counter to the best interest of the Jews of Russia."

It seems apparent that Rabbi Agus can reach these controversial opinions because he seems to bring very little emotion to bear on extremely emotional issues. Perhaps because of this trait some have called him cold, but he is above all a pragmatist, a freethinker and a scholar who views things from the larger perspective. His comments on the *Encyclopedia Judaica* might very well apply to his outlook in general: "We must avoid like a plague the temptation to narrow our field of vision. An extremely wide lens is needed if the fullness of Jewish life is to be viewed in focus."

## RATIFICATION OF GENOCIDE TREATY IS FIRST STEP TOWARD WORLDWIDE HUMAN RIGHTS

Mr. PROXMIRE. Mr. President, Franklin Roosevelt, in an address to Congress in 1943, said:

There have always been those who did not believe in the people, who attempted to block their forward movement across history, to force them back to servility and suffering and silence.

Let it not be said of the Senate that we have tried to block the fundamental human rights of people worldwide. It is now 27 years since the text of the Genocide Convention was adopted by the United Nations. The Senate has shamefully ignored this treaty by refusing to vote for its ratification.

Genocide, the immoral and brutal killing of millions of Jews, Poles, Czechs, and many others, was carried out by the Nazis throughout World War II in an effort to exterminate men, women, and children who did nothing wrong except belong to ethnic and religious groups which were not sanctioned by the ruling government.

Well over 70 countries have ratified this important human rights treaty opposing genocide. The United States is not among these nations.

We must ask ourselves if we, as a nation regarded as a world leader and dominant inspiration of all free world countries, are not blocking the formation of basic human rights for citizens in other countries.

We can hesitate no longer. If the United States is to stand up to challenges from friend and foe and maintain its role as a world leader, the Senate should ratify the Genocide Convention.

## AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION PRESIDENT ON ENERGY

Mr. BEALL. Mr. President, over the past several months, Congress has wrestled with our Nation's energy crisis, but has regrettably failed to develop a comprehensive plan to deal with this problem. I strongly believe that the accomplishment of such a plan is one of the most pressing requirements in this Congress, and I hope that the Congress and the administration will be able to agree on an overall battle plan to meet our Nation's energy problems in the very near future.

In spite of the inaction by Congress, however, many private citizens are shedding light into the darkness in which we grope. One of these concerned citizens is Mr. Charles Bulotti, president of the American Automobile Association. At that organization's recent 73d annual meeting, he made a particularly thoughtful speech on our Nation's energy policy—or lack of it—which I believe deserves careful attention and analysis by Congress.

Mr. Bulotti clearly points out in his speech that—

We still have a great genius in America. Let us insist that it be unfeathered and let us have confidence in it.

He proposed comprehensive solutions to our present difficulties, and I ask unanimous consent that his remarks be printed in the RECORD for the benefit of my Senate colleagues.

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

USING COMMON SENSE TO SOLVE UNCOMMON PROBLEMS

(By Charles F. Bulotti)

I take special pride, as I am sure many of you do, in being in this historical city today. That we are within the Bicentennial year, within reach of this great nation's 200th anniversary, and that simple acts of birth have given the present generations of Americans the honor of being alive on this occasion are thoughts to conjure with.

I think of the genius of those who founded this nation—I guess we all go back to that.

But I also wonder how people like Washington, Jefferson, Madison and Franklin would react if they came back today and saw how we use the system they helped to establish. I wonder if we would be proud of the grades that they might give us for the way we utilize the heritage they passed down.

Let me give you some examples. American genius created the automobile industry, and American business acumen made it a vast and profitable enterprise. Now, there

are people who will tell you that the automobile is a symbol of all the things that are wrong with America—that it reflects our crassness, our materialism, and our shallow values. They tell you that we love our cars more than our fellow man.

And if we reply that the automobile is basic to the freedom we cherish as Americans, all the intellectuals giggle and chuckle at our ignorance and forgive us for being a bunch of antiquated old fools who do not have the good fortune to be blessed with that marvelously modern, multi-patented device called "social consciousness," which comes as standard equipment on every liberal intellectual.

Here we are saying that the freedom to buy the automobile you want, and drive it when you like is akin to other freedoms since freedom is indivisible. I admit that freedom of travel doesn't have the same noble ring as some others. On the other hand, it wasn't a question in 1776, or in 1789 when the Constitution was written.

I think if the Constitution were being written today, freedom of movement would be in it. Does that sound trite? It shouldn't. It wouldn't sound trite to a Soviet citizen. It would sound impossible. A Russian citizen can't travel without permission from the state. There is a reason why Communist governments control the movement of their citizens as severely as they control speech, press, assembly and religion. Because that is a valuable and necessary human right. To take it away is to control a person's behavior.

Look at it another way. If the American Constitution had been written before Gutenberg invented movable type for the printing press, with all the consequences which flowed from that, then freedom of the press wouldn't have been in our Constitution either. So perhaps it is only a slight technology lag that prevents us from according to the automobile the same respectable place in the list of human freedoms that we accorded the press, or speech, or assembly.

Today, freedom of movement in America is in serious jeopardy.

It is in jeopardy not because a dictatorial government has suddenly decided the automobile is a threat. It is in jeopardy because a faction-ridden government cannot unite on a non-political solution to the energy problem.

Since no single group can come up with a good solution for which it gets full credit, every group is intent to take the fall back position which is to make hay out of blaming everybody else for not solving the problem. The interest of the motorist falls between the cracks.

I could go through a long laundry list of a thousand pieces of energy legislation, but I won't. The immediate problem, for car owners, after all the analyses are done, and all the computer runs computed, and all the blue-ribbon studies, and the hearings and the investigations, comes down to a very simple fact. We don't have enough gasoline.

Oh sure, at the moment you can pull into most any filling station in the country and fill the tank. But we're still running short on gas.

Never mind why. We know we're being priced to death by the oil exporting nations because we can't supply enough of our own short-term petroleum needs. But I don't want to get into the basic problem. You're now well familiar with it. I am concerned about how we cope with the problem.

So far we aren't coping at all. We have taken a bad situation and made it worse. It always embarrasses me to simplify these weighty matters that Washington wrestles with so valiantly and renders so complex. I always wonder if I'm not missing the point. But I don't think I am.

Simplified, it comes down to this. In 1950, we were pretty much sufficient in energy. In 1960 we were importing 16% of our oil. In 1974, we imported 37%. If we keep consuming at the present rate, and if we don't come up with new domestic energy sources, we will be importing 50% of our oil by 1985. That kind of dependency is very dangerous. That kind of dependency is the sort of thing that leads to wars.

Since we have not decided on war, the next best step seems to be to reduce our dependency. That can only be done by increasing domestic resources. Since this cannot be done overnight, the more immediate solution to decreasing dependency is to decrease consumption. Now we get to the nub of the problem, and if I may say so, we get to one of those violations of the essential American system which is at the least a denial of faith in our own system ,and at worst a dangerous departure from common sense.

The real argument within the government is not the need for energy conservation. We are all agreed on that. The argument is over how to bring it about. The argument is not whether the government should insert itself between the problem and the free enterprise market mechanisms which are important to its solutions, but rather how to insert itself.

And so the President wants to put a tariff on oil, and has already put a two dollar tariff on it, which raises the cost of energy across the board and particularly the cost of all petroleum derivatives. The Congress, which boasts a very considerable number of "social consciousnesses," wanted to tax gasoline specifically to get back at those who have the temerity to want to use an automobile.

This, in turn, begs fuel efficiency goals for the automobile manufacturers, who have the bad grace to try to make a profit on their automobiles. Congress also wants to tax anyone who wants to drive anything larger than a motorized roller-skate. I can see a day when we'll have to pay a surcharge if we want a back seat in the car. Catalytic converters and air bags will be mandatory. The gas tank will be optional.

When there is a shortage of a commodity such as energy, the price goes up. When the price reaches the market clearing point, it stops. At that point, people use what they can afford. If they can't afford to use as much, you have a conservation program. It ought to be that simple.

There is a rumor, which may be untrue, that Washington has a hoary old moss-backed economist left over from the pre-Keynesian days of the Eisenhower administration, whom they keep folded up in a footlocker somewhere in the basement of the Commerce Department. They bring him out for a little sun every fourth of July, because Congress isn't in session then and the bureaucracy is on vacation, so he can't hurt anything. They let him out a couple of months ago and asked him his views on energy and the economy, and he described approximately the process I just described to you, whereupon it was decided that he was incoherent by virtue of senility and could safely be released without doing himself or anyone else any harm. His release has been set pending a Congressional hearing on the matter.

We might remember an event that occurred in Vietnam back in 1965 in a city called Ben Tre. There was a terrible battle there between Communist forces and the government forces, and when it was over, the place had been virtually leveled. When the press flocked in to get some misinformation for a good sensational story, they cornered some tired American Army Captain and questioned him about the battle. In the most poorly chosen words since Marie Antoinette suggested a change in diet for the starving French, the Captain said, "We had to destroy the city to save it."

Well, that didn't make any sense to anybody and the liberal intellectuals, the doves, the anti-war activists and their friends set up a terrible howl about it. But today, ironically, their spiritual heirs are among the same group which has adopted a strategy of destroying our economy, ostensibly to save it.

The policy of piling inflationary prices onto exorbitant prices for gasoline while foot-dragging on such matters as deregulating the costs of natural gas, bringing in the Naval Petroleum Reserves, opening up the outer continental shelf of drilling, and producing a sensible strip-mining policy has managed to throw Detroit into a tailspin and to increase unemployment and other ancillary benefits which further cripple an already damaged economy.

You know what is the only conservation program that has worked, in spite of all the Federal foolishness? Voluntary conservation. Heaven forbid that anyone should credit the American motorist with having any sense. And Heaven forbid that the Federal government should take that good sense into account when it is developing its policies.

And so I only cite to you the fact, for your own amusement and with no thought that it will matter much to anybody in Washington, that gasoline consumption is down by millions of barrels this year compared with the same period of 1973, before the energy crisis broke. I think the American motorist deserves some credit for that.

I also think that we deserve some credit for it. There is no question whatever in my mind that the American Automobile Association with its GAS WATCHERS program has contributed more to energy conservation than all the taxes and tariffs and rationing schemes put together.

If I were a jaundiced observer, I might say that the government, as usual, is asking more of the American people—and has gotten better from the American people—than it is willing to give.

Here again is another breach of faith with the American spirit so soundly confirmed 199 years ago. It says we no longer believe in the capacities of American genius. Can anyone really believe that it has to take ten years to increase our domestic energy output by a petty one million barrels a day?

In World War II, Japan cut off the world's chief supply of raw rubber in Southeast Asia. We didn't have the time to discuss the problem and debate and complain. We didn't even have much time for politics. We needed rubber, and our chemists, our technicians, and our engineers went to work and produced artificial rubber from hydrocarbons. And it didn't take ten years to do it.

In 1940, we knew that the Germans were working on atomic energy, we knew what would be the result if they successfully developed an atomic bomb and we didn't have one. So we went to work and we built the atomic bomb. We put together the plants to produce the bomb even before all the technical work was completed. It was one of the greatest scientific efforts, and one of the most remarkable technological feats of this century.

In 1961, President Kennedy committed the nation to put a man on the moon by the end of the decade. In 1969, Neil Armstrong and Buzz Aldrin stood on the surface of the moon.

Now, it seems to me that if we can accomplish the impossible in space in less than ten years, we can certainly achieve the possible—energy self-sufficiency—in less than ten years in a nation as rich in resources and technology as our own. We can certainly do better than a million barrels a day by 1985.

Consider the question of the Naval Petro-

leum Reserves. The Nixon Administration tried, unsuccesfully, and the Ford Administration is still trying, to have those reserves opened up. For many years we have had one or two small committees in the House of Representatives sitting on millions and millions of barrels of oil for no other reason than the fact that they have the authority to do it.

Those reserves were established for use in our naval vessels in the event that other sources were insufficient or unavailable. In the broader sense, they were established for use in a national emergency. Since they were set up, we have fought one world war, a war in Korea, and a war in Vietnam, and we have never touched them.

Moreover, in most cases, with the exception of the Elk Hills Reserve, it would take longer to make those fields productive than any war in which they might be needed could be expected to last.

If the Petroleum Reserves had been available during the '73–'74 embargo, there probably would not have been an embargo—and if there had, we would have weathered it with no hardship at all. If the reserves were available for consumption right now, they would provide a countervailing force against the world price of oil. But, as usual, "if" is a very big word. The reserves are not yet available.

There are enormous resources on our outer continental shelf, but most coastal states don't want any drilling off their shores, so there is another resource tied up in many areas because of a lack of national unity and common commitment to the national good. Then, of course, there is the Environmental Protection Agency, and that is a major impediment. If Moses had had to file an environmental impact statement before he parted the Red Sea, you can guess what might have happened to the Israelites.

Certainly we need to protect our environment but the time to restrict energy resource development for environment purposes is not when we are going through a severe energy shortage.

Coal is our most abundant resource, but there again we have neglected this resource in a short-sighted fashion, in favor of once-cheap oil from abroad, with no thought to the fact that even aside from possible political differences and changes in the international climate, foreign oil reserves, too, must someday run out.

Now that we want to use coal, we find environmental restrictions making it costly when it should be very cheap. But this is only the most immediate and obvious lapse. The real question is why we are so far behind in developing coal as the kind of energy feedstock it should be.

We act as though coal gasification and liquefaction are new and exotic possibilities. In fact, the Germans supplied a very substantial part of their energy requirements during the war from coal gasification and liquefaction. If they could do it thirty-five years ago, why can't we do it today?

At a time when we have a natural gas shortage, the price of natural gas remains regulated. If it were permitted to seek its market-clearing level, the operators would bring in new natural gas or the utilities would be forced to find other fuels, and we wouldn't have an artificially created shortage.

The point is that we really don't have a shortage of energy, per se, in America. We have a shortage of traditionally used fossil fuels. But most of all, we have a shortage of initiative, self-confidence and commitment.

The solution, I suggest to you, is to open the problem up to the full range of American ingenuity, of scientific skill and engineering know-how and not limit incentives to the present energy industry alone.

Let me give you one example of acute tunnel vision where the development of our energy resources is concerned. Out in Utah, Colorado and Wyoming there are an estimated three trillion barrels of oil locked in shale lands out there. But nearly all of the rich shale land is owned by the Federal government—under the control of the Department of Interior.

The law says that when the Interior Department leases land for private use, it has to get a maximum return on that land—it goes to the highest bidder. So, theoretically the American people get the best possible return on their land. But, by seeking maximum bids, the Government virtually forecloses at the outset any incentive to bring in oil at a low price. The conditions of these leasing arrangements, to the contrary, encourage costly inefficiencies by forgiving payments when development costs exceed the bid. And the law which requires that the American people get maximum financial return for their land simply guarantees that the cost of that land will be passed right back to them when they buy the end product.

We have a new situation in the world, and we have to think and act anew in order to cope with it. We have to stop thinking in terms of fossil fuels as our sole, or principal energy resource.

The anti-atomic energy lobby has managed to scare the country to death about a vital resource. And yet nuclear energy is one of the safest and potentially cheapest sources of energy we have. Today, it takes eleven years to get a nuclear plant sited in this country. In Japan it takes only six—and don't you think the Japanese, living on an over-crowded island, have at least as much respect for atomic energy as we have? And atomic energy is only one of a host of possible energy sources.

We haven't scratched the surface in developing geothermal energy. Iceland uses geothermal energy to heat its homes, provide its hot water, heat the greenhouses which make it agriculturally self-sufficient in spite of its weather and barren soil.

People say, well, geothermal energy is only available on the West Coast. Fine. Let's develop it on the West Coast. That means that a large part of the oil and gas now consumed on the West Coast can be diverted to other parts of the nation—and be more plentiful, and thus cheaper.

We have only begun to scratch the surface in applying the technology for solar energy. It is possible today to buy a solar heating system that will provide up to 90% of a home's heating requirements. Consider what that would free up in terms of natural gas, oil, and electricity. We have proposals to provide tax incentives for increased home insulation, storm windows and such. We need to move faster with attractive tax incentives for conversion to alternative energy sources, such as solar energy. It is beginning to promise cost figures even more favorable than nuclear, without any environmental consequences to boot.

We need incentives for motorists to choose automobiles using alternative power sources. There is a growing technology in the development of more efficient storage batteries. There are electric cars on the market. Shouldn't incentives be established to purchase them? Shouldn't there be some effort to look at steam driven autos again? Why is the automobile the most suspected, the most neglected, and one of the least perfected of our energy users, when it is a dominant energy user? Is it because of the age old bias among the self-proclaimed "thinkers" toward Detroit and the American motorist?

Wind energy is another possibility. So we are told that it can only be used in certain areas where the wind is constant, and if we use it elsewhere, then we have to store the energy created in peak producing periods and save it to keep the supply constant. That's expensive. All right, just use it where the wind is constant. That still will permit some diversion of resources to areas that can't use wind.

Tidal power is once again being studied as a likely energy source. It is true that it only works in certain areas. It isn't the whole answer. Fine. We recognize that it isn't the whole answer. Let's use it where it is the answer. The tides in the Bay of Fundy can produce enough energy to meet the electricity needs of New England. And New England can certainly use it.

In other words, we have to stop thinking in terms of universal solutions to the energy problem.

We have to develop a lot of different solutions and use them where they work. We have to get away from the philosophy that says we are going to have to reduce energy consumption forever, and adjust to paying more for our energy. That is absurd. It completely ignores what the scientists and the engineers and the natural resources of this nation have to offer. And it is unrealistic, because it ignores the very facts of our national existence and the way we live. With six percent of the world's population we consume thirty-three percent of the world's energy output. Our entire way of life depends on it. The present thinking is as pessimistic as saying that air is short, and we are all going to have to breathe a little less from now on.

The truth is that energy, per se, is not short; we are just going to have to be more creative and daring and enterprising about developing it. Fifty years from now people are going to look back and be enormously puzzled at the fact that we had an energy shortage in this country at the same time we had engineers out of work. It won't make sense then, and it doesn't make sense now.

We are on the threshold of a vast expansion and diversification of a major industry. All we need to do is open the door. That door is closed now, in part because of outdated government policies and the contemporary fuzziness in government thinking. And it is closed in part because we have all been lulled into the fallacy that traditional fossil fuels are the only answer to the energy situation. They are only one answer. There are a lot more waiting to be developed, and I have absolute confidence that they will be developed, and that we can and will return to the days of plentiful energy at tolerable prices.

Much of the task of making that happen will fall on the citizenry at large. We can do it. And the sooner we join together as a people and lift our heads up from the stumbling blocks in front of us and focus on the possibilities on the horizon—the sooner we acknowledge the great wealth of skill that we have available to us today and use it, the sooner the so-called energy crisis will be a thing of the past.

I don't accept the argument of those who say we have to drastically change the way we live. The way we live is a reflection of the kind of people we are. We have one of the highest standards of living in the world today not because anybody handed it to us, but because we came up with the energy, the ambition, the ingenuity and the guts to build this nation into what it is. To say that we have to totally alter our way of life is to say we have to change the kind of people we are. And that mentality has already gone too far in America. What we really have to do is to determine that we are going forward, not backward, that we are going to build, not just tear down. So what we need is a grand com-

mitment on the scale of the Manhattan Project to get the energy job done.

To those who say America can't cope with its problems, and that we must let our problems control our lives, I say baloney. We are in serious trouble if we really believe that kind of argument. The fact is that America remains America.

We still have rights and freedoms in America. Let us use them. Let us be more diligent and more fierce, if we have to be, in protecting them.

We still have a free enterprise system. Let us insist that it be left alone to work.

We still have a great genius in America. Let us insist that it be unfettered, and let us have confidence in it.

If we can do these things, then the American motorist will be all right. And so will the country.

Because, let us never forget, if an irresponsible government is left alone to tinker with the rights of the motorist, it will soon find other rights that do not accord with the latest fashion in social engineering. What the outcome will be is unforeseeable. But at the least we can be sure that it will be unworthy of those who built a nation that was able to celebrate two hundred years of freedom.

## JEROME S. ADLERMAN

Mr. PERCY. Mr. President, I was deeply saddened to learn of the passing of Jerome S. Adlerman, the former general counsel of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations, who died October 1 in Miami.

Mr. Adlerman, who retired in 1971 after 11 years as general counsel to this subcommittee, was a tenacious investigator, a skillful lawyer, and a gentleman.

I had the good fortune to work with him on this subcommittee and learned to respect his judgment and appreciate his thorough professionalism.

Jerry came to Washington first in 1947 to serve as counsel on the Senate War Investigating Committee under William P. Rogers, the then general counsel of the committee who was later to be appointed Attorney General and subsequently Secretary of State. While he planned to stay in Washington for only a little while, he became so fascinated with the legislative process that he wound up spending half a lifetime here, serving at one point as assistant to the late Robert F. Kennedy and later succeeding him as chief counsel to the Senate Select Committee on Improper Activities in the labor or management field.

Jerry Adlerman is in large measure responsible for the brilliant studies that the Investigations Subcommittee has undertaken in the matter of the TFX airplane, which undercovered poor management and Federal waste. He also managed the subcommittee's investigation of organized crime that was highlighted by the carefully documented testimony of Joe Valachi, as well as the role of organized crime in stolen securities.

During his service in the Senate, he was a loyal associate of Senator McCLELLAN who so ably chaired the Investigations Subcommittee through many of its most challenging years.

Even before coming to the Senate, Jerry Adlerman was a dedicated public servant, serving as chief of the Prosecution Subcommittee of the War Crimes Commission after World War II. He was well known for his diligence in gathering much of the evidence later used in prosecuting Nazi war criminals who performed medical experiments in concentration camps.

Mr. President, Jerry Adlerman was a credit to the staff of the subcommittee and his country. He will be sorely missed.

## TOP LEVEL GOVERNMENT JOBS REMAINING VACANT

Mr. HUGH SCOTT. Mr. President, the problem of Federal salaries keeping pace with private industry has still not been solved. The result is painful and predictable: top-level Government jobs are remaining vacant because competent professionals can find higher paying positions in the private sector.

An article of Joseph E. Persico in today's New York Times discussses the inequities inherent in the present system. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

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

STILL TRUE: YOU GET NO BREAD WITH ONE MEATBALL

(By Joseph E. Persico)

WASHINGTON.—The doctor at the Veterans Administration responsible for the care provided to over a million patients a year and for the operation of 171 V.A. hospitals is paid a $40,000 Federal salary. A typical neurosurgeon in private practice earns about $70,000, a general practitioner in the Northeast about $45,000.

The Federal official responsible for assuring the safety of drugs consumed by 214 million Americans is paid $36,000 per year. A top research scientist with a drug manufacturing company earns over $97,000 a year.

If your money is in a bank protected by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the official responsible for insuring the safety of deposits in that bank (and of 8,825 banks in this country, with assets of over $300-billion) is paid an annual $39,960 Federal salary. The president of a large bank in New York City earns about $200,000 per year.

And so it goes. The Federal official responsible for regulating the 3,565 brokerage houses in this country gets $36,000, a typical stockbroker in a metropolitan area $55,000. The Federal official who oversees the sales operation of 2,768 commercial aircraft and the competence of 30,000 pilots is paid $36,000, a senior airline pilot $55,000.

All of this is not to say that Government salaries, however elevated the responsibility, ought to equal private-sector incomes. There are deep nonmaterial satisfactions in doing something that one believes in and that is useful and important.

Obviously, no one who is thinking straight goes into Government for the money. Those who do risk winding up their careers in a far more confining kind of Federal institution than they originally had in mind.

Nor is the point that top Government salaries are low in an absolute sense. In a country where median family income last year was $12,840, few Americans will shed a tear for someone earning $36,000, whatever the job.

But, when the gulf between public and private salaries yawns too wide, it is hard to attract and hold able people in top Government jobs. And these are posts that affect the health, safety and well-being of everyone in this country.

Until recently, top Federal salaries for career employes had been frozen at $36,000 since 1969. In the meantime, the cost of living has gone up 48 per cent. In other words the $36,000 salary then is worth about $24,324 in buying power now.

The results are predictable. Empty offices in key places, early retirements and a fast switch from public to private payrolls. Resignations among professional Federal employes have doubled since 1970. The chief actuary's job for the entire Social Security system has gone vacant for fifteen months. The directorship of the program for the aging at the National Institutes of Health has not been filled since its creation in 1974.

High-level program managers at the Atomic Energy Commission, a chief economist at the Commerce Department, a top Justice Department trial attorney, and a computer systems director at Agriculture all quit for higher paying jobs in private industry, the computer expert nearly doubling his salary to $70,000 by the move.

Recently, the Congress and the President broke the current $36,000 logjam with a bill providing that some 17,000 top Government officials and members of Congress will get their salaries increased by the same percentage as other Federal workers, whenever pay raises are passed.

But a long-term solution is wanted to keep Government and private salaries in reasonable tandem. President Ford appointed a President's Panel on Federal Compensation last June headed by Vice President Rockefeller to help find the answer.

It would help if people took a consumer attitude toward what they get for their tax dollars. Just as we buy cars with income dollars, we buy safer highways with tax dollars and protection for our savings, the assurance of the safety of drugs, cleaner rivers and purer air, and all the other purposes of a well-governed society.

When salaries for taking on major responsibilities are relatively low, only selfless saints, of whom there are few, or run-of-the-mill bureaucrats, of whom there are plenty, will be drawn to public service. Whether we are talking about the quality of products we buy with income or the quality of government we buy with taxes, it is hard to escape the ancient truth: We probably get what we pay for.

## THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND THE U.S. ECONOMY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, last week our colleague from the State of Illinois (Mr. PERCY) gave an address before the 18th Annual Convention of the Illinois State AFL–CIO. In his speech, Senator PERCY reviewed the state of the economy and recommended certain actions which the Congress and the executive branch can take to improve Government efficiency in productivity, and to improve the employment picture in the national economy.

Perhaps the most important point made in Senator PERCY's speech is the fact that—

It is time to admit that America as a Nation, Americans as individuals, cannot buy everything all at once and not expect to pay the price.

I say this because I believe our country has entered upon a very difficult phase of readjustment of expectations, in the wake of the guns and butter ideology

that seemed to pervade our thinking during the sixties and even well into the seventies. This cannot be taken to mean cutting health, education, research, and welfare essential to a just Government and people but it can mean that conservation must become a way of life. Should it really matter to us, for example, that we may have to drive smaller cars if this is the price we pay for a socially progressive country? Should it really matter to us that we may have to wear heavy clothes in winter rather than burning excessive amounts of fuel, in order to accomplish the other tasks which we as a nation have set out for us?

I ask unanimous consent that the speech be printed in the RECORD.

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

ADDRESS BY SENATOR CHARLES H. PERCY, 18TH ANNUAL CONVENTION, ILLINOIS STATE AFL–CIO

Stan Johnson, Bob Gibson, Harl Ray, Members of the Executive Board, Delegates and Guests:

It is a pleasure and a privilege to be with you again to address this great convention. You have an outstanding program planned that reflects the vitality and strength of the Illinois State AFL–CIO.

The first time I appeared before this convention was five years ago in Peoria. On that occasion, I had the distinction of being the first Republican U.S. Senator from Illinois to address you in at least two decades. I am pleased to see that at least one other Republican is with us today to discuss the vital economic and social issues that affect every working man and woman regardless of party affiliation.

The last time I appeared before this convention was three years ago in Chicago during the 1972 campaign when my opponent and I participated in a debate. It was one of the high points of the campaign. The debate was comprehensive and vigorous. Stan Johnson stood by with a stop-watch, carefully refereeing the program. I must say that I much prefer the present circumstances, although the issues we face today are equally if not more challenging than those we debated three years ago.

The obvious difference between the state of the nation in 1972 and the situation we face today is the condition of the economy. The economy was vigorous in 1972, although even then a few warning clouds were beginning to form on the horizon. Our prime concern then was growing inflation. The concern already had inspired the ill-fated experiment with wage and price controls that made us all aware that inflation is a chronic rather than a temporary national problem.

Today we are in the first months of economic recovery following the worst bout with both inflation and recession since the Great Depression. But there is a wide range of opinion about the strength and sticking power of the recovery. This has created a pervasive mood of uncertainty in the country. Leaders in labor, business and government, along with working men and women throughout America, are watching and waiting to see the results of the economic recovery period.

This uncertainty centers on conflicting predictions about what will happen in the months ahead and on conflicting advice about what the Federal government should do to encourage recovery. The Administration advocates a steady-as-you-go approach, warning that more economic stimulus now could further aggravate the volatile inflation rate. In due time, Administration spokesmen say, unemployment will decline as recovery advances.

Others claim that increased economic stimulus is needed to bolster the recovery and to reduce unemployment more rapidly. They accept the danger of higher inflation as a necessary evil.

This debate is not a theoretical argument for you, your families and your fellow workers. You live daily with the consequences of inflation and recession. Your experiences remind the economic thinkers and planners that there is a human side to the economic debate that looms much larger than charts and graphs. Recession to you means lost jobs and the reality of unpaid bills and idle hours. Inflation to you means reduced earning power that strikes home every time you pass through the check-out line at the supermarket.

What, then, is the most accurate picture of our current economic condition? What is the real hope for recovery? Where do we stand and what can we expect? What can labor, business and government do to restore our national economy to a state of health and prosperity?

We are all painfully familiar with the latest facts and figures about unemployment and inflation. Seasonally adjusted unemployment stood at 8.4 percent last month, down from the peak of 9.2 percent in May. Unemployment hit 9.1 percent for the State of Illinois in August. In Chicago, the unemployment rate was estimated at 11.7 percent, mostly because of cutbacks in heavy manufacturing. These unemployment conditions are totally unacceptable to every citizen in Illinois and throughout the nation.

Inflation was up to double-digit proportions in July and August, primarily because of food and fuel price hikes. Inflation is nearly as high today as at any time in the last two years.

Signs of economic growth are more encouraging. The gross national product is on the positive side after negative growth last year and early this year. Industrial production is up with the largest one-month increase last month in nearly three years. Business is selling off inventories. New housing starts show impressive gains after reaching a low point in February, although housing starts at the current annual rate of 1.2 million are obviously insufficient to meet the Congressional target of 2.6 million needed each year to keep pace with demand.

But long-term projections about unemployment, inflation and economic growth are disappointing and unacceptable. Predictions set unemployment at between 7 and 8 percent and inflation at about 6 or 7 percent by late next year. Estimates put growth of the gross national product at between 4 and 6 percent by the end of 1976.

These predictions foreshadow distress and challenge for every sector of the American economy for the next year or two or even longer. Our economic problems are not temporary conditions; they will not pass quickly. We face an extended effort to restore the health of our national economy. The quick fix cannot be accepted as a substitute for sound policies that yield long-term stability.

We must all realize—and this realization must touch leaders in labor, business and government as well as working men and women—that a healthy and stable economy demands discipline by every American citizen. There is little question that we spent our way into the current economic mess. We fought a wasteful war and launched new, loosely administered social programs without taking the necessary economic precautions to prevent future trouble.

It is time to admit that America as a nation, and Americans as individuals, cannot buy everything at once and not expect to pay the price. We all want a nation that provides a strong defense, adequate social programs and progressive reforms to improve the quality of life. But we must set priorities to reach and maintain these national goals.

Most of all, we must dispel the popular American myth that says "bigger is better." This myth extends to the cars we drive and the gadgets that fill our homes. We have the highest standard of living in the world, and we are dedicated to the principle of improving living standards for the greatest possible number of citizens. But perhaps it is time to return to basic values and reject the notion that size, speed and luxury bring happiness.

This re-evaluation of goals and values can guide us as we act to restore economic health. The national agenda for economic action is extensive and will not be accomplished in a period of weeks or months. In the interest of long-range as well as short-term advancement, we must strike a careful balance between economic stimulus and restraint to assure that immediate gains are not erased by future setbacks.

The keystone of economic recovery is renewed confidence among consumers and producers. To help build confidence as the economy recovers, Congress should extend at least a portion of the tax reduction program passed earlier this year. It would be folly for Congress to take away from consumers in December what it gave them in April. And we must consider ways to increase capital for producers so that business confidence increases along with consumer confidence.

We have a mutual concern about the lagging job market and what can be done to improve its prospects. This is the foundation of your organization's Jobs Program and puts you squarely on the side of economic stimulus as the way to return workers to their jobs. Congress can respond now by taking a number of actions to help put people back to work, assist those who remain unemployed and help find new jobs to meet the demands of the growing labor force.

The Senate-passed plan to spend Federal dollars for short-term, quickly implemented public works projects and direct assistance to cities and states most severely affected by the recession is sound and practical. Congress should approve the plan now in conference at the earliest possible date. The program would direct Federal money to areas most in need and would adjust spending to meet changes in state and local unemployment conditions.

We also must maintain funding for existing programs that provide public service jobs. This is the quickest and most effective way to reduce unemployment. It pays people for working and thus reduces the personal frustration and humiliation that often accompanies public support for people who are involuntarily unemployed. These programs need not be permanent parts of our economic process, but they should be maintained as long as unacceptable levels of unemployment exist.

The minimum program we should support is the current level of 310,000 public service jobs. You know and I know that this is not enough. We should move toward the 550,000-job level that we both support.

Congress must also continue unemployment benefits for workers not employed in insured jobs. These workers are perhaps the most helpless victims of the recession. They must not be abandoned and made to weather an unpredictable period of economic recovery without assistance.

We should also consider applying the concept of adjustment assistance to workers who lose their jobs because of a change in national policies and priorities. If we can assist

workers who lose their jobs because of imports, then we can provide aid to workers who lose their jobs because a new national policy such as gasoline conservation causes layoffs in the auto industry or related industries.

Congress also must face the challenge of doing its part to fight inflation, the main cause of reduced purchasing power, depressed business activity and unemployment. I, for one, do not believe that a major assault on inflation means an automatic increase in unemployment. If we act responsibly, Congress can help reduce inflation without hampering moves to put people back to work.

One critical element in this effort is the new budget procedure that regulates Congressional spending. It is a system based on spending limits and priorities. Because of the new system, Congress is on the course of sensible spending for the first time in decades. As a strong proponent of this reform, I emphasize that we do not intend to control spending without regard for priorities.

We approach the Federal budget with a scalpel and not a hatchet. We are as concerned about expenditures for aircraft carriers as we are about spending for school lunch programs. We intend to examine every spending proposal carefully to assure that we meet the nation's needs and at the same time keep spending below the budget ceiling set earlier this year by the House and the Senate. Every time I cast a vote in the Senate on Federal spending I remind myself that it is your money we are spending.

In the battle against inflation, we also must stabilize government policies that affect the prices of food and fuel, the two most serious causes of inflation. American consumers feel the pinch worst when they stretch their budgets to feed their families and heat their homes. It is inexcusable for Congress or the Administration to sit idly by while government policies over which each branch of government has control contribute to higher inflation.

The government should establish sensible export policies to prevent sudden jolts in the agricultural market. The current flap over grain sales to the Soviet Union shows the results of poor planning. Farmers must have access to foreign markets without undue government interference, but the American consumer should not be forced to pay the bill for such access. The current negotiation between U.S. and Soviet officials is a hopeful sign that additional sales to the Soviet Union will follow the same long-term pattern that governs sales to other nations. This will help avoid future shocks in the grain market.

The government also has a responsibility to establish sensible policies regarding the production and marketing of fuel. The responsibility is especially obvious in the current stalemate between Congress and the Administration over decontrol of domestic oil prices. Decontrol must be gradual to prevent sudden increases in consumer prices.

This need makes it mandatory that both Congress and the Administration set political considerations aside and act immediately on a compromise and not return to total market control for another three to five years. Beyond that, we must work together to forge a comprehensive national energy program that provides for conservation and the development of new energy sources. The inability of politicians and policy makers in Washington to agree on national energy policy is nothing less than a national disgrace.

There are other opportunities for government action to fight inflation. One that deserves prompt attention is the opportunity to cut consumer prices by reducing unnecessary government regulation of business. This action should not follow the course of wiping out government regulation across the board. Many businesses and industries should be regulated to prevent even higher prices that could result from reduced controls. But many Federal regulatory practices, some of which receive strong business support, reduce competition and inflate prices. I have joined with other Senators in the Government Operations Committee to launch a study of Federal regulation to determine costs and benefits to consumers and recommend which regulations should be modified or terminated. In particular we should ask why the regulated are sometimes the strongest proponents of continued regulation.

The government also has a role in increasing productivity to help improve economic performance and reduce inflation. I spoke of this need when I addressed your convention in 1972, and I emphasize it again today. Productivity can benefit both labor and management by raising profits, increasing wages, creating jobs and stimulating competition in foreign and domestic markets. The AFL–CIO has been helpful in the effort to boost the nation's productivity.

Recently the Senate addressed the need to increase productivity by passing legislation to create a National Center for Productivity and Quality of Working Life. The Center will be the focal point of the Federal government's effort to increase productivity in the private and public sector. The legislation deserves prompt consideration by the House and support by leaders, in labor as well as business.

In the months ahead, Congress also will be looking carefully at many Federal social programs to examine their costs and the relative benefits to the American people. This examination is long overdue. Many Federal social programs such as welfare are a hodge-podge of conflicting goals and priorities. But the tone of this examination is crucial. We must abandon inflammatory rhetoric that cries out against "welfare cheats and chiselers." The fact is that middle class persons benefit greatly from Federal social spending. They receive assistance through Social Security and veterans' benefits; unemployment compensation provides assistance to millions of men and women. We all have a stake in future planning and spending for social programs.

One area in particular that deserves Congressional attention is Federal spending to improve health care. The Medicare and Medicaid programs that were heralded in the sixties as the answer to our health care problems need review and reform. In some cases, outright fraud and abuse have increased the cost of these programs and reduced their impact on those who need them most. Following reform of these programs, we should enact a national health insurance plan to assure quality health care for all Americans at a cost they can afford. We should place special emphasis on the need to protect Americans against the expense of catastrophic illnesses.

I very much appreciate the opportunity to be with you today and participate in this meeting. I can assure you that the hopes and aspirations of working men and women in Illinois and through the nation are in the forefront of national concern. As we move through the period of economic recovery ahead, your voices will be heard and your needs will be met.

## UNITED NATIONS

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, the 30th general session of the United Nations opened last month on an unexpected note of international harmony. The rhetoric of confrontation, which has been prevalent in all General Assembly meetings for the past several years, was reduced and replaced by rational suggestions for the solution of the major economic and social problems confronting the world community.

The United States left the U.N. community virtually speechless with its opening address listing alternative methods of solving the serious economic problems facing the third and fourth world nations. Contrary to past practice, our proposals were not open-ended offers of financial and development assistance. In fact, they put the United States on record as expecting the nations of the world to solve their own problems without direct American aid.

While these events represents a psychological advantage for the United States at the U.N., substantive economic advances are far from being accomplished. There is considerable doubt in my mind as to whether the U.N. apparatus ever will be able to handle critical international problems. Its past history has shown it to be a more effective debating society than a responsible forum for the rational solution of worldwide problems.

If the U.N. is to be a viable organization, it must be reformed. Membership should be broad but it also should be based on acceptable standards such as governmental stability both political and economic; worldwide recognition; and willingness to support the parent organization morally and financially. Member nation governments should have the support of a cross section of their population, they should be able to withstand a specified test of time, they should have an organized governing system, they should be able to provide for at least a subsistence level of well-being for their citizens and they should be sufficiently solvent to pay off loans and other debts for services rendered. Formal recognition by previously established governments should be required before an applicant nation is approved for membership. Each prospective member should support the ideals of the organization's charter.

The United States should not continue to provide the major portion of U.N. funding. The annual assessments of other nations must be readjusted to portray their improved economies and the extent of their influence within the U.N. community. The United States provides 25 percent of the funding for the U.N. and approximately that same level of support for all the related agencies. This is the largest proportion of the budget assessed any U.N. member. According to the 1975 assessments, the next largest amount was 14.9 percent and that was charged to the Soviet Union. Not one of the newly rich oil-producing states has been asked to contribute as much as one-half of 1 percent to the support of the United Nations.

A recent public opinion poll, which I initiated in Arizona, showed my constituents in opposition to the United States remaining in the United Nations. A final tabulation of the responses showed 44.5 percent of the respondents favoring our participation in the U.N. and 55.5 percent objecting to our membership in that organization. The ultra-liberal Chicago

Council on Foreign Relations conducted a survey this year titled "American Public Opinion and U.S. Foreign Policy, 1975." Even their conclusions on American attitudes toward extensive U.S. participation in international organizations showed a considerable degree of disregard for U.S. participation in international organizations such as the United Nations. "The American public is ambivalent about formal international organizations; supporting the principles and procedures rather than the institutions themselves. Eighty-two percent of the respondents regarded the U.S. role in founding the United Nations as a proud moment in American history, but only 53 percent thought that it was very important for the United States to be a world leader in support of international organizations such as the U.N."

I remain deeply critical of the U.N., in spite of the hopeful events surrounding the opening of its 30th general session. Because of these encouraging signs, I will expect a great deal more from this organization this year with respect to achievement of rational, practical economic and social policies. Presently, in the U.N., there seems to be an inclination among all members to work toward accomplishing realistic solutions for devastating problems. I am anxious to see how effectively the U.N. responds to this positive attitude. A few months' time should prove whether my critical attitude is justifiable or not.

Mr. President, a pertinent editorial, "Winning the Fourth World," appeared in the Wall Street Journal on September 26, 1975. It is a commentary on the opening session of the U.N. and, in my opinion, is on target as a thoughtful response to the potential for revitalization currently existing at the United Nations. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Wall Street Journal, Sept. 26, 1975]

WINNING THE FOURTH WORLD

To almost everyone's surprise, the United States seems to have pulled off something of a diplomatic coup at, of all places, the United Nations. As the dust settles from the recent Seventh Special Session of the UN General Assembly, called to further the "Third World's" demands against the West, the results seem so much less bad than they could have been that even we are tempted to applaud them.

We must immediately add that a lot of the dust is still in the air. The United States made 41 specific proposals in its Labor Day speech attributed to Secretary of State Kissinger and read by Ambassador Daniel Patrick Moynihan. Not even the proposers seem to be sure how they will all work out in practice. The touchy business of commodity agreements, for instance, could cause greater or less damage to world free trade and more or less cost to consumers depending on which section of the U.S. bureaucracy gets hold of it. But the speech, and the fact the Special Session seized on it as an agenda, mark a turn against the talk of across-the-board cartelization of commodities, so prevalent in the "Third World" and even in the State Department since the previous UN Special Session.

The marathon haggling over rhetoric obscured the remarkable fact that most of the substance in the session's final resolution came point for point from Mr. Kissinger's speech. Instead of the Algerian program of coordinated Third World price-fixing, a la OPEC, this document calls for such American proposals as commodity stockpiling to stabilize price swings, expanded credit to finance trade deficits and removal of trade barriers.

While we reserve the right to take a closer look at the merits of ideas like buffer stocks, the diplomatic outcome certainly vindicates Ambassador Moynihan's basic approach. Rather than play the European game and swallow as much, and a bit more, of the Third World's demands as the U.S. could tolerate, the U.S. set out to be a responsible opposition. Accepting the basic structure of the UN, the U.S. criticized programs the U.S. thought were wrong and offered solid alternatives.

More fundamentally, the resolution shows how hollow were most of the programs of the "new international economic order." Although the resentment and hardship of the world's poor countries are very real, their suggestions for changing things seemed little more than the attempt to duplicate OPEC's success for the other raw materials that some of them export.

This approach hasn't been pushed because it won't work economically. The oil cartel succeeded because of the geographical concentration and relative political cohesion of the major exporters and because of a temporary tightness in the world supply. Other commodities, such as copper, are a glut on the market; or like bauxite, are found in large deposits in countries more closely tied to the West than the Third World; or, like bananas, can't be withheld from the market without spoiling.

And the bulk of the world's poor countries can't, in their sober moments, really want these cartels to succeed. We use "Third World" as the only possible collective description of some 100 separate nations, but the phrase obscures enormous variations in politics, ethnicity and economic make-up. One major faction, the OPEC bloc, has recently become rich primarily at the expense of the rest. At the very best, new cartels would create a few more "rich-poor" nations and increase import costs for the "poor-poor," the so-called "Fourth World." If OPEC is any example, the "Fourth World" won't see much of the revenue these cartels are supposed to "redistribute" from the industrial nations.

It's still a very open question whether any form of foreign aid will do much lasting good for countries like India, which seem determined to frustrate development by foolish policies and bureaucratic inertia. In some cases, the foreign aid programs of the '60s not only failed, they seemed to sap the will of recipients to put their own houses in order. Mr. Kissinger's speech shifts the emphasis to the capital markets, which at least gives the borrower responsibility to use his loan wisely. But it makes only a token bow to the nagging question, what if the borrower doesn't?

Even so, the American proposals are infinitely preferable to the neomercantile fantasies of the "new international economic order." The secret of their favorable reception at the UN is, in short, that Kissinger has more to offer the Fourth World than does Algeria's Boutefilika. His various investment trusts and capital facilities are sincere efforts to get money to the most needy, not to the lucky few who can cash in on cartelization. The recent marathon on Turtle Bay suggests at least that some good sense is returning to the debate about development.

## JEROME S. ADLERMAN

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, it is with a deep sense of regret and sadness that I have learned of the death on Wednesday, October 1, 1975, of Jerome S. Adlerman, general counsel of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations from 1960 until his retirement in 1971.

As chairman of the subcommittee during the period in which Jerry Adlerman served in this position, I had the opportunity to observe his dedicated and loyal work on the subcommittee, to the Senate as a whole and to the people of the United States.

Mr. Adlerman was a key figure in the successful efforts of the subcommittee to investigate and uncover corruption, waste and wrongdoing in Government and labor-management relations and to expose the activities of organized crime in America. His work resulted not only in the exposure of malfeasance, misfeasance, and corruption but also in positive legislative reforms—and almost every segment of American society has reaped the benefits of his efforts.

Mr. Adlerman came to Washington in June, 1947, to serve as assistant counsel to the Senate Committee To Investigate the National Defense. This was intended to be a 6-month assignment but it developed into a quarter century of valuable service to the Nation.

A graduate of the New York University Law School, Mr. Adlerman was in private practice in New York City from 1925 until 1933, when he became assistant counsel of a task force investigating welfare scandals. During the early days of World War II, he was an attorney with the Department of Justice. From 1944 to 1946, he was chief of the prosecutions subsection of the U.S. Army War Crimes Group in Germany, which gathered evidence on medical experiments performed in Nazi concentration camps.

Mr. Adlerman joined the staff of the Senate Permanent Subcommittee on Investigations on February 1, 1948, upon its organization and became chief assistant counsel in 1957. In 1960, I had the pleasure of appointing him general counsel of the subcommittee upon the resignation of his able predecessor, Robert F. Kennedy.

Throughout his career with the subcommittee, Mr. Adlerman was a vigorous and responsible investigator. But he was not only a dedicated public servant, he was also a gentle and considerate man who often agonized over the transgressions of others with whom his work brought him in contact.

He played a valuable role in investigating irregularities in military procurement, corruption in the field of labor-management relations, and helped rip away the cloak of secrecy which had surrounded the burgeoning influence of organized crime in American society. He also delved into irregularities in the TFX

contract, helped uncover waste in foreign assistance programs in Southeast Asia and brought to light valuable information concerning the criminal disorders that swept our Nation in the late 1960's.

Mr. President, the Senate has indeed been fortunate in the quality and dedication of many of its staff members. Jerry Adlerman typified in his personality all the labor that is good in our system and our way of life.

I know I speak for all Members of the Senate, and staff members who knew Jerry, in these sentiments I have expressed. Mrs. McClellan and I extend our profound sympathies to his wife, Evelyn, and to the other members of Jerry's family.

His passing leaves a void in our lives that will be impossible to fill.

## BEDFORD-STUYVESANT COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I have the great satisfaction today to report to my colleagues the opening of a $6 million commercial complex in the Bedford-Stuyvesant community in Brooklyn, N.Y.

The late Robert F. Kennedy founded the Bedford-Stuyvesant Corporation, in which I joined with him. I have consistently supported the gifted concept of community economic development corporations, in a multifaceted attack on poverty based upon a "special impact" program. The Bedford-Stuyvesant Corporation was the first community development corporation and now over 40 of these programs are funded through the Community Service Administration.

It is backed by a list of eminent business and financial leaders per the appended list.

The results of congressional support for the concept of community development can be seen in Bedford-Stuyvesant, once a ghetto community with no hope and no future. Now, the community can point with pride to its new commercial complex, with its infusion of new capital, and the creation of new jobs. This can only be a starting point on which to build and grow. Not only will this result in economic gain, but it will also increase the social services available to the community.

The Bedford-Stuyvesant Corporation has shown that local communities can and do form the leadership of an economic community to develop local businesses. The support of major corporations, such as Lane Bryant, Nathan's Famous, Chemical Bank, and Consolidated Edison, add to the economic strength and confidence of the community.

An article in Friday's New York Times, written by Charlayne Hunter, highlights the renewed spirit and confidence in this community. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the New York Times, Oct. 3, 1975]

BEDFORD-STUYVESANT COMPLEX OPENS

(By Charlayne Hunter)

"Isn't it spectacular?" said a beaming Franklin A. Thomas, president of the Bedford-Stuyvesant Restoration Corporation, as he welcomed guests yesterday to the opening ceremonies of the corporation's new $6-million commercial center.

"It's terrific, Frank," replied Ann Doar, whose husband, John, is a former principal of the corporation. "I could do my Christmas shopping here."

Her companion, Barbara Elliott, said: "A beautiful spot like this, you won't be able to keep people out."

"I hope not," Mr. Thomas said.

That was certainly the case yesterday as several thousand people streamed to the spacious plaza, including Ethel Kennedy, widow of Senator Robert F. Kennedy, who was one of the creators of the corporation. Also present were bank and corporate executives, foundation officials and residents of the Bedford-Stuyvesant community.

A 32-STORE COMPLEX

The only major black-owned commercial complex in the city, "Downtown Bedford-Stuyvesant," as it is called, is a 32-story split-level complex on the square block bounded by Fulton and Herkimer Streets and New York and Brooklyn Avenues—the heart of the community.

In the three newly constructed and four renovated buildings, the tenants include small businesses such as the Chic d'Amerique Boutique and A. J. Battle, opticians, along with major retail stores such as a Lerner shop and a Lane Bryant, Nathan's Famous, a Baskin-Robbins Ice Cream parlor, the Brooklyn Union Gas Company, Consolidated Edison and the Chemical Bank.

Five years ago the space, which now also includes a skating rink and underground parking facilities, contained a milk-bottling plant, several partially abandoned and decaying manufacturing and warehouse facilities, and tenements.

Plans for the future include such "desperately needed facilities," according to an official of the corporation, as a major supermarket and a drugstore.

A MAJOR COUP

"They really pulled off a major coup," said an official of the Ford Foundation, which financed the complex along with the First National City Bank, the Vincent Astor Foundation and the Federal Community Services Administration.

"This whole area was an urban wasteland," he said, "and they've brought life and vitality to it in a relatively short period of time."

James Shipp, president of the Restoration Development Center, the corporation subsidiary that owns and is responsible for developing, constructing and operating the center, said the most difficult part of the development has been the leasing.

"Major stores were telling us that they left Bedford-Stuyvesant 15 years ago, and that the people had followed them to the outskirts.

"We argued that there are 450,000 people here that represent a market that ought to be tapped. We stressed the reaffirmation of their commitment."

WHY THEY CAME

Avrum Marcus and Steven Schleifer, who own Stav's Cards and Books, said they decided six weeks ago to come into the complex because "we like the way they handled things."

"I felt they knew what they were doing," said Mr. Marcus. "It's a terrific opportunity."

Fred Powell, a young black entrepreneur who with his wife, Barbara, will run Every Blooming Thing, a flower shop, said he knew people would support the complex.

"We have a store in the area on Nostrand Avenue, and when we told the people we'd be moving here, they were tremendously excited."

Paula Miley, who is 14 years old, said: "From what I've seen today, you put me in one of these stores and I'd go crazy."

While some statistics indicate that conditions are worse today in Bedford-Stuyvesant than five years ago—unemployment then was 6 per cent and now it is at least 20 per cent—many involved with the corporation feel that the effects of such ventures as the complex will make a difference in the years to come.

"This certainly should encourage the people who have been fleeing to take a second look," said Judge Joseph B. Williams, administrative judge of Family Court, who is chairman of the corporation's board. "With the tremendous labor market and the cost of land lower and more available, there can be the kind of development that leads to jobs and many other things."

"A lot will depend on the follow-through," said a bank executive. "But Frank's on the board of two banks, so that shouldn't be a problem."

As for Mr. Thomas, he said: "It's a plateau. But we take off from here on to the next project because the process of change is the nature of the industry."

## CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

Under the previous order, the Chair now recognizes the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON).

## ANNOUNCEMENT OF SENATOR PASTORE NOT TO SEEK REELECTION

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, I have had the privilege of serving in this body and also on the Commerce Committee with the distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE). I have come to acquire the greatest respect and affection for Senator PASTORE and, therefore, it is with disappointment and dismay that I learned this morning of his intention to not seek reelection to the Senate. His departure from this body will be a loss for the Senate, and a very real personal loss for all of his colleagues, including myself.

## BASE NEGOTIATIONS WITH SPAIN

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, before turning to the subject of oil and gas price regulation, I want to make a few observations about the conduct of the present negotiations with Spain.

Mr. President, the Western World has been shocked by the executions in Spain. We are brutally reminded that the exercise of tyranny is not restricted to the Communist nations but lives on in the only Fascist dictatorship to survive World War II. I do not condone terrorism. I accept that one man's revolutionary is another man's terrorist. I do not challenge the right to trial who are charged with murder. But I do find summary justice by a military court abhorrent. I share the indignation voiced

by our NATO allies in Europe, most of whom have withdrawn their Ambassadors from Madrid in protest, and the Commission of the European Common Market, which has recommended that trade negotiations with Spain be suspended.

I regret that our own Government has been almost mute, or perhaps worse than mute. The reluctant utterances from the White House and the State Department have ducked the issue on the ground that it is an internal Spanish matter and that—after all—many nations impose death penalties.

We all know, of course, why the administration is so reluctant to say anything to offend an aging dictator. We do not wish to jeopardize our negotiations for the renewal of agreements for the use of naval and air bases in Spain. With a fine disregard for public opinion both here and in Western Europe, our Secretary of State was actively pursuing these negotiations directly with the Spanish Foreign Minister last week. We read in the Saturday newspapers that the Secretary has reached agreement in principle on a new accord. We do not know precisely what this one will cost the American taxpayer, but we read in the press that it may be as much as $750 million—five times more than the expiring agreement cost us. Our NATO allies must regard this expression of support for Franco's regime as an act of extreme imprudence. The Spanish Foreign Minister has been quoted as describing this agreement as "an affirmation of friendship at a moment of extraordinary importance." Extraordinary indeed.

This is another case of pragmatism at the expense of principle. I question that it can be justified as pragmatism. We and our European allies share the earnest hope that the successor government to the present dictatorship will make of Spain a democracy worthy of membership in the Western family of nations. How are we going to deal with such a government if, right up to the last ditch, we continue to support antidemocratic forces? Why must we always end up on the wrong side? The history of the past 30 years is strewn with the wreckage of these decisions: China, Vietnam, Chile, and—perhaps most aptly—Greece. Who can deny that our support to the Papadopoulos regime encouraged the Greek military adventure in Cyprus which has led us to today's wretched impasse? Who can wonder that the Greek people see in our bases there, whose future is in doubt, a symbol of our kinship with a departed dictatorship?

Mr. President, this matter is far too serious to escape the earnest attention of this body. The American people deserve an answer to the question "What is the rush?" The 1970 base agreement expired on September 25. Under its terms, we have a year's grace within which to conclude another agreement. Given the present climate of public opinion, here and abroad, toward Fascist Spain and given the fluid political situation in that country, why not step back and take a hard look at what we are doing before we are committed again to the wrong side? The appropriate committees should hold hearings to enable this body, and the public, to examine the issues. Meanwhile, I urge that further negotiations be held in suspense.

Mr. Safire, a columnist with whom I do not always agree, wrote on the subject in Wednesday's New York Times that—

Standing for something in the world is worth both the trouble and the money.

I ask unanimous consent that his column be included in the RECORD as well as a letter I wrote to Secretary Kissinger last Friday, before the agreement in principle with the Spanish Government was announced, urging him to put the negotiations "on ice."

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

[From the New York Times, Oct. 1, 1975]

THE REIGN IN SPAIN

(By William Safire)

WASHINGTON, Oct. 1.—America's interest in Franco's reign in Spain falls mainly on the planes—that is, the air and naval bases we have been renting, whose leases are now being renegotiated.

The world's interest in Spain these days centers on the execution of five terrorists, including two Basque separatists, convicted by a military court of murdering policemen in the course of bank holdups. General Franco evidently decided that one way to discourage cop-killing was to put a handful of cop-killers in front of a firing squad.

The world little notes nor long remembers the stern measures used behind the Iron Curtain to "repress' killers of public officials. No voices are raised in the United Nations to demand an accounting of the death march ordered by Cambodian Communists. No ambassadors are withdrawn to protest the absolute termination of press freedom in Saigon.

But General Franco is a Fascist, not a Communist, dictator, and an aging one at that. That's why his stern response to the murders of a score of policemen so far this year, including three yesterday, met this international reaction:

Fifteen ambassadors from European countries, including the entire Common Market, were recalled from Madrid or kept home.

Mexican President Luis Echeverria, with no relations to break off, found a way to express his rage by cutting off postal communications with Spain.

The Vatican, hardly a leftist redoubt but conscious of the need to establish a footing with the people who will come after Franco, expressed its displeasure after the Spanish Government would not heed the Pope's plea for clemency.

What can we learn from this? And what should our own reaction be?

The first lesson is that solemn declarations not to interfere in the "internal affairs" of sovereign nations are hogwash. Almost every nation feels free to meddle and to moralize, restrained only by threat of military or economic retaliation.

Lesson number two is that leftist leaders are much better at meddling in rightist nations' affairs than vice versa. Sweden's Prime Minister is now contributing money to Spanish opposition groups; he would cry havoc if the Shah of Iran or somebody were to help finance anti-Socialist activities in Sweden.

Our first reaction should be to recognize the right of any nation to impose a death sentence on murderers of police or prison guards. We may disagree on capital punishment, but the penalty is not beyond the pale of civilized national behavior.

Next, we should set aside the temptation to bedeck murderers with the verbal garland of "guerrilla" or "commando" or even "revolutionary." A person who kills another human being in a bank holdup, whether in the name of Basque separatism or Symbionese Liberation, is a murderer. (Radicals change terrorist to "guerrilla" in the same way liberals soften "involuntary" to "court-ordered" and conservatives harden "involuntary" to "forced.")

Does this mean the Government of the United States should continue to say nothing, to hold that terrorism in Spain—and the repression it desires and has triggered—is "an internal matter" off-limits to comment, and to keep our eye on the ball of the military bases?

Absolutely not. Franco's transfer to the terrorists' trials from civil courts to military courts was wrong, and we should say so. The principle of summary execution, without the right of appeal, is abhorrent to our idea of justice, and we should make our opinion known. Only when a state provides an individual with a fair trial can it claim the right to put the guilty to death.

Secretary Kissinger would say that's all well and good, but to speak up would jeopardize delicate negotiations. Not necessarily so: A statement of our beliefs, including a unique emphasis on the tragedy visited on the families of the dead policemen, could be fashioned in a way that would not be unwelcome in Spain.

An honest and reasonable statement by the U.S., especially at a delicate moment, is important for our own self respect as well as our image abroad. This is sneered at as moral posturing by the power pragmatists on the seventh floor of State, but unless they make some obeisance to international morality, they will be faced with the practical problem of a grand agreement and no Congressional approval.

America is against terrorism and against mindless overreactions to terrorism. Saying so now requires some courage, some diplomatic finesse, and may cost us a few million dollars on our air base leases. Standing for something in the world is worth both the trouble and the money.

We could become the only nation in the world consistent in applying a measure of moral pressure on dictatorships of both left and right. If Mr. Kissinger persists in looking the other way, he will discover, as the embattled General Franco has, how foolish it is to put all our Basques in one exit.

---

OCTOBER 3, 1975.

Hon. HENRY A. KISSINGER,
*Secretary of State,*
*Department of State, Washington, D.C.*

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am disturbed by indications that we are proceeding with negotiations for a renewal of the Spanish Bases Agreement at a time when public opinion, particularly among our Western European NATO allies, is inflamed over domestic developments in Spain. I am aware of the strategic considerations which make a renewal of the Agreement important to us. However, I fear that in this case the pursuit of pragmatism may not be justified. In the past our dogged support of waning authoritarian regimes has not served us well. I urge that further negotiations be put on ice until we have carefully examined the options in the light of current Spanish political dynamics and our relations with Western Europe as a whole.

I am enclosing a copy of a statement I intend to make in the Senate at an early opportunity.

With best wishes,

Sincerely,

ADLAI E. STEVENSON.

## NATURAL GAS EMERGENCY ACT OF 1975

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now resume consideration of the pending business, S. 2310, which the clerk will state by title.

The second assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2310) to assure the availability of adequate supplies of natural gas during the period ending June 30, 1976.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, what is the pending business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARY W. HART). The pending question is the amendment of the Senator from Illinois to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas to the amendment of the Senator from South Carolina to S. 2310.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, I ask that this amendment No. 948 be modified in accordance with modifications which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the modifications.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON) proposes modifications to amendment No. 948.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be so modified.

The amendment, as modified, is as follows:

In lieu of the language proposed to be inserted, insert the following: That this Act may be cited as the "Natural Gas Production and Conservation Act of 1975".

SEC. 2. The Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717 et seq.) is amended by striking out section 24 thereof (15 U.S.C. 717w) in its entirety and by inserting immediately after the enacting clause thereof and before section 1 thereof (15 U.S.C. 717) the following: "That this Act may be cited as the "Natural Gas Production and Conservation Act of 1975."

"TITLE I—GENERAL PROVISIONS"

SEC. 3. The Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following two new titles:

"TITLE II

"PURPOSES

"SEC. 201. The purpose of this title is to establish temporary emergency authorities for minimizing the detrimental effects on employment, food production, and public health, safety, and welfare caused by natural gas supply shortages.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 202. As used in this title—

"(1) The term 'Administrator' means the Administrator of the Federal Energy Administration.

"(2) The term 'Commission' means the Federal Power Commission;

"(3) The term 'essential user' means a user or class of user who satisfies criteria to be established by the Commission, by rule, as indicative of a user for which no alternative fuel is reasonably available and whose supply requirements must be met in order to avoid substantial unemployment or impairment of food production or the public health, safety, or welfare.

"(4) The term 'Federal lands' means any land or subsurface area within the United States which is owned or controlled by the Federal Government or with respect to which the Federal Government has authority, directly or indirectly, to explore for, develop, and produce natural gas, including any land or subsurface area located on the Outer Continental Shelf.

"(5) The term 'intrastate commerce' means commerce between points within the same State not through any place outside thereof.

"(6) The term 'interstate commerce' has the same meaning as such term has in section 2(7) of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717a(7)).

"(7) The term 'Outer Continental Shelf' has the same meaning as such term has in section 2(a) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331(a)).

"(8) The term 'new natural gas' means (A) natural gas which was not, prior to September 9, 1975, committed by contract to interstate commerce, and (B) any natural gas (i) committed by contract to intrastate commerce which contract, on or after September 9, 1975, terminates and is not renewed or (ii) otherwise available for sale during the period that this title is in effect. Except as provided in this title, new natural gas shall not be subject to Commission jurisdiction. The term does not include 'transferred natural gas' as defined in subsection 205(e).

"(9) The term 'person' includes any governmental entity.

"(10) The term 'pipeline' means a person engaged in the transportation by pipeline of natural gas.

"(11) The term 'priority interstate purchaser' means (A) any interstate pipeline (or a person acting on behalf of an interstate pipeline) which the Commission, taking into account any existing curtailment plan of such pipeline and the natural gas supplies available to such pipeline, determines is, to a significant extent, unlikely to obtain supplies of natural gas adequate to meet the requirements of essential users under any agreement (without regard to whether such agreement is for interruptible or firm service) to supply natural gas to such user by—

"(i) such pipeline; or

"(ii) a person to which such pipeline supplies natural gas for purposes of resale,

or (B) any interstate pipeline that can demonstrate it will otherwise be unable to secure supplies of natural gas that are necessary to supply essential users on such pipelines through June 30, 1976, because of competition from interstate pipelines that have previously been designated as priority purchasers.

"(12) The term 'supply emergency period' means the period, or any part thereof, which begins on the date of enactment of this title and ends on July 1, 1976.

"ACCESS BY PRIORITY INTERSTATE PURCHASERS TO NATURAL GAS

"SEC. 203. (a) The Commission shall, not later than the end of the 15-day period which begins on the date of enactment of this title, and shall as necessary throughout the supply emergency period, upon petition or upon its own motion, designate priority interstate purchasers.

"(b) The Commission shall, by rule, not later than the end of the 15-day period which begins on the date of enactment of this title, establish an area ceiling price applicable to any first sale of new natural gas (except first sales of new natural gas produced from lands located on the Outer Continental Shelf) for each area in the United States in which natural gas is produced during the supply emergency period. The Commission shall designate areas to which such ceiling prices shall apply. Such ceiling price shall, to the maximum extent practicable, approximate the average sales price, as determined by the Commission, for contracts entered into or renewed during the period from August 1, 1975, through August 31, 1975, for natural gas produced in the area and sold in intrastate commerce: *Provided*, That until the Commission establishes an area ceiling price in any area, sales of new natural gas may be made pursuant to this Act at the price the producer or other seller charged for the latest sale of natural gas produced nearest to the point of production of the natural gas being sold.". If no such sales were made during the period from August 1, 1975, to August 31, 1975, in a designated area, the Commission shall establish a ceiling price by rule based on the average sales price for contracts most recently entered into or the average sales price in another similarly situated area during the period from August 1, 1975, to August 31, 1975.

"(c) No producer or other seller (as the case may be) may charge and no purchaser may pay a price for the first sale of new natural gas occurring between September 8, 1975, and June 30, 1976, which price exceeds the applicable area ceiling price established by the Commission or if purchased from an intrastate pipeline, the acquisition cost pursuant to contracts entered into prior to September 8, 1975, of such natural gas by the selling intrastate pipeline plus a reasonable charge for any transportation services rendered by a producer or other seller (as the case may be). Any contractual provision prohibiting such sales or transportation or terminating any other obligations of any gas supply or sales contracts as a result of such sales or transportation shall be unenforceable in respect to any such sale or transportation.

"(d) Any new natural gas produced from lands located on the Outer Continental Shelf shall be sold in interstate commerce.

"(e)(1) No new natural gas produced in the United States (except new natural gas produced from lands located on the Outer Continental Shelf) may be sold in interstate commerce unless—

"(A) the purchaser has been designated by the Commission as a priority interstate purchaser; or

"(B) the producer or purchaser has filed a notice of a proposal to sell new natural gas (whether in the form of an offer to sell or a proposed contract to sell such gas) with the Commission at least 15 days prior to sale.

"(2) The Commission shall, by rule, prohibit the sale in interstate commerce from lands located in the United States (except lands located on the Outer Continental Shelf) of any new natural gas to any person other than a priority interstate purchaser if, (A) a priority interstate purchaser, within the 15-day period specified by paragraph (1)(B), offers to purchase such new natural gas under terms and conditions substantially similar to or identical with the terms or conditions of such proposal to sell to which the notice prescribed by paragraph (1)(B) pertains, or (B) if the purchasing pipeline is directly or indirectly connected to a priority interstate purchaser and that priority interstate purchaser has not yet obtained sufficient quantities of natural gas to satisfy the needs of the essential users of such pipeline and the priority interstate purchaser indicates a willingness to purchase such natural gas within the 15-day period specified in paragraph (1)(B), under terms and conditions which the Commission determines are substantially similar to or identical with the terms or conditions of such proposal to sell to which the notice prescribed by subparagraph (B) pertains.

"(3) Paragraph (2) of this subsection shall not apply (A) to sales of new natural gas (i) by a producer that is an affiliate of an interstate pipeline, or (ii) by a producer to a pipeline in the case of an advance payment financing arrangement between such producer and such pipeline entered into prior to September 9, 1975, whereby such pipeline has been granted a right of first refusal, option, or other priority claim to natural gas produced from a property as consideration for advance payments made to such producer to finance exploration or development, or (B) to sales of new natural gas (i) sold pursuant to the Natural Gas Act, and (ii) committed

by contract for a duration in excess of 2 years. No provision of this subsection provides any priority to any interstate purchaser over any intrastate purchaser. If both an interstate purchaser and an intrastate purchaser offer to purchase new natural gas (except new natural gas produced from lands located on the Outer Continental Shelf) from a producer, or other seller, the producer or seller may sell to either purchaser, subject to the prices permitted to be charged under this Act.

"(f) Any interstate purchaser may purchase new natural gas produced from lands located other than on the Outer Continental Shelf pursuant to the provisions of this title, for a period not to exceed 180 days, provided the price of the first sale of such new natural gas does not exceed the applicable price permitted to be paid pursuant to subsection (b) or (c) of this section. Any such sale price shall be deemed just and reasonable for purposes of section 4 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717c) and any such sale to an interstate purchaser shall not require certification of such sale under section 7 of such Act (15 U.S.C. 717f), except certification shall continue to be required for the construction of facilities under the Natural Gas Act and the Commission shall continue to have jurisdiction over transportation charges for new natural gas sold for resale by an interstate pipeline over which the Commission exercised jurisdiction on or before September 8, 1975.

"(g) If the Commission determines that natural gas could have been produced or sold, or both, but was not produced or sold, or both, during the period that this title is in effect, such natural gas may not at any time thereafter be sold at a price above that permitted under this title.

"(h) A priority interstate purchaser shall obtain priority only to the extent necessary to meet the requirements of essential users and the Commission shall take such steps as are within its authority under the Natural Gas Act to assure that any additional supplies of new natural gas obtained by a priority interstate purchaser are made available to essential users.

"(i) The Commission shall encourage and expeditiously consider voluntary agreements between pipelines that are not inconsistent with this title to sell or exchange natural gas or other arrangements that increase the supply of natural gas available to priority interstate purchasers.

"AVAILABILITY OF GAS FOR AGRICULTURAL USERS

"SEC. 204. (a)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law or of any natural gas allocation or curtailment plan in effect under existing law, the Commission shall, by rule, upon petition or upon its own motion prohibit any interruption or curtailment of natural gas supplies, and take such other actions under authority of the Natural Gas Act and this title as the Commission determines to be necessary and appropriate, to assure to the maximum extent practicable the availability of sufficient quantities of natural gas from the interstate pipelines serving the essential agricultural, food processing, or food packaging user for use for any essential agricultural, food processing, or food packaging purposes as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, for which natural gas is necessary, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture including, but not limited to, irrigation pumping, crop drying, and use as a feedstock or process fuel in the production of fertilizer and essential agricultural chemicals in existing plants (for present or expanded capacity) and in new plants.

"(2) No prohibition pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection may be implemented by the Commission in a manner that results in curtailing natural gas supplies to residential users, to small users, to hospitals, or for products and services vital to public health and safety. If an implementation of a prohibition pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection would necessarily and unavoidably result in curtailments to other essential users, the Commission shall, in its discretion, weigh the unemployment impacts to other essential users against the benefits of continuing or increasing natural gas service to the essential agricultural, food processing or packaging users and shall apportion the natural gas supplies available in the most equitable and beneficial manner.

"(b) For purposes of this section, the Secretary of Agriculture shall not determine any use of natural gas to be necessary if such gas is to be used as a boiler fuel to serve (1) expanded capacity of existing facilities, (2) an existing facility for which natural gas supply contracts have expired, (3) new facilities, or (4) an existing facility that has the capability and necessary equipment to burn petroleum products or other alternate fuels, the burning of petroleum products or other alternate fuel by such facility in lieu of natural gas is practicable, and petroleum products or other alternate fuels will be available to such facility. The Secretary of Agriculture shall certify to the Commission the volumes and identify the users of natural gas determined to be necessary for essential agricultural, food processing, or food packaging purposes.

"PROHIBITION OF USE OF NATURAL GAS AS BOILER FUEL

"SEC. 205. (a) The Administrator shall, by rule, prohibit any powerplant from burning natural gas if he determines that—

"(1) such powerplant had, on September 1, 1975 (or at any time thereafter), the capability and necessary plant equipment to burn petroleum products;

"(2) the burning of petroleum products by such plant in lieu of natural gas is practicable;

"(3) petroleum products will be available during the period the order is in effect; and

"(4) natural gas made available as the result of such prohibition could be available, directly or indirectly, to a priority interstate purchaser.

A rule under this subsection shall not take effect (A) until a date which the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency certifies is the earliest date on which such plant can burn, in compliance with the Clean Air Act (including any applicable implementation plan) petroleum products which the Administrator determines, under paragraph (3), are available, or (B) if the Commission certifies to the Administrator that the prohibition under this paragraph will impair the reliability of service in the area served by the plant.

"(b)(1) The Administrator shall, by rule, prohibit the use of natural gas by any powerplant if the Administrator determines—

"(A) that alternative supplies of electric power are available to the electric power system of which such powerplant is a part;

"(B) that the generation of such alternative supply of electric power will not result in an overall increase in consumption of natural gas; and

"(C) natural gas made available as the result of such prohibition could be made available, directly or indirectly, to a priority interstate purchaser.

"(2) A rule under this subsection shall not take effect if the Commission certifies to the Administrator that the prohibition would impair the reliability of service in any area served by those affected electric power systems.

"(c)(1) The Administrator shall exempt from any rule under this section the burning of natural gas for the necessary processes of ignition, startup, testing, and flame stabilization by powerplants.

"(2) Subject to paragraph (1) of this section the Administrator may make a rule under subsection (a) or (b) of this section apply to all natural gas burned by the powerplant to which such rule applies or may specify the periods and amounts of natural gas to which such rule shall apply.

"(d) The Administrator shall, by rule, prohibit the sale, directly or indirectly, to any person other than a priority interstate purchaser of natural gas made available as a result of rules under subsections (a) and (b) of this section.

"(e)(1) If the application of a rule under this section results in a sale of transferred gas by a curtailed user or a supplier of a curtailed user to a person other than such curtailed user or a supplier of such user, such seller may not charge an amount for such transferred gas which exceeds the amount he would have charged such user or supplier (as the case may be). In addition, the person to whom such sale is made shall compensate the curtailed user, and any supplier of such curtailed user, in an amount which is equal to any net increase in such user's reasonable costs for replacement fuel or replacement power, and any net increase in such supplier's or curtailed user's reasonable costs and any other losses which are incurred by such supplier or curtailed user, as a result of the application of the order issued under this section. Such compensation shall be in an amount agreed upon by the parties, or if the parties are unable to agree in an amount determined by the Commission in accordance with the provisions of this section.

"(2) For purposes of this subsection—

"(A) The term 'curtailed user' means a powerplant to which a rule under this section is applicable.

"(B) The term 'transferred natural gas' means natural gas which a curtailed user does not consume by reason of a rule under this section and which is made available to another person.

"(C) A person is a supplier of a curtailed user if he sold natural gas to such user, or sold natural gas to any person for resale (directly or indirectly) to such user.

"(f) This section shall not apply to any powerplant of which the maximum daily use of natural gas does not exceed fifty thousand cubic feet.

"(g) For purposes of this section, the terms 'powerplant' and 'petroleum product' have the same meanings as such terms have under section 2 of the Energy Supply and Environmental Coordination Act of 1974.

"(h) Section 2(f)(1) of the Energy Supply and Environmental Coordination Act of 1974 is amended by striking out 'June 30, 1975' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1976'.

"(i) This section (other than subsection (1)) does not affect any authority under the Energy Supply and Environmental Coordination Act of 1974.

"PRODUCTION OF GAS AT THE MAXIMUM EFFICIENT RATE

"SEC. 206. (a) The Secretary of Interior shall, by rule, require natural gas to be produced from fields, designated by such Secretary, at the maximum efficient rate of product determined for such field.

"(b)(1) Within 45 days after the date of enactment of this title, the Secretary of the Interior, by rule, shall determine the maximum efficient rate of production for each field on Federal lands which such Secretary determines produces, or has the capacity to produce, significant quantities of natural gas.

"(2) Each State or the appropriate agency thereof may determine the maximum efficient rate of production for each field (other than a field on Federal land) within such State which the State or appropriate agency determines produces, or has the capacity to produce, significant quantities of natural gas.

"(3) If, at the end of the 45-day period which begins on the date of enactment of this title, a State or the appropriate agency thereof has not determined the maximum

efficient rate of production for any field (other than a field on Federal land) within such State, which field the Secretary of the Interior determines produces, or has the capacity to produce, significant quantities of natural gas, the Secretary of the Interior may, by rule, specify the maximum efficient rate of production.

"(c) For purposes of this section the term 'maximum efficient rate of production' means the maximum rate of production of natural gas which may be sustained without loss of ultimate recovery of crude oil or natural gas, or both, under sound engineering principles.

"(d) Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize the production from any Naval Petroleum Reserve subject to the provisions of chapter 641 of title 10, United States Code.

"PRICE CONTROL AND ALLOCATION AUTHORITY FOR PROPANE AND OTHER PRODUCTS IN SHORT SUPPLY

"SEC. 207. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 4 (g) or any other provision of the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973, as amended, the regulations promulgated by the President under section 4 of such Act and the authority of the President under such Act shall, with respect to propane and butane, remain in effect for the duration of the supply emergency period.

"PENALTIES

"SEC. 208. (a) (1) Any person who is determined by the Commission, Administrator, or Secretary, after notice and an opportunity for a presentation of views, to have violated a provision of this Act or any rule or order under this title (for which such Commission, the Administrator, or the Secretary has responsibility), shall be liable to the United States for a civil penalty of not more than $10,000 for each violation; and if any such violation is a continuing one, each day of violation constitutes a separate offense. The amount of any such penalty shall be assessed by the Commission, the Administrator or the Secretary by written notice. In determining the amount of such penalty, the Commission, the Administrator or the Secretary (as the case may be) shall take into account the nature, circumstances, extent, and gravity of the violation committed and, with respect to the person found to have committed such violation, the degree of culpability, any history of prior offenses, ability to pay, effect on ability to continue to do business, and such other matters as justice may require.

"(2) Such civil penalty may be recovered in an action brought by the Attorney General on behalf of the United States in the appropriate district court of the United States or, prior to referral to the Attorney General, such civil penalty may be compromised by the Commission, the Administrator, or the Secretary, as may be applicable. The amount of such penalty, when finally determined (or agreed upon in compromise) may be deducted from any sums owed by the United States to the person charged. All penalties collected under this subsection shall be deposited in the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts.

"(b) A person is guilty of an offense if he willfully violates a provision of this title or rule or order under this title. Upon conviction, such person shall be subject, for each offense, to a fine of not more than $25,000, imprisonment for a term not to exceed 5 years, or both.

"ENFORCEMENT

"SEC. 209. (a) The Attorney General, at the request of the Commission, the Administrator, or the Secretary (as the case may be), may bring an action for equitable relief to redress a violation by any person of a provision of this title, or a rule or order under this title. Any other person may bring a civil action alleging a violation of a provision of this title or rule or order under this title.

"(b) The district courts of the United States shall have jurisdiction with respect to any civil action brought under subsection (a). The court shall have the power to grant such equitable relief as is necessary to prevent, restrain, or remedy the effect of such violation, including declaratory judgment, mandatory or prohibitive injunctive relief, and interim equitable relief, and the courts shall further have the power to award (A) compensatory damages to any injured person or class of persons, (B) costs of litigation including reasonable attorney and expert witness fees, and (C) whenever and to the extent deemed necessary or appropriate to defer future violations, punitive damages.

"(c) A rule or order prescribed under this title is subject to judicial review to the extent authorized by, and in accordance with, chapter 7 of title 5, United States Code, except that (A) the second sentence of section 705 thereof is not applicable, and (B) the appropriate court shall only hold unlawful and set aside such a rule or order on a ground specified in subparagraph (A), (B), (C), or (D) of section 706(2) thereof.

"RULEMAKING

"SEC. 210. The Commission, the Administrator, or the Secretary, in addition to the authorities specifically granted herein, may, notwithstanding any other provision of law, require the submission of such information as the Commission, the Administrator, or the Secretary, in their discretion, determines are necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this title, and shall have authority to issue rules and orders applicable to any person which the Commission, the Administrator, or the Secretary (as the case may be) determines are necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this title.

"EXPIRATION

"SEC. 211. Sections 203 (except subsection (g) thereof), 204, 205, 206, 207, and 210 of this title shall expire on midnight, June 30, 1976.

"TITLE III—PRODUCTION AND CONSERVATION INCENTIVES

"SHORT TITLE

"SEC. 301. This title may be cited as the 'Natural Gas Production and Conservation Act'.

"DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 302. As used in this title, the term—

"(1) 'affiliate' means any person directly or indirectly controlling, controlled by, or under common control or ownership with any other person as determined by the Commission pursuant to its rulemaking authority. In promulgating rules to implement this paragraph to specify when one person is an affiliate of another person, the Commission shall consider direct or indirect legal or beneficial interest in another person or any direct or indirect legal power or influence over another person, arising through direct, indirect, or interlocking ownership of capital stock, interlocking directorates or officers, contractual relations, agency agreements or leasing arrangements;

"(2) 'boiler fuel use of natural gas' means the use of natural gas or synthetic natural gas as the source of fuel for the purpose of generating steam or electricity in amounts in excess of 50 Mcf on a peak day;

"(3) 'Federal lands' means any land or subsurface area within the United States which is owned or controlled by the Federal Government or with respect to which the Federal Government has authority, directly or indirectly, to explore for, develop, and produce natural gas, except that nothing in this Act shall amend or change in any way any grant of land or right in land created by the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (18 U.S.C. 437) or any Act granting statehood to a State. The term includes the Outer Continental Shelf, as defined in section 2(a) of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331(a)). The term excludes lands which the Federal Government acquired by mortgage foreclosure and continues to hold mineral interests;

"(4) 'includes' should be read as if the phrase 'but not limited to' were also set forth;

"(5) 'intrastate commerce' means commerce between points within the same State, unless such commerce passes through any place outside such State: *Provided*, That all sales of new natural gas or exempt natural gas produced from Federal lands within a State and consumed within the same State shall be treated as sales of natural gas in interstate commerce;

"(6) 'joint venture' means any undertaking by two or more persons who have a community of interest in the purposes of the undertaking, and who share the right to control or direct the conduct of the undertaking;

"(7) 'Mcf' means one thousand cubic feet of natural gas at 60 degrees Fahrenheit and 14.73 pounds per square inch pressure;

"(8) 'new natural gas' means—

"(A) any natural gas which the Commission in its discretion determines was not dedicated to interstate commerce prior to September 1, 1975; or

"(B) any natural gas which is committed by contract to the intrastate market if such contract, on or after September 1, 1975, terminates and is not renewed or if such natural gas is otherwise available for sale;

"(9) 'old natural gas' means natural gas that, prior to September 8, 1975, was dedicated to interstate commerce on the date of the first delivery of such natural gas as determined by the Commission in its discretion;

"(10) 'paragraph' means a paragraph of the subsection in which the term is used;

"(11) 'pipeline' means a person engaged in the transportation by pipeline of natural gas in interstate commerce except that the term does not include persons who are exempt from the Commission's jurisdiction pursuant to sections 1(b) or 1(c) of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717(b) or 717(c));

"(12) 'producer' means a person who produces and sells natural gas;

"(13) 'purchaser' means a person who purchases or acquires natural gas from a producer or small producer;

"(14) 'residential user' means a person who uses natural gas for personal, family, or household purposes;

"(15) 'section' means a section of this title;

"(16) 'small user' means a person or governmental entity that used not more than 50 Mcf of natural gas on its peak day of natural gas usage in the preceding calendar year;

"(17) 'subsection' means a subsection of the section in which the term is used; and

"(18) 'user' means a person or governmental entity using any natural gas after it is delivered in interstate or intrastate commerce; the term includes a producer or small producer who consumes natural gas (except for transporting or processing natural gas) in facilities owned or controlled or under common control by such producer or small producer.

"NEW CRUDE OIL AND NEW NATURAL GAS PRICING

"SEC. 303. (a) NEW CRUDE OIL PRICE CEILING.—Crude oil that is defined as new crude oil, pursuant to subsection (h)(4), may not be sold or transferred, after the date of enactment of this title, by a producer of crude oil or by an owner of oil-producing land receiving royalties, at a price in excess of $9.00 per barrel plus any increases authorized pursuant to subsection (c). Such ceiling shall apply only to any first sale of new crude oil in the United States.

"(b) OLD CRUDE OIL PRICE CEILING.—Crude

oil that is defined as old crude oil, pursuant to subsection (h)(5), may not be sold or transferred, after the date of enactment of this title, by a producer of crude oil or by an owner of oil-producing land receiving royalties, at a price in excess of $5.25 per barrel. Such ceiling shall apply only to any first sale of old crude oil in the United States.

"(c) NEW CRUDE OIL PRICE CEILING ADJUSTMENT.—Commencing with the month following the date of enactment of this title, and at monthly intervals thereafter, the new crude oil price ceiling enumerated in subsection (a) shall be adjusted by the Administrator for any inflation or deflation by multiplying it by a number whose numerator is the latest available quarterly implicit price deflator for gross national product as of the date of computation and whose denominator is the implicit price deflator for gross national product for the corresponding quarter of the base year 1974, as compiled by the Bureau of Economic Analysis as initially published by the Department of Commerce, but in no event shall such adjustment amount to an increase of more than 5 cents ($0.05) per barrel in any month.

"(d) EXCEPTIONS.—(1) The provisions of subsections (a), (b), and (c) shall not apply to any of the following categories of new crude oil production—

"(A) synthetic oil produced from coal, organic wastes or from other nonconventional sources;

"(B) shale oil;

"(C) heavy oil production.

"(2) The Administrator may, by rule, promulgate a special price ceiling or exempt from price ceilings new crude oil produced by tertiary or a comparable advanced recovery technique or for any category of new crude oil production specified in paragraph (1) if he finds that such a ceiling or exemption is necessary and in the public interest. If any such ceiling or exemption is promulgated, the Administrator shall transmit a copy of such ceiling or exemption and findings to the Congress in writing together with a statement of the reasons therefor. Such a ceiling or exemption shall be known as a special new crude oil price ceiling or exemption. The Administrator may implement a special new crude oil price ceiling or exemption 60 days after the applicable transmittal to the Congress, unless either House of Congress approves a resolution of that House stating in substance that such House disapproves such ceiling or exemption, in accordance with the procedures set forth in section 1017 of Public Law 93-344 (31 U.S.C. 1407). If such a ceiling or exemption is disapproved by either House, the Administrator is authorized to modify the initially proposed special new crude oil price ceiling or exemption, taking note of the reasons for such disapproval. The Administrator may transmit to the Congress a revised special new crude oil price or exemption in accordance with the procedures for an initial transmittal.

"(e) NEW NATURAL GAS PRICE CEILINGS.—(1) Not later than January 1, 1976, the Commission shall establish a national price ceiling applicable to any first sale of new natural gas in the United States. Such price ceiling shall become effective midnight, June 30, 1976, and shall to the maximum extent practicable approximate the average sales price, as determined by the Commission, for contracts entered into or renewed during the period August 1, 1975, through November 1, 1975, for natural gas produced and sold in intrastate commerce but in no event shall such price ceiling exceed $1.30 per Mcf.

"(2) The Commission shall, by rule, provide that no producer may charge, and no purchaser may pay, a price for any first sale of new natural gas in the United States occurring after November 1, 1975, which exceeds (A) the national price ceiling established by the Commission under paragraph (1) plus any increases authorized pursuant to paragraph (3); or (B) the applicable special new natural gas price, if any, established pursuant to subsection (f).

"(3) Commencing with the month following the date of enactment of this title, and at monthly intervals thereafter (notwithstanding that the national price ceiling becomes effective midnight, June 30, 1976), the new natural gas national price ceiling enumerated in paragraph (1) shall be adjusted by the Commission for any inflation or deflation by multiplying it by a number whose enumerator is the latest available quarterly implicit price deflator for gross national product as of the date of computation and whose denominator is the implicit price deflator for gross national product for the corresponding quarter of the base year 1974, as compiled by the Bureau of Economic Analysis as initially published by the Department of Commerce, but in no event shall such adjustment amount to an increase of more than 1 cent ($0.01) per Mcf in any month.

"(f) EXCEPTIONS OF NEW NATURAL GAS CEILINGS.—(1) The provisions of subsection (e) shall not apply to any of the following categories of new natural gas production—

"(A) synthetic natural gas;

"(B) new natural gas produced from wells that exceed 20,000 feet in depth;

"(C) new natural gas produced from wells located in water at depths in excess of 600 feet;

"(D) new natural gas produced from low-porosity rock formations.

"(2) The Commission may, by rule, promulgate a special price ceiling for any category of new natural gas production specified in paragraph (1) if it finds that such a ceiling is necessary and in the public interest. If any such ceiling is promulgated, the Commission shall submit a copy of such ceiling and findings to the Congress in writing together with a statement of the reasons therefor. Such a ceiling shall be known as a special new natural gas price ceiling. The Commission may implement a special new natural gas price ceiling 60 days after the applicable submission to the Congress,".

"(g) PRESIDENTIAL REPORT.—On January 1, 1980, the President shall submit recommendations and the reasons therefor in writing to Congress together with any proposed changes in the price ceilings for new crude oil, new natural gas, or both. Such proposed changes in price ceilings for new crude oil and new natural gas shall be effective 60 days after the applicable submission to the Congress, unless either House of Congress approves a resolution of that House stating in substance that such House disapproves such change or changes, in accordance with the procedures set forth in section 1017 of Public Law 93-344 (31 U.S.C. 1407). If any such change is disapproved by either House, the President may modify the initially proposed recommendation and change, taking note of the reasons for such disapproval. The President may submit a revised proposed change in any such price ceiling, subject to the procedure for an initial submission.

"(h) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section, the term—

"(1) 'Administrator' means the Administrator of the Federal Energy Administration;

"(2) 'base period production level' means a number which shall be computed monthly, subject to supervision by the Administrator, by each producer of crude oil and each owner of oil-producing land receiving royalties. Such number shall be equal to (A) the number of barrels of crude oil, defined by the Administrator under the 'old crude oil' definition in effect on August 31, 1975, pursuant to the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Act of 1973, produced during the year prior to the date of enactment of this section; (B) divided by 12; (C) reduced by 1.67 percent of such quotient for each month that has elapsed since the month following such date of enactment; and (D) increased by the amount, if any, by which the base period production level for any preceding months exceeded the actual production of such producer or owner during such month;

"(3) 'crude oil' means all hydrocarbons, regardless of gravity, that exist in a liquid in underground reservoirs and that remain liquid at atmospheric pressure after passing through surface separating facilities, and lease condensate, which is a natural gas liquid recovered in associated production by lease separators;

"(4) 'new crude oil' means the total number of barrels of domestic crude oil produced from leased or owned property during a specific month less the base period production level for such month; and

"(5) 'old crude oil' means the total number of barrels of domestic crude oil produced from leased or owned property during a specific month, up to the base period production level for such month.

"(i) ADJUSTMENTS TO NEW NATURAL GAS PRICE CEILING.—A producer shall increase or reduce the price at which he sells natural gas to a purchaser by the following factors:

"(1) a gathering allowance as specified by the Commission for any gathering actually performed by the producer or small producer;

"(2) the actual costs of removing carbon trastate commerce must comply with the provisions of this Act concerning new natural gas.

"(3) any amount actually paid by a producer or small producer for State or Federal production, severance, or similar taxes;

"(4) a proportional adjustment for British thermal unit (Btu) content from a base of one thousand Btu's per cubic foot of natural gas at 60 degrees Fahrenheit and 14.73 pounds per square inch pressure; and

"(5) an amount equal to the uncompensated value of any advance payments or any other form of compensation paid to the producer or small producer.

"(j) TREATMENT OF OTHER GAS.—After the date of enactment of this title, all sales of natural gas in interstate commerce that are not sales of old natural gas must comply with the provisions of this title concerning new natural gas.

"(2) After the date of enactment of this title, all dedications of natural gas in intrastate commerce must comply with the provisions of this Act concerning new natural gas.

"FILING REQUIREMENT

"SEC. 304. All purchasers shall file with the Commission all new natural gas sales contracts, transfer agreements, or any other transfer arrangements.

"OLD NATURAL GAS

"SEC. 305. The Commission, notwithstanding any other provision of law, shall not authorize an increase in the price charged by a producer of old natural gas unless such an increase is necessary—

"(1) to cover the cost of production (including deeper drilling or reworking operations) of such old natural gas and to provide a reasonable rate of return on investment to such producer or small producer; or

"(2) to afford (A) such a producer a price which is equal to a cost-based price which the Commission has authorized a similarly situated producer of old natural gas; or (B) such a small producer a price that is equal to a cost-based price which the Commission has authorized a similarly situated small producer to charge for old natural gas.

"RESIDENTIAL AND OTHER SMALL USERS

"SEC. 306. (a) GENERAL.—The Commission shall—

"(1) require all pipelines to file separate tariffs with respect to (A) old natural gas, (B) new natural gas, and (C) synthetic or liquefied natural gas, in such form and manner as to reflect the price and average an-

nual volumes of each which enter each such pipeline;

"(2) require all pipelines to give first priority for sales or transfers under the applicable tariff for old natural gas to local distribution companies, to the extent such old natural gas is available, to meet the requirements of each such company's residential users and small users; and

"(3) promulgate rules to govern sales, exchanges, or transfers among pipelines and sales, exchanges, or transfers to local distribution companies served by multiple pipelines, to the extent necessary to achieve the purpose of this section.

"(b) ENFORCEMENT.—It shall be unlawful for local distribution companies to charge residential users and small users rates which do not reflect the lesser cost of old natural gas for such users. It shall be the duty of the State utility commissions to assure that the benefits of the old natural gas tariffs are reflected in the rates to such residential and small users.

"INCREASING NATURAL GAS SUPPLIES

"SEC. 307. (a) PROMPT CERTIFICATION.—All applications, except where two or more natural gas companies file competing and mutually exclusive applications under section 7(c) of this Act (5 U.S.C. 717f(c)), for the construction of pipeline facilities subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission shall be decided by the Commission in accordance with this subsection. The Commission shall grant (with or without conditions) or deny such applications within 120 days of the filing of an application, or within 120 days after the date of enactment of this title in the case of applications pending before the Commission on such date. The 120-day period shall commence on the date on which such applications contain all of the information required by the Commission. If the Commission fails to grant or deny any such application within the applicable 120-day period, the Commission shall be deemed to have approved such application as last submitted.

"(b) EXEMPTION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, sales of new natural gas (except synthetic or liquefied natural gas) by producers or by small producers may be made without any application for a certificate of public convenience and necessity under section 7(c) of this Act (15 U.S.C. 717f (c)) and such sale shall be made at a price pursuant to the applicable provisions of section 303, and if applicable in accordance with section 202(8).

"(c) COMMON CARRIER.—After date of enactment of this title the Commission shall, as a prerequisite to granting any certificate of public convenience and necessity for facilities for transporting or gathering natural gas on Federal lands, require such transportation and gathering facilities to be common carriers for use by any pipeline to transport natural gas upon payment of a reasonable transportation fee. The Commission shall require other natural gas gathering and transportation systems to operate on such a common-carrier basis for use by any pipeline to the extent that surplus capacity is available.

"(d) PRODUCTION REQUIREMENT.—(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any agreement (including a renegotiation) pertaining to natural gas or oil development on Federal lands which is consummated on or after the date of enactment of this title shall require, as a condition to such agreement, that the person granted the right of development shall design and immediately implement an exploratory and development program to obtain maximum efficient rates of production from such lands as soon as practicable, subject to submission of such program to, and its approval by, the Secretary of the Interior. The person granted any right of development shall in writing immediately inform the Commission of the discovery of natural gas on any such lands, and within 90 days after such a discovery shall submit to the Commission an estimate of volumes discovered and a timetable for commercial development. Such a person shall prepare and submit to the Commission a detailed timetable of the actions necessary for the speedy development and production of such natural gas. Such a person shall contract for the sale of such natural gas in interstate commerce within 2 years after the date of discovery unless the Commission finds, upon the petition of the person granted such rights, that the volumes of natural gas discovered or developed are not sufficient to be commercially viable or that other valid reasons exist (including the possibility in certain frontier areas, such as Alaska, where transportation costs are so high that additional discoveries of natural gas in the area are likely and could materially reduce transportation costs), but not including market demand prorationing, which justify delaying the production until a subsequent date certain. If such a petition is granted, the Commission shall require the person granted such rights to submit monthly reports of actions taken to begin production at the earliest possible time. The Commission shall also advise other interested Federal agencies and assure that all possible steps are taken to commence the production of this natural gas at the earliest possible time.

"(2) Unless a contract is entered into for the sale of such natural gas within 2 years after the date of discovery of natural gas on such Federal lands, or unless such petition is granted, and in effect and its terms complied with, the rights that had been granted the person to develop natural gas or oil on the Federal lands covered by such agreement shall terminate and any sum paid for such rights shall be forfeited.

"(3) With respect to agreements pertaining to natural gas or oil development on Federal lands (other than agreements entered into for the purpose of establishing strategic reserves) consummated prior to the date of enactment of this title, the requirements of paragraphs (1) and (2) of this subsection shall be applicable to the fullest extent legally permissible. To the extent that such requirements cannot legally be made applicable to any such agreements, such agreements shall be terminated at the earliest possible date in order to make such requirements applicable.

"(4) In order to facilitate the enforcement of this subsection, the Secretary of the Interior shall report to the Congress and the Commission, within 90 days after the date of enactment of this title and annually thereafter, on the status of all Federal lands leased or planned to be leased in the subsequent year for natural gas and oil development. Each such report shall list all parcels planned to be leased in the subsequent year and parcels leased; the name, address, and affiliates of the holder of such lease; the Interior Department's prelease evaluation of probable quantities and values of natural gas and oil underlying such lease; the number of exploratory and developmental wells drilled to date; whether natural gas and oil have been discovered at the time of the report; the date on which any natural gas or oil not being produced was discovered; estimated reserves of natural gas and oil; and annual production of natural gas and oil therefrom.

"(e) RESOURCE EVALUATION.—In estimating the value of natural gas on Federal lands for the purpose of determining the sufficiency of any bid, the Secretary of the Interior shall utilize the appropriate applicable price ceiling established by the Commission as adjusted pursuant to section 303.

"(f) DEDICATION REQUIREMENTS.—After the date of enactment of this title, all production of new natural gas from Federal lands shall be sold or transferred to a pipeline.

"(g) RESERVE INFORMATION.—(1) The Commission is further authorized and directed to conduct studies of the production, gathering, storage, transportation, distribution, and sale of natural, artificial, or synthetic gas, however produced throughout the United States and its possession whether or not otherwise subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission, including the production, gathering, storage, transportation, distribution, and sale of natural, artificial, or synthetic gas by any agency, authority, or instrumentality of the United States, or of any State or municipality or political subdivision of a State. It shall, insofar as practicable, secure and keep current information regarding the ownership, operation, management, and control of all facilities for production, gathering, storage, transportation, distribution, and sale; the total estimated natural gas reserve of fields or reservoirs and the current utilization of natural gas and the relationship between the two; the cost of production, gathering, storage, transportation, distribution, and sale; the rates, charges, and contracts in respect to the sale of natural gas and its service to residential, rural, commercial, and industrial consumers and other purchasers by private and public agencies; and the relation of any and all such facts to the development of conservation, industry, commerce, and the national defense. The Commission shall report to the Congress and may publish and make available the results of studies made under the authority of this subsection.

"(2) In making studies, investigations, and reports under this section, the Commission shall utilize, insofar as practicable, the services, studies, reports, information, and programs of existing departments, bureaus, offices, agencies, and other entities of the United States, of the several States, and of the natural-gas industry. Nothing in this section shall be construed as modifying, reassigning, or otherwise affecting the investigative and reporting activities, duties, powers, and functions of any other department, bureau, office, or agency in the Federal Government.

"AVAILABILITY OF GAS FOR AGRICULTURAL USERS

"SEC. 308. (a)(1) Notwithstanding any other provision of law or of any natural gas allocation or curtailment plan in effect under existing law, the Commission shall, by rule, upon petition or upon its own motion prohibit any interruption or curtailment of natural gas supplies, and take such other actions under authority of the Natural Gas Act and this title as the Commission determines to be necessary and appropriate, to assure to the maximum extent practicable the availability of sufficient quantities of natural gas from the interstate pipelines serving the essential agricultural, food processing, or food packaging user for use for any essential agricultural, food processing, or food packaging purposes as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture, for which natural gas is necessary, as determined by the Secretary of Agriculture including, but not limited to, irrigation pumping, crop drying, and use as a feedstock or process fuel in the production of fertilizer and essential agricultural chemicals in existing plants (for present or expanded capacity) and in new plants.

"(2) No prohibition pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection may be implemented by the Commission in a manner that results in curtailing natural gas supplies to residential users, to small users, to hospitals, or for products and services vital to public health and safety. If an implementation of a prohibition pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection would necessarily and unavoidably result in curtailments to other essential users, the Commission shall, in its descretion, weigh the unemployment impacts to other essential users against the benefits of continuing natural gas service to the essential agricultural, food processing or packaging users and shall apportion

the natural gas supplies available in the most equitable and beneficial manner.

"(b) For purposes of this section, the Secretary of Agriculture shall not determine any use of natural gas to be necessary if such gas is to be used as a boiler fuel to serve (1) expanded capacity of existing facilities, (2) an existing facility for which natural gas supply contracts have expired, (3) new facilities, or (4) an existing facility that has the capability and necessary equipment to burn petroleum products or other alternate fuels, the burning of petroleum products or other alternate fuel by such facility in lieu of natural gas is practicable, and petroleum products or other alternate fuels will be available to such facility. The Secretary of Agriculture shall certify to the Commission the volumes and identify the users of natural gas determined to be necessary for essential agricultural, food processing, or food packaging purposes.

"(c) ESSENTIAL INDUSTRIAL PURPOSES.—Except to the extent that natural gas supplies are required to maintain natural gas service to users specified under subsection (a), the Commission shall exercise its authority under this title to assure, to the maximum extent feasible, the continuance of natural gas service to users using natural gas as a raw material and uses other than boiler fuel for which there is no substitute regardless of whether such users purchase natural gas under firm or interruptible contracts.

(c) PROMPT CURTAILMENT DECISIONS.—The Commission shall decide applications for relief under subsections (a) and (b) as soon as practicable, but in no event later than 120 days of the time such applications are filed.

"NATURAL GAS CONSERVATION

"SEC. 309. (a) GENERAL.—The Commission shall by rule prohibit all boiler fuel use of natural gas in interstate and intrastate commerce if such use is not initially contracted for prior to January 1, 1975, by users other than residential or small user unless, upon petition by a user, the Commission determines that—

"(1) alternative energy supplies, other than crude oil or products refined therefrom or propane, produced in any State are not available to such user; or

"(2) it is not feasible to utilize such alternative fuels at the time of such Commission determination.

"(b) Existing Contracts.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), paragraph (3), boiler fuel use of natural gas contracted for prior to January 1, 1975, shall be terminated by the user of such natural gas at the expiration of such contract or 10 years after the date of enactment of this section, whichever is earlier, unless, upon petition of such user, the Commission determines that (A) alternative fuels, other than crude oil or products refined therefrom and propane, are not available to such user, or (B) it is not feasible or practicable to utilize such alternative fuels at the time of such Commission determination. The Commission shall modify or terminate certificates of public convenience and necessity relating to such contracts, to the extent necessary to carry out the purpose of this subsection.

"(2) Except as expressly provided in paragraph (1), the Commission shall not (A) modify, amend, or abrogate contracts entered into prior to January 1, 1975, for the sale or transportation of natural gas for boiler fuel use, (B) modify, amend or abrogate certificates of public convenience and necessity authorizing the sale or transportation of natural gas under such contracts, except upon application duly made by the holder of a certificate under section 7 of this Act; or (C) prevent, impair, or limit, either directly or indirectly, the performance of any such contract or certificate: *Provided,* That the provisions of this paragraph shall not otherwise modify or affect the authority of the Commission under this Act.

"(3) The Commission shall not prohibit the boiler fuel use of natural gas by any facility for the necessary processes of ignition, startup, testing, and flame stabilization, or for the purpose of alleviating short-term air quality emergencies or any other danger to the public health, safety, or welfare.".

"(c) PROCEDURE.—In implementing the provisions of this section with respect to intrastate commerce, the Commission shall apply the provisions of section 17 to this Act (15 U.S.C. 717p).

"(d) EFFECT ON OTHER LAWS.—Nothing in this title shall impair any requirement in any State or Federal law pertaining to safety or environmental protection. The Commission, in determining feasibility or practicability, where required by this section, shall not assume that there will be any lessening in any safety or environmental requirement established pursuant to State or Federal law.".

SEC. 4. Section 2 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717a) is amended (1) by inserting in paragraph (7) thereof after "thereof," and before "but only insofar" the following: "or between a point upon Federal lands within a State and any other point,"; (2) by inserting in paragraph (5) thereof (A) after "gas" and before "unmixed" the following: "produced from a gas well or an oil well" and (B) by inserting after "natural" and before "and" the following: "synthetic"; and (3) by inserting the following new paragraph:

"(10) 'synthetic natural gas' means gas entering a pipeline or intrastate pipeline or local distribution company produced from any source other than a gas well or an oil well. As used in this paragraph 'intrastate pipeline' means a person engaged in the transportation by pipeline of natural gas in intrastate commerce.".

SEC. 5. Section 20 of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717s) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) Any district court of the United States in which venue is appropriate under section 1391 of title 28, United States Code, shall have jurisdiction, without regard to the citizenship of the parties or the amount in controversy, with respect to any civil action involving any alleged violation of (1) the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717(a) et seq.), the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 791a et seq.), or any other Federal law under which Congress directs the Commission to exercise any independent regulatory function; (2) any duly authorized rule, regulation, or license issued under any such law; or (3) any condition of any certificate of public convenience and necessity issued by the Commission under any such law. The court shall have the power to grant such equitable relief as is necessary to prevent, restrain, or remedy the effect of such violation, including declaratory judgment, mandatory or prohibitive injunctive relief, and interim equitable relief, and the court shall further have the power to award (A) compensatory damages to any injured person or class of persons, (B) costs of litigation including reasonable attorney and expert witness fees, and (C) whenever and to the extent deemed necessary or appropriate to deter future violations, punitive damages. Any court of appeals of the United States in which venue is appropriate under section 1391 of title 28, United States Code, shall have jurisdiction, upon petition by the Commission, to grant appropriate mandatory or prohibitive injunctive relief, and, at any time interim equitable relief.".

SEC. 6. The Bureau of Economic Analysis shall continue to compile, and the Department of Commerce shall continue to publish, the implicit price deflator for gross national product, in accordance with procedures consistent with those in effect on January 1, 1975, in order to carry out the purposes of this Act.

SEC. 7. If any part of this Act is declared unconstitutional, or the applicability thereof to any person or circumstances is held invalid, the applicability of such part to other persons and circumstances and the constitutionality or validity of every other part of the Act shall not be affected thereby.

ORDER FOR STAR PRINT—AMENDMENT NO. 948

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a star print of this amendment as modified, together with any additional modifications which I may make today.

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

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, these modifications are all, with several exceptions, of a technical and clarifying nature. I shall attempt to describe those which are not of such a nature.

By inadvertence, an allocation of natural gas supplies to agricultural uses, including manufacture of fertilizer, was excluded from the amendment as originally introduced. One of the modifications simply reestablishes the agricultural allocation authority.

In addition, the amendment as printed created a class of new gas produced in association with oil, and as to that class of new gas continued FPC cost based regulation. That was not the intention of the author of this amendment. The intention, in fact, is to completely eliminate FPC regulation of all natural gas production that is based on historical costs in order to establish a simple easily administered system for wellhead natural gas prices.

With this modification, old gas remains frozen and all new gas, including new gas produced in association with oil, would be permitted to rise to a ceiling of $1.30 per Mcf. Thereafter that ceiling would be indexed to the GNP deflator in order to accommodate production costs increased by inflation in the future.

The modifications also clarify the date after which gas produced is classified as new gas. That date is now, as a result of this modification, September 1, 1975.

In addition, and finally, Mr. President, these modifications will permit certain utilities which otherwise might be required to convert from natural gas to alternative fuels to retain natural gas if it is supplied to them under existing contracts and for periods up to as long as 10 years.

Mr. President, this amendment is offered as a substitute for the so-called Pearson-Bentsen amendment. That amendment provides the worst of all worlds. It establishes OPEC regulation for domestic onshore natural gas production and it continues FPC regulation for domestic offshore natural gas production.

Onshore, all regulation would cease and the undenied result would be an increase of natural gas prices to at least the equivalent OPEC level for oil.

I say "at least" because it is probable that the OPEC oil prices would be exceeded in the case of natural gas because of the extreme shortages of this premium fuel.

When asked how high the price would go, the Chairman of the Federal Power

Commission during hearings on the subject in the Commerce Committee said that the price would instantly rise on spot basis to $3 per mcf.

The highest certificated interstate price for natural gas is now about 52 cents. In the intrastate market, the unregulated intrastate market, the price has hit as high as $2, but if the demand, the pent-up, strong demand of some 45 consuming States, is added to the demand for natural gas in the States that produce it, it is not difficult to understand that the price would rise, and rise very substantially above the unregulated price in the intrastate market.

Having already reached as high as $2 in the intrastate market, it is conservative to conclude that it would reach $3, with a demand of 45 States added on, and that is just the immediate consequence.

Over time, with industrial users and all the interstate pipelines competing for this limited supply of natural gas, the price would rise higher.

The result of that increase in the price of natural gas would be rising unemployment, more inflation, and a resumption of the recession. The analyses of the Budget Committee of this body, confirmed by analyses of others, including some by the Federal Power Commission and the Joint Economic Committee, indicate that the overall price level would rise an additional 2.2 percent by the end of 1977 if the Pearson-Bentsen amendment was adopted. The same study indicates also that by the end of 1977 the level of employment would rise by 650,000.

The recession would resume. The result would not be more natural gas. As a matter of fact, the administration's own Project Independence concluded that beyond the price of 85 cents the high price for natural gas at the wellhead does not produce more gas. It cannot produce gas which simply does not exist. To the extent gas supplies are marginally increased, that production becomes extremely expensive.

The immediate deregulation of natural gas would force natural gas prices in the interstate market to increase 400 to 600 percent. Under the Pearson-Bentsen amendment the natural gas price in the intrastate market, now unregulated, would also increase. It would increase by approximately 100 percent. Those prices are far in excess of the price necessary to optimize supply. It is possible that these prices will, in fact, decrease supply.

We have observed in the case of gasoline production in the United States, and also in the case of crude oil production abroad, the power to maintain a high price or to increase the price by actually decreasing production. The same phenomenon which has taken place in the case of gasoline in the United States last spring and oil in the world, as recently as only a week or so ago, could happen in the case of natural gas.

Also, these prices create inflation in the energy industry as well as in the economy at large.

Energy prices, that is to say leasehold costs, equipment costs and labor costs, have risen about 50 percent in the last 2 years, far in excess of the general increases in prices in the economy.

As these prices produce greater revenues and greater profits within the industry, the companies, among themselves, drive up all of their production costs so that the revenues end up going into increased production costs instead of into increased production, and we end up without more energy and with a very high priced energy industry.

As a matter of fact, the domestic production of oil and gas, in spite of a quadrupling of oil prices, has declined.

Offshore the situation is even more serious because there FPC regulation is continued and FPC regulation with new standards that are inconsistent—they conflict with one another, have no definition of law—would have to be applied in the course of protracted regulatory proceedings, and in the course of litigation in the courts.

The Pearson-Bentsen amendment establishes wellhead price regulation for offshore production, and the criteria for that offshore reduction are fourfold. The FPC in determining wellhead rates is to consider prospective costs. It is prevented from considering current costs, yet those are the only costs that can be considered in connection with leasehold expenses. Leasehold bonuses are current or retroactive costs. They are not prospective. This requirement would mean that the FPC had to consider an unascertainable future cost as opposed to the relevant and ascertainable past cost, the cost of the lease.

The FPC is also required, in determining the wellhead rates, to consider "the rate necessary to achieve optimum deliveries of natural gas." Also, "the rate necessary to promote conservation of natural gas," and, finally, "the rate necessary to protect consumers from price increases attributable to shortage conditions."

Those criteria, Mr. President, are inconsistent. One criterion says protect the consumers from price increases, in other words bring down the price, and the other two say reflect the rate necessary to achieve optimum deliveries and conservation, which means an increased price.

I am not sure that it is possible for the FPC or the courts to give such conflicting criteria any meaning at all. But clearly the efforts to do so will consume a great deal of time, both in the FPC and subsequently in the courts, with the end result that the producers are faced with continued uncertainty about price and, as a result, will curtail exploration and production from developed leases.

That is precisely the complaint that has been made against FPC regulation in the past, and with good reason. The uncertainty about the future price for natural gas has caused producers to withhold production and just not develop leases which otherwise might now be producing natural gas for a country that is starved for natural gas. They withhold development and production in anticipation of higher prices. They would have that very same incentive, to withhold production, as a result of this continuation of FPC regulation in the offshore domain.

So this amendment, the Pearson-Bentsen amendment, through its provision for OPEC control of domestic natural gas prices, has inflationary consequences and, through its continuation of FPC regulation offshore, aggravates the shortages from which the country is already suffering.

Mr. President, there is a better way to do it. The United States does not need to leave the control of domestic wellhead prices for either oil or natural gas to the governments of foreign producers. There is no question but what the effect of decontrol is exactly that. Domestic energy prices rise to levels established by the governments of the foreign oil producers or to higher levels. I think it would be a higher level in the case of natural gas. That is beyond dispute. The price of unregulated intrastate gas has already risen to a level very close to that established by the OPEC producers for oil.

There is not much question, either, though there is some question about the degree, that the effect of OPEC-established energy prices is both inflationary and recessionary. Indeed, it was not very long ago that the President of the United States and the Secretary of State were rattling the saber. They came close to threatening war against the foreign oil producers for bringing the world to the edge of depression. It is inconsistent for the President now to criticize Congress for failing to establish the same OPEC prices for domestic energy at the wellhead. Yet that is what he is proposing. And it is inconsistent to suggest decontrolled prices for natural gas at the wellhead, while recognizing, belatedly, that there must be some protection in the case of oil from OPEC pricing of domestic supplies. The administration has recognized the need for a ceiling oil price in order to prevent domestic prices from rising to the OPEC level. It has not, for reasons which are unclear, accepted the same logic with respect to natural gas.

Mr. President, the amendment which I have offered would establish a reasonable ceiling for both oil and gas. For the first time, it recognizes that neither one can be priced without reference to the other. In fact, the disparity between oil and natural gas pricing in the United States is one of the reasons why the country now faces a natural gas shortage. As long as natural gas is priced at an artificially low level, the incentive has been great to burn that premium fuel in short supply, and the incentive has been great to produce the higher-priced oil, which is in relatively ample supply. If that disparity is continued, the shortages will continue.

The Pearson-Bentsen amendment would eliminate it over time by simply letting both rise to the OPEC level or higher. The amendment which I have offered, Mr. President, recognizes that the price of oil has been too high and the price of natural gas has been too low; and, instead of letting both rise to the

OPEC level or higher, it therefore brings down the price of oil and up the price of natural gas and, over a period of 5 years, it would establish a single tier comprehensive price celing for both.

At that point, there would no longer be a need for a complex allocation system. The many tiers which exist under the House-passed bill and under the Emergency Allocation Act would be replaced by a single tier price ceiling for all domestic natural gas except that which is most expensively produced: tertiary recovery, for example. The high cost natural gas and oil would simply be exempted from this ceiling, and permitted to rise.

Mr. President, this amendment accomplishes that result by establishing a $9 per barrel ceiling price for new domestic oil, which would remain constant in real dollars over a period of 5 years. Quarterly increases are limited to the GNP deflater; but those increases are not to exceed 5 cents per barrel per month. It then phases out prices controls on old domestic oil over a 5-year period, up to the ceiling established for new oil. The Federal Energy Administration is authorized, subject to congressional approval, to exempt from this ceiling the high cost of production categories, in addition to tertiary recovery, and also heavy oils and synthetic oils, and the Federal Power Commission would have similar authority with respect to natural gas.

It also establishes a single ceiling price for all new natural gas, based on the average new natural gas price in the intrastate market from August to November of 1975, but not to exceed $1.30 per Mcf, with quarterly increases, as in the case of oil, based on the GNP deflater, but in this case not to exceed 1 cent per Mcf per month.

At the expiration of the 5-year period, the President could modify or eliminate the pricing formulas, subject to disapproval by either House of Congress.

Mr. President, the $1.30 price established for natural gas as the initial ceiling for new natural gas is not only the current average price for natural gas in the intrastate market; it is also the same as the average price initially established for oil under this amendment, on a Btu equivalent basis. In that way, no rollback for natural gas is required; it is the average intrastate price now. We simply prevent extortionate price increases. But we also establish, and for the first time, this relationship between natural gas and oil, and the relationship is maintained over the 5-year period, because price increases for both are geared to the same index, the GNP deflator.

A question has arisen about the adequacy of that $9 price. That figure of $9, Mr. President, is not picked out of the air. It is a generous price. It reflects, among other things, comments and suggestions by the administration and by the industry, made as recently as early in 1974.

In January 1974, the Federal Energy Office said:

> The long-term supply price of bringing in the alternate sources of energy in this country as well as drilling the Outer Continental Shelf and the North Slope is $7 a barrel.

The Department of the Treasury in December 1973 said:

> No one knows exactly what the long-term supply price is and, as no one can predict the future that clearly, our best estimate is that it would be in the neighborhood of $7 per barrel within the next few years.

Mr. President, the average price established under this amendment for oil between the new oil price of $9 and the old oil price is $7, and that average price, of course, rises as the old oil is decontrolled and as the new oil goes up with the rate of inflation.

The Independent Petroleum Association of America in its 1973 projection said:

> In terms of constant 1973 dollars an average price of about $6.65 per barrel for crude oil would be required over the long run to achieve 85 percent self-sufficiency in oil and gas by 1980.

The National Petroleum Council, in a study issued December 1973, projected barrel of oil prices necessary to produce various rates of return for the industry, in a table which was part of its oil and gas availability study; then it concluded that for maximum energy self-sufficiency by 1985 the industry required a 15-percent rate of return on investment, and that required an oil price of $6.62 per barrel.

Mr. President, the average price established by this amendment according to the industry's own figure would give the industry a 20-percent rate of return.

The Oil and Gas Journal in September 1973 said:

> The price outlook for domestic crude thus has to be rated promising. The new prices make investment attractive in the new equipment and services to rejuvenate marginal wells. Risks are becoming worth taking.

This amendment offers higher prices.

The Petroleum Independent, November 1973, said:

> There is no doubt that prospects are for increased drilling. Everybody I know is planning on it. With new oil price from $5.30 to $6 per barrel, there is incentive now to go looking for oil.

This amendment, even with allowances for inflation, offers the industry a higher price than that.

Mr. President, much has been made of the rate of return for the oil companies, and it has been claimed in the past that the rate of return, return on equity, of this industry is not equal to that for other industries. These comparisons rarely take into account the unique accounting procedures in the oil industry, which, for example, permit write-offs for intangible drilling costs, artificially depressing the return on investment. But, even without making such allowances, this has been a highly profitable industry, more profitable than most others, and with decontrol would become still more so.

Mr. President, the profits of the U.S. oil companies after taxes more than doubled from 1972 to 1974. The return on stockholders' equity of the 20 largest companies rose from 9.6 percent, figured very conservatively, in 1972, to 15 percent in 1973, and 19 percent in 1974.

The average after-tax return on equity for domestic operations for the 10 largest oil companies rose from 11.3 percent in 1973 to 14.2 percent in 1974, despite the embargo, despite the price controls and a business recession.

What happens next, of course, depends on some imponderables, including the state of business recovery and the future OPEC price increases.

I point out that as OPEC increases the price abroad, if not controlled at home, the price rises, and the industry profits increase. The industry has no incentive, therefore, to bargain with the foreign oil producers for lower prices. On the contrary, it has every incentive to go along from its vulnerable position and to go along because, to do so means higher prices and profits from domestic operations.

An OPEC increase of the magnitude just experienced—in other words, about $1.35 per barrel—boosts annual company revenues from U.S. production by about $5 billion without controls. If the existing controls were retained under the Emergency Allocation Act, that increase could boost the revenues of the domestic companies by about $3 billion.

With immediate decontrol of domestic wellhead prices and an OPEC increase of about $1.35 per barrel, the 1976 revenues on domestic oil for the oil companies would be about 80 percent greater than in 1974.

As I have indicated already, the return on equity for 1974 from all operations was about 20 percent, and from domestic operations it was more than 14 percent. This increase in revenues is based almost entirely on United States domestic production.

The component, according to a study conducted very recently by the Joint Economic Committee, traceable to the pass through of higher foreign crude oil prices is only $3.6 billion. Some $25.9 billion would be paid for domestically produced fuels; and of this, some $23.5 billion would redound to the oil and gas industry, as opposed to royalty owners.

If investment in domestic exploration and development grows by 50 percent in 1976, in response to decontrolled prices and such windfall profits, the increase over estimated 1975 levels would be about $4.25 billion, excluding lease bonuses.

If this amount of oilfield investment materialized, with deductions for intangible drilling costs and other expenses of about 70 percent and an effective Federal corporate tax rate of about 35.6 percent on the windfall profit after allowance for the remaining applications of percentage depletion, the companies would end up with about $9 billion in windfall after tax corporate profits.

This after-tax windfall would boost the industry's domestic rate of return by about 12 percentage points and its worldwide return by perhaps 7 percentage points. It could easily put the after-tax rate of return in the domestic oil and gas industry near 25 percent in 1976 and even higher in 1977.

For the crude production segment of the industry, profits would go still higher. With those profits, of course, the industry could subsidize its refining and marketing operations—the major oil companies could, the integrated companies—and eliminate the little remaining competition from independent refiners and independent marketers.

Those figures, Mr. President, indicating a 25-percent increase in the rate of return for 1976 over 1975, do not include the windfalls to others, including the windfalls to royalty owners and the suppliers of this industry.

The increase in oilfield investment spending in 1974 was accompanied by a roughly 25 percent jump in drilling costs. Costs have continued to rise rapidly since then. The large infusions of capital anticipated would renew the inflationary pressures in this industry. Their production costs already have increased by about 50 percent since 1972.

So the result of all these profits is more energy inflation, a more expensive energy industry, and not increased production.

What happens then, of course, is that the companies are tempted to invest in other enterprises. Some are energy related. They expand their holdings of coal resources. The integrated companies already control about 50 percent of the Nation's recoverable oil resources. They already control about 80 percent of the known uranium reserves in the United States. They move beyond the energy industry into other fields. One of the largest, Mobil Oil Corp., recently acquired Marcor, the holding company for Montgomery Ward and the Container Corp., for a reported $800 million—funds which, according to industry advertising, these companies need from higher energy costs in order to explore for more oil and gas. They create for themselves a concentration of economic power that is unprecedented in the world, and the United States ends up with not only the production of oil and gas, the refining capacity, the pipelines, the marketing facilities for petroleum products controlled by a handful of corporations, but with those same corporations moving beyond oil and gas to control alternative sources of fuel and even beyond that.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum without losing my right to the floor. I ask unanimous consent that I not lose that right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Utah.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. MOSS. The amendment which is presently before the Senate is one of greatest concern for the economic well-being of this country as well as the lifestyle of our people, and it is of such importance I think we need to examine very carefully all the ramifications that would come from a course that would follow complete decontrol of oil and gas so far as prices and allocations are concerned or, on the other hand, restrictions on allocation and price that are so severe that they would not propel us toward a position of greater energy independence.

I do not think it is possible for us to attain total independence, at least for a long period of time, but we certainly must come closer to independence than we are now. We must reduce our imports of oil and gas down to a point where we cannot be left totally vulnerable in the event of an embargo by the suppliers of either of these two fuels.

At the present time our importation is so high if we received an embargo and suddenly had to cut off anywhere from 20 to 40 percent of our supply, our economy would be immediately crippled, and we would be vulnerable either militarily or economically because our economy then would shoot up as far as inflationary pressures are concerned, and the result would be increased unemployment and a rekindling of all of the factors of the very severe recession which we have been experiencing these past 3 years.

We are now beginning to show some recovery—at least there are indicators that there may be a recovery—from the worst parts of the depression or recession we have been experiencing.

If we had a sudden increase in price and a shortage of supply, we would be right back again to double digit inflation and double digit unemployment would follow. So the future of the United States depends, in large part, on the policies the Congress adopts concerning the economy and energy.

Energy policy must attempt to restore a measure of control over prices and supply of energy by reducing our vulnerability to the OPEC nations. There is need for early action, and we cannot afford false starts.

Energy, as we all know, is the lifeblood of the U.S. economy. In turn, economic progress will depend upon the price and the availability of energy. The impact of energy policy on revenues, taxes, and the general macroeconomic goals of a fiscal policy is of great significance.

Now, we have been told by those who argued for higher prices for energy or complete deregulation that this is the way to get independence because it will stimulate production, and in this way will make us self-sufficient rather than depending on imports. Well, there is no doubt that raising prices for energy does increase the effort to discover and to produce more petroleum and more natural gas. But there is a limit to that, and this is the thing I am afraid that many of the opponents of the amendment before us overlook, that even if the price goes very, very high there is a finite limitation on how much oil we can produce and how much gas we can produce. It is not open-ended by any means, and I think this is a mistake that many make.

The Budget Committee appointed a task force on energy policy, and seminars were held with a number of experts on this policy. Among other things, we explored this idea of higher prices and whether it would increase oil production on an open-ended basis.

One of the witnesses before that committee was Mr. John F. O'Leary, who is technical director of the energy resources and environment division of the Mitre Corp. Mr. O'Leary, I think, is well-known to nearly all of the Senators. He has served in Government in very important positions, including the Office of Coal Research, and other areas in the Interior Department, and is one of the most knowledgeable experts we have.

He said about this question of whether or not we could increase the oil production:

> There is a possibility of going up about 2 million barrels a day on the outside for the United States between now and 1985. I would say that is without regard to price; that is to say, in a price level of between $10 and $20. I don't think you would swing more than a quad on that number. This is going to be conditioned by a lot of other factors.
>
> Now, past 1985, the price could have a significant impact, but right now if you push the price to $100 a barrel, it would not significantly influence production except for infield drilling and going into places where we already know the oil is there, let's say, between now and 1980.

What Mr. O'Leary was trying to say is that to take off the lid and let the price go up to the import price of OPEC oil would not significantly change our production, at least for a period of time, say 5 years down the road, because it takes that length of time to acquire the capital, to find the location to explore, to produce once a deal has been discovered. It takes 3 or 4 years before it is in production of any consequence.

He said also, in regard to natural gas:

> With regard to natural gas, the situation is much more severe. We can't look forward to any increase. There is in the Federal Power Commission a recently developed statistical tool called the national availabilities curve, from which you can easily predict the level of finding required to support any level of production over any period of time. In order to support the Project Independence Blue-print projections of gas production by 1985, we would require a finding rate of around 50 trillion cubic feet a year. That is a factor of five higher than the average of the last 10 years.
>
> In all likelihood, regardless of what will happen in 1990 and the year 2000, regardless of the resource constraints, we cannot, I believe, over the next 10 years, increase the finding rate of the gas industry by anything approaching that level.
>
> In fact, we will be lucky to increase the finding rate by about 50 percent from the current 10 trillion up to 15 trillion. That would permit the production of 17 trillion cubic feet a year in contrast to the current 22 trillion.

So what Mr. O'Leary was saying there is that we do not cure all of our production problems by simply letting the price go sky high. Of course, we must have enough change in price, enough increase in price, that we will have continued efforts made at discovery and production

and we must have an industry that operates at a reasonable rate of profit so that they will continue to operate at the fullest efficiency possible.

But it is not one of these open end things. This is what I think has been overlooked by so many arguing for the other side. It is the fact that many have said, simply let the price go high enough and the energy will be there, the oil will be there and the gas will be there.

What Mr. O'Leary says and what their other witnesses said is that there are limitations other than price that are holding us from having the amount we need.

Those limitations are the inability to find it, time to get in place to get it out, and that although we must work diligently at that and move along as fast as possible we cannot do it alone, simply pushing the price up high.

We have spent so much of our time, at least while I have been engaged in this discussion on this amendment, talking about whether we were going to get production, whether we were going to become independent by reason of a pricing and allocations policy, that I think we have overlooked a good part of the other side of the equation.

The other side of the equation is the consumer and through the consumer into the economy and what happens to the economy.

We have developed a lifestyle of housing, heating, industrial production, automobile transportation, all of these things which are dependent on petroleum, unfortunately, because it was such an abundant resource, so readily transportable and usable, that we have become dependent on this source of energy. This is just the way it is. Houses are built now and we have heating systems and furnaces in them and they depend on natural gas or oil for their heating.

If that suddenly becomes so high in price that it cannot be afforded, the same people that cannot afford to buy it any more cannot afford to change their system of heating their houses.

So we are pushed in a dilemma. We cannot permit prices to shoot up so high that our people cannot afford the energy they need and our industrial machinery cannot be thrown out of whack because it cannot afford the cost of energy.

It is pervasive. It is through our whole society. The reason it costs more to ship by truck is energy, it costs more now to fly because of energy, it costs more to do anything we can name because of the increased price of energy.

This amendment that is before us takes note of the fact that, indeed, we have come to the end of an era. We are leaving the time when we can be dependent almost totally on petroleum and natural gas for our sources of energy. We are leaving that and we must now phase over into something else.

We must phase over into coal as a source of a large part of our energy, we must rely more on nuclear energy, we must develop oil shale, we must ultimately move on to solar energy, geothermal, all these other kinds, and we need to develop them.

In fact, the President now is so convinced that we have to develop them that he is talking about a $100 billion corporation to go into the business of developing these other kinds of energy.

I do not know when this startling revelation finally came along, because we have been talking about it here in the Senate for the last 4 or 5 years, to my knowledge. In fact we had a bill before us to set up a $20 billion authorization to authorize ERDA and finance ERDA in getting development of other sources of energy.

So we are all in agreement now that we need to put all the time and energy, and whatever resources we need, in developing ultimate sources of energy. But not even the most optimistic of people will predict that those other sources of energy will be available to us in our resources within a matter of 2, 5, or even 10 years.

Maybe by 5 years we will begin to see a reasonable impact of additional coal and additional nuclear energy. We may find some breakthroughs on shale. Maybe in 5 years some of our energy will be coming from oil shale, and hopefully, probably not in 5 years, but in a few more years, we will be getting it from solar sources, and elsewhere.

So what we are talking about is, What are we going to do these next 5 years? What are we going to do this winter for the consumer who has to have energy to carry on his living standard that he has? Even if he does squeeze out all the waste that he can find, he still has a minimum amount that he must have.

And what about our industrial plants? What about our farmers? Production of food and fiber are dependent upon the use of hydrocarbon forms of energy. They must have it at a price they can afford to pay and not kick off our inflation to a point where the impact on our people will be too severe for us to endure.

What this amendment that we are talking about does is to try to find the middle ground on this matter. One extreme is to roll back the cost of oil and gas to a very low level and, by legal fiat, say that that is the price at which it must be sold. In so doing, it would discourage production by those who must seek, discover, and produce it. If the cost is so low that they are not induced to do it, if they will not do it, then, of course, we have defeated our own purpose by reducing the flow of domestic energy. But equally bad on the other side is to turn it loose, to let it go up to the high price that our OPEC neighbors want to impose upon us. They have just given us a 10-percent increase and promise us another one. Early next year, I think the first of January, they will look at it. Apparently we will have continuing increases in the cost of energy. That can be just as devastating, perhaps even more shocking in the early stages, than to have the rollback situation that I talked about.

So the amendment that we have here would enable us to set a price where the producers of domestic oil, of old oil, can realize an income of approximately 14 percent net on invested capital. That should be enough to induce them to continue to seek, to find and to produce energy, and at the same time, to let the consumer just very gradually, and by very small increments, begin to pay more and more for his energy. In this way, we will not disrupt and set off our inflationary pressures again.

UNITED STATES ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

Energy independence will require efforts to reduce energy consumption, increase domestic production of energy, and provide standby ability to meet future embargoes. Some energy saving will be achieved by the price increases that have already taken place. In addition, mandatory conservation programs for regulating automobile efficiency, establishing performance standards for housing and commercial energy use, and improving industrial energy efficiency will save oil and natural gas. The regulatory "rules of the game" must be clarified so that coal and nuclear power can begin to reduce our dependence on oil and natural gas. An efficient program of tax credits for insulation and utilization of solar units can save scarce natural gas. Research and development of new energy sources are vital if the world is to progress in the post-petroleum era.

ECONOMIC GOALS NEED NOT BE ABANDONED

In order to reduce oil imports to 10 percent of our requirements by 1985, it will be necessary to enforce fuel economy standards, improve public transit, and permit energy prices to rise over the next 10 years. However, the price rise need not require abandoning our macroeconomic goals, provided it is done gradually, and offsets are provided. Moreover, phased decontrol need not substantially impede progress toward energy independence.

The promise of higher prices in the future for oil and natural gas will lead to a more vigorous search for new supplies of energy and more conscientious efforts to conserve. Perhaps even more important, higher prices provide an incentive to utilize coal and solar power; there will be incentives to adopt more efficient automobile engines and tires; and there will be an incentive to search for new alternatives such as efficient electrical storage and the safe use of nuclear energy.

There is general agreement that a free uncontrolled market would be the best basis for determining energy prices and quantities. Unfortunately, a free market does not exist as long as prices are set by the OPEC cartel. If the U.S. economy is to be insulated from capricious OPEC actions some measure of control will be necessary until the United States is substantially independent of oil imports.

However, this independence will not be achieved unless energy prices increase. This is especially so in the case of natural gas where current prices in interstate markets are inadequate to call forth the necessary development, production, and conservation. It is hardly equitable to maintain low prices for some consumers while others suffer unemployment or are unable to heat their homes because of inadequate supplies.

ACCEPTABLE ENERGY POLICY

Phased decontrol is an acceptable energy strategy because of the long periods of time required to bring new energy sources into use and the time required to change energy consumption patterns. However, it is necessary to provide producers and consumers with some certainty so that they can move ahead with long-lived investments, and planned changes in living patterns.

Witnesses before the Task Force emphasized the substantial investments ($300 to $500 billion from 1975 to 1985) required to increase domestic energy production to near independence levels by 1985. A number of general principles were suggested:

So, Mr. President, what I have been trying to say in this discussion is that

we must now find the place where we can get this degree of balance that we have talked about, the balance of encouraging conservation, of encouraging the changes in the uses of energy, of research and development to produce other types of energy to come in, but, at the same time, to also preserve our economic stability and to protect the consumers from outrageous increases in prices.

Many will insist that they are already victims of outrageous increases in prices. Complaints have come to me, and I am sure to other Senators, from people whose utility bills have shot up 30 or 50 percent. There seems to be no end in sight as to how high they are going. Everyone knows the cost of gasoline has about doubled since we had the embargo 2 years ago, and it seems to be on the way up again. Fuel oil, residual fuel, plastics, whatever is touched by energy, have gone up a great deal. If we permit it to skyrocket now, it will have a very severe impact on all of our people. If we have energy so high that it cannot be used and the people suffer by lack of it we will then have an impasse. We are going to have a situation on our hands that will cause a clamor for nationalization or a takeover of some kind that none of us want to contemplate and which we hope would never occur.

That is what I have been trying to impress upon this body and upon all who would discuss this matter. If we do not find that central tradeoff place, our difficulties are going to be so severe that they will make the present ones look like a happy, easy time.

As Senators will recall, Congress made an effort at extending the controls on energy, and, because the President did not agree, we had a veto, and there was a time when we did not have any controls over prices and allocations. This was a very worrisome time. The President was very concerned for fear that without any kind of restraint, the prices would take off. For that reason, he agreed to the extension that we later passed in Congress, and we are now back under a controlled situation. But it lasts only until the 15th of November. Between now and the 15th of November, we must have put in place what we intend to have as a long-range policy on energy pricing and energy allocation.

For that reason, I think we need to move along and get to the point where we can come to a majority consensus as to how to deal with the problem.

I think that the amendment now before this body offers that point, and I strongly urge that the Senate adopt the amendment, and in that way stake out what is the compromise position. I compliment the Senator from Illinois, who has taken the leadership in this matter of the pricing of natural gas. He and the Senator from South Carolina have exhibited strong leadership in this matter, and have presented to us an emergency bill which is the basic vehicle on which we are now trying to place this amendment, which could control the prices and allocations not only of natural gas, but of petroleum.

This is wise also. Gas and petroleum are not only produced in much the same way, by drilling holes in the ground, but they occur together a good part of the time, and they are competitive fuels in many ways, because they both have a quality of being easily transported by pipeline, of being storable, of being used that way. Therefore, both of them ought to be treated very similarly.

This amendment has the virtue of trying to treat them essentially the same, of more or less equating the kinds of energy, as far as pricing is concerned, on a roughly equivalent Btu basis. It cannot be exact, of course, and can never be totally precise. But the ceilings that are proposed in this amendment on the cost of oil and the cost of gas would be roughly equivalent one with the other. As we move out into the decontrolled situation, the phaseout over 5 years' time, and finally reach the point where we can be in a free market, then we would not have one of these kinds of energy severely below the other, on a noncompetitive basis.

I would like to get to a competitive market system again for energy. Perhaps if after 5 years, or even 10, we have enough oil coming from coal and enough gas coming from coal, if we have an increase in natural gas production, and we learn how to get the ferrugin out of our shale, so that we will have oil from that source, all these forms of energy can begin to compete with one another in desirability and usability, and on the basis of price, and by that time we can be on a firm basis in our economy to deal with the price.

I wish to quote at this point from the statement of George Perry, a senior fellow of Brookings Institution, who appeared before our energy seminar.

Mr. Perry said:

> Another round of oil price increases will pose problems for fiscal and monetary policy similar to those at the start of 1974.
>
> At that time, many economists recognized that the money supply would have to grow faster and consumer taxes would have to be reduced in order to offset the two principal depressing effects of higher oil prices on the economy.
>
> It was also recognized that, without a renewed effort at wage-price moderation or a reduction of other prices through excise or payroll tax cuts, higher oil prices could themselves trigger some further rounds of wage-price increases outside the oil sector of the economy.
>
> NO ONE ANTICIPATED DEPTH OF RECESSION
>
> Policymakers chose not to respond on any of these fronts during 1974. Taking a recession and raising unemployment and excess capacity was the preferred course, presumably on the grounds that this would combat inflation. It is doubtful that anyone planned or anticipated the depth of the recession that occurred. Yet now that it has, I am concerned at how easily we accept it and how ready we are to compromise our national commitment to high employment.
>
> Having reached 9-percent unemployment, we seem content with the possibility of reducing it to 8 percent a year from now. Had we fallen to 10 percent—as I believe we would have without the fiscal stimulus of recent months—we presumably would be content with the prospect of reducing it to 9 percent by next year.
>
> There are enormous costs to such indifference. For many workers, unemployment becomes a habit; we institutionalize semipoverty, then deplore the costs of welfare and unemployment insurance. For minorities and the young, we strengthen their suspicions that the system just doesn't work.
>
> INABILITY TO MEET CAPITAL NEEDS
>
> At the same time we weaken our labor markets, we undermine the major incentive to capital expansion by business. The pains of a cyclically depressed economy get diagnosed as the pathological ailments of a whole system. Today the popular press is full of stories about our supposed inability to meet our growing capital needs, when in fact business investment plans are being sharply curtailed because the market for their products is so depressed and their existing capacity is so underutilized.
>
> I stress these concerns because any response to future energy price increases must take account of the present state of the economy. The dismal consequences of not responding last year makes it even more important to respond fully this time.
>
> Inflation has slowed, and demand pressures are no longer a concern.
>
> With the economy badly depressed, the risks lie disproportionately in one direction—that we will fail to do enough to assure the strong and sustained economic expansion that is necessary to restore high employment and generate adequate profits and investment incentives.

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, the major determinants of energy price changes in the near future are:

First, what OPEC does to the world oil price, and what they have just done;

Second, what we do to oil import duties; and

Third, what we do to the price of domestically produced oil and price-controlled natural gas.

If OPEC raises prices, and we keep our present import duty and decontrol old oil prices, the average oil price of around $10 a barrel that prevailed this spring will rise to around $16 a barrel, an increase comparable to the one that took place in the summer of 1973.

Together with the rise in natural gas prices that would follow their gradual decontrol, we would be facing an energy price increase even larger than the one experienced in 1973–74. Based on 6 billion barrels a year of oil consumption, users would be paying an additional $36 billion annually for oil products.

Conservatively estimating the cost of higher gas and coal prices at half again this much, our total annual energy bill would rise by roughly $55 billion. All this increase would not occur at once.

But if oil were decontrolled abruptly, at least $36 billion of it would occur before the end of this year.

If the $2 excise duty were removed, it would save $12 billion on the pricetag of our 6 billion barrel oil consumption, and the additional cost of oil would fall to $24 billion annually. Again, adding in half again as much for coal and gas price increases, the total energy bill would rise by $36 billion. If the duty were removed immediately and oil and gas were decontrolled gradually, the increase might be limited to about $12 billion a year over 3 years. These are necessarily rough orders of magnitude, but they represent a reasonable guess at the minimum cost we are likely to face.

In principle, we could lean particular-

ly hard on either fiscal or monetary policy to offset the depressing effects of higher energy prices. Realistically we should try to use both.

We can estimate that some three-fourths of the rise in national energy costs arising from higher prices will correspond to a reduction in consumer purchasing power. This amounts to $41 billion in the worst case, with most of it coming in a few months if prices are decontrolled abruptly; and it amounts to $9 billion each year, rising to $27 billion by the end of 3 years, in the "better case" considered above.

Some allowance must be made for increased demands from non-consumption sectors that would accompany higher energy prices, but these will be very much smaller than the declines in consumer demands. Thus either through tax reduction or other fiscal measures, policy should be prepared to offset most of the loss in consumer purchasing power that higher energy prices will entail.

Any such incremental action must be in addition to the fiscal stimulus that would be appropriate without further energy price increases.

In particular, it should be considered in addition to the $12 billion of personal tax reduction that will be needed for 1976 just to keep withholding rates from rising at the start of the year.

So, Mr. President, the thing that I return to again is the admonition that we must not at this time fail the American consumer and the American economy by suddenly decontrolling natural gas or petroleum in price nor in allocation.

Nor must we decontrol a large segment of it, as is proposed essentially in the Pearson amendment. If we decontrol the major part of our natural gas, it will be almost the same as if we decontrolled every bit of it. This would be an impact that would reverberate through our economy and cause disruptions that are unacceptable for the people of the United States.

For these reasons, I urge that we proceed to consideration and adoption of the amendment that is before us which has been discussed at some length by our colleague from Illinois, and others, and I certainly hope that we can, out of this discussion and in this chamber, fashion an energy policy that will be in the best interests of the people of this country.

We have come into a situation of great difficulty because of our failure to anticipate and be prepared for the petroleum shortage that came upon us and that was triggered when we had the embargo of 1973.

Since that time we have never been able to move to a position of security so far as our supply is concerned, and our prices have continued to rise so that we have been in a period of inflation and high unemployment.

This we must remedy. This we can remedy. But it is going to take time, it is going to take patience, and above all it is going to take governmental direction and control over these policies until we can finally get to the area of free competition which would come after the 5-year period or somewhere around that time when the gradually increasing prices will have moved up to the point where we can then be in a free competitive market. We would have moved on by then in other forms of energy so that we will have more kinds of energy going into the mix and being utilized by our industrialized society.

We became a great industrial nation because of our source of energy and our uses of energy. Now we must find ways to have different kinds of energy to propel us onward as the great industrial society that we are.

Mr. President, I have about completed my discussion of this matter for this afternoon. I understand that the Senator from Oklahoma desires to seek the floor on another matter, at which point, if he requests, I will yield to him for that purpose.

I now understand, Mr. President, that the Senator will not be able to be in the Chamber this afternoon, and I have about completed my discussion.

I ask unanimous consent that I may suggest the absence of a quorum, without losing my right to the floor. I do this to ascertain whether there is to be any more discussion.

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

Mr. MOSS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ADDITIONAL STATEMENT SUBMITTED ON S. 2310

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, the Congress has been debating the natural gas issue intensively since the Phillips Supreme Court decision handed down over 20 years ago. The dialog on natural gas has been taking place in committees and on the floors of both Houses. Within the past 2 years in the Senate alone, the natural gas debate has filled more than a hundred pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and several thousand pages of hearing records in the Senate Commerce and Interior Committees alone.

While the debates have been going on and the legislative opportunities to deal with the gas shortage have come and gone, a nationwide crisis of extreme proportions has intensified. Five years ago, in 1970, interstate pipeline curtailment imposed by the Federal Power Commission had begun to mount. At that time there was a 100-billion-cubic-foot shortage, far less than 1 percent of consumption; in 1974, curtailments had risen 2 trillion cubic feet or 10 percent of total demand. This year the forecast is for an increase of 45 percent to 2.9 trillion cubic feet which is approximately 15 percent of total demand. This winter's shortage will be 300 billion cubic feet worse than last winter's.

It is surprising to note that the distinguished Senator from South Carolina and the distinguished Senator from Ohio have asserted in debates that there really is no shortage. They imply that there is plenty of gas for everyone. The Senator from Ohio last week asserted that if the industry would stop setting on reserves, there would be more than enough gas to meet everyone's needs. My colleague from Idaho dealt quite adequately with that false contention by demonstrating that several studies, including one recently conducted by the Interior Department, revealed that there was little evidence that industry is sitting on reserves.

Our colleagues from South Carolina and Ohio have denied that wellhead price controls imposed by the Federal Power Commission have had much to do with the present natural gas supply situation, notwithstanding volumes of testimony from the Federal Power Commission which has emphatically stated that the Federal Power Commission imposed wellhead price controls have been the principal cause of our Nation's natural gas shortage. The record is full of the analyses of academic experts that Federal Power Commission price controls have been, in essence, the sole cause of our Nation's shortage of natural gas.

I would like to speak about one factual dimension of the natural gas shortage. The best factual example of which I am aware, relating to the increasing criticality of the Nation's gas shortage, pertains to reserve to production ratios. This ratio is computed by dividing the amount of Natural Gas consumed nationwide in a given year into the total proved reserves of natural gas known to exist that same year. Why a reserve production ratio is an important indicator of abundance or a shortage is that the higher the ratio, the greater the supply and the lower the ratio, the lower the supply. In 1954, the year of the Phillips decision, the reserve production ratio for natural gas in this country was 22.5. what that meant is that when the amount of natural gas consumed in 1954 was divided into the total amount of proved reserves known to exist that year, the number which resulted from that division was 22.5. What that meant was that assuming that gas demand would remain constant and that no additional reserves were added, the United States would have had a 22.5-year supply of natural gas. In 1970, the reserve production ratio for natural gas had dropped to 12.1. In 1971, it had dropped to 11.5. In 1972, it had dropped to 10.7. In 1973, it had dropped to 9.9. It has been decreasing since. What this means is that we are drawing natural gas out of the bank at a far faster rate than we are adding natural gas reserves to our bank account. It means that the incentive to produce natural gas—due to low natural gas prices—has been low while the incentive to consume it has been high. There is no getting away from these facts.

Here are some more facts. Any alternative to natural gas will cost more than natural gas itself. Let us take the example of Ohio. In 1974, 2,561,400 homes used natural gas. Natural gas supplied 31 percent of all energy used in Ohio. In 1974, here is what Ohio consumers paid for their fuels. Those who used natural gas in their homes paid $1.08 per million Btu's for their gas. Those who used heating oil in their homes paid $2.20 per million

Btu's for heating oil. Those who used electricity in their homes paid $7.11 per million Btu's for their electricity.

Because of the natural gas shortage, it is estimated that Ohio, this winter, will be short nearly 80 billion cubic feet of natural gas. Assuming alternative fuels are not available to the industries now using natural gas, this shortage could potentially place 186,000 manufacturing and related industry workers out of work.

The Senator from Ohio seems to think that his potentially unemployed voters are not in need at this time of legislation which would solve the Nation's natural gas shortage, thereby insuring their continued employment, but instead has preferred to support a dubious stop gap measure which will do them little or no good. I will return to why the bill he is supporting will be of little or no use to his constituents in just a moment.

But first, let me return to the facts regarding prices. If his constituents either do not wish or cannot afford to switch from natural gas to oil or from natural gas to electricity, and they insist upon using natural gas, and price controls remain in effect, then natural gas pipelines will be forced to manufacture synthetic natural gas to supplement their rapidly declining reserves of natural gas. Present day prices for synthetic natural gas range between $3 and $4 a thousand cubic feet. This is because much synthetic natural gas is produced from naphtha which must be converted into synthetic gas. Naphtha in turn is refined from crude oil. The costs of manufacturing natural gas from crude oil into naphtha or other expensive feedstocks into synthetic gas are practically twice as much as what new natural gas would cost if it were selling a Btu equivalent basis at the same price it would cost for new oil. Even if new natural gas did sell as high as $2 a thousand cubic foot—approximately one half the cost of synthetic natural gas, residential consumers would only be confronted with a gradual price increase under the Pearson-Bentsen amendment. This is because, assuming the Pearson-Bentsen amendment becomes law, the first year one-tenth of the Nation's gas supply would be the higher priced new gas while nine-tenths would be old gas, the price of the latter still being controlled by the FPC.

The following year another tenth of the supply would be new gas and the next another tenth, and so on. Each year the new gas price would be rolled in with the old gas price with the result that the increase of costs to ultimate consumers would be quite gradual. This is a reality which my esteemed colleagues from South Carolina and Ohio seem to enjoy avoiding. Under the guise of protecting the consumer, they are opting for a policy which force their constituents to burn synthetic natural gas which would cost nearly 13 times the average cost of natural gas of today, or twice the cost of new natural gas, assuming it reached a price as high as today's oil prices on a Btu equivalent basis.

To sum up the facts before getting into the bills themselves, the Nation has a natural gas shortage this winter equivalent to 15 percent of normal consumption. This natural gas shortage was caused by 20 years of FPC price controls on natural gas sold in Interstate Commerce. There is no shortage of natural gas in the intrastate market, because there never have been price controls. In fact, due to the absence of price controls, the supply of natural gas in the intrastate market now actually exceeds demands.

The only practical alternatives to natural gas for homeowners for the purpose of heating and cooking, is oil or electricity or some combination of the two. Electricity costs about 7 times as much as natural gas does now and heating oil costs twice as much as natural gas. If, on the other hand, homeowners refuse to use electricity or heating oil and their Senators vote to continue FPC price controls on natural gas, then the homeowners will be forced to use synthetic natural gas which, as indicated, costs $4 per thousand cubic feet. Finally, due to FPC price controls, the Nation's supply of natural gas dwindled from a 22-year supply in 1954 to less than a 10-year supply in 1974.

Now, let us get into the issues regarding the Hollings-Glenn alternative as compared to the Pearson-Bentsen option. Here is what Mr. Zarb had to say about the Hollings-Glenn alternative. He said that continued regulation of new natural gas and regulation of presently unregulated intrastate natural gas would be unwise and unacceptable for several substantial reasons. These are:

The principal reason for the present state of natural shortages is the current system of regulation, which inhibits production and should be removed from the interstate market instead of extended to the intrastate market.

An artificially controlled low price (relative to alternative fuels) encourages excessive consumption of natural gas.

Continued excessive consumption exacerbates shortages, and requires bureaucratic decisions as to what industries and other users will receive priority.

Since the amount of natural gas available over the short term is limited, the setting of priorities amounts to taking natural gas from some and giving it to others.

Regulation of intrastate prices will be an immense administrative burden.

He said that the area ceiling price called for in the Hollings-Glenn alternative to be established within 15 days of enactment is unwise and administratively unworkable. He stated eight other reasons why the Hollings-Glenn amendment is unacceptable. These reasons have already been called to the attention of my colleagues.

Additionally, under the price limitations applicable to intrastate pipelines, the intrastate pipeline will have to prove to the Federal Power Commission that it charged no more than the weighted average cost of all the natural gas it purchased plus a transportation allowance for producer transportation or gathering plus the cost of transportation services that it rendered in getting the gas to the interstate pipeline. In order to justify this, the intrastate pipeline could seriously expose itself to having the Federal Power Commission do a complete cost of services of its system. In addition to this exposure, the most the intrastate pipeline would receive would be a recovery of its "costs".

With no economic incentives to sell plus serious FPC encroachment into its cost and services, it is highly unlikely any pipeline would ever sell gas under amendment no. 934 to interstate pipelines.

The same problems exist with respect to 180-day sales permitted under section 4(f). For these sales, the pricing limitations under section 4(c) still apply.

Mr. Nassikas, Chairman of the FPC, also reached substantially the same conclusions as did Mr. Zarb. He said:

I find the provisions of S. 2310 . . . administratively unworkable within the time period proposed.

Mr. Nassikas additionally said:

I do not believe it is feasible for the commission to establish intrastate rates for new onshore gas at the average new or renewed intrastate price for August 1975, within 15 days after date of enactment.

Additionally, Mr. Nassikas said:

The 15 day requirement of section 4(a) . . . would impair the commission's ability to make a well thought out determination of what pipelines would qualify as priority interstate purchasers and what end-users would qualify as essential users for the purpose of this emergency relief legislation.

Mr. Nassikas also said,

I believe (section 4(g) could lead to protracted litigation and controversy.

Mr. Nassikas also gave several other reasons why the Hollings-Glenn alternative is unworkable.

Now, let us turn to the Pearson-Bentsen substitute amendment No. 919, which would deregulate new gas sales at the wellhead for onshore production upon enactment. It would establish FPC ceiling price authority over OCS production for a term of 6 years through December 31, 1980.

The offshore ceiling price would be set by FPC rulemaking based upon four criteria.

First. Prospective costs.

Second. Capital formation raised for exploration.

Third. Promotion of conservation of natural gas.

Fourth. Consumer protection.

This new criteria would allow the FPC to set prices to provide sufficient incentives to develop new gas at a far higher rate than present FPC price regulations will permit. The Pearson-Bentsen amendment, additionally, would establish a statutory priority for essential agricultural uses of natural gas produced in interstate commerce and would ban new gas sales for boiler fuel use for electrical generation and phase out use of natural gas as boiler fuel.

The Pearson-Bentsen substitute would also deal with the winter 1975–76 emergency by permitting 180-day emergency purchases by distressed interstate pipelines to meet the needs of their high priority customers as well as providing for other short-term relief.

To sum up the explicit objectives that the Pearson-Bentsen substitute is designed to achieve, these are:

First, to alleviate, to the extent possible, natural gas emergencies this winter;

Second, to increase supplies of new natural gas for the benefit of the American consumer;

Third, to protect the consumer against inflationary price increases for gas presently flowing in interstate commerce.

Fourth, to assure efficient allocations of dwindling gas supplies to high priority residential and agricultural usages until the gas shortage is alleviated.

Fifth, to inhibit the demand for natural gas for consumption under boilers where alternate fuels can reasonably be obtained.

Sixth, to authorize collection of comprehensive data on natural gas supplies, production, transportation, sale, and consumption.

Mr. President, for all of these reasons, I would urge my colleagues to support the Pearson-Bentsen substitute. The Pearson-Bentsen substitute is, in fact, a fair and reasonable compromise. It does not go as far as my amendment would have, had it been adopted rather than tabled on last Wednesday. It is an honest, diligent, and fair attempt to reach a compromise which will truly serve the national interest.

## ORDER FOR THE RECOGNITION OF SENATORS MANSFIELD AND ROBERT C. BYRD TOMORROW

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, prior to the period for the transaction of routine morning tomorrow and following the recognition of the two leaders under the standing order, Mr. MANSFIELD and Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD be recognized each for not to exceed 10 minutes in the order stated.

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

## PROGRAM

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, the Senate will convene at 9 a.m. tomorrow. After the two leaders or their designees have been recognized under the standing order, Mr. MANSFIELD will be recognized for not to exceed 10 minutes, after which Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD will be recognized for not to exceed 10 minutes. Thereafter, there will be a period for the transaction of routine morning business of not to exceed 15 minutes, with statements limited therein to 3 minutes each.

At the conclusion of routine morning business on tomorrow, the Senate will resume consideration of the bill S. 2310. Rollcall votes may occur during the day tomorrow.

I believe I should state that in the event the House of Representatives overrides the Presidential veto of the school lunch bill, the Senate is expected shortly thereafter to attempt to do the same thing.

Other rollcall votes may occur on the pending measure, S. 2310, or amendments thereto, or motions in relation thereto.

Of course, conference reports, being privileged matters, may be called up at any time, and other measures that are cleared for action may also come up.

## RECESS UNTIL 9 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, subject to the previous agreement entered into with the assistant majority leader, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 9 a.m tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and at 2:51 p.m. the Senate recessed until tomorrow, October 7, 1975, at 9 a.m.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 6, 1975:

### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Dale Kent Frizzell, of Kansas, to be Under Secretary of the Interior, vice John C. Whitaker, resigned.

### EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY COMMISSION

Ethel Bent Walsh, of the District of Columbia, to be a member of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission for the term expiring July 1, 1980 (reappointment).

### FEDERAL HOME LOAN BANK BOARD

Ben B. Blackburn, of Georgia, to be a member of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1978, vice Thomas R. Bomar, resigned.

### IN THE AIR FORCE

The following-named officers for promotion as a Reserve of the Air Force, under the appropriate provisions of chapter 35 and 837, title 10, United States Code:

#### LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

*Lieutenant colonel to colonel*

Ackley, John B., III, [redacted].
Adams, Merlin R., [redacted].
Allen, Ronald C., Jr., [redacted].
Amberson, Roger G., [redacted].
Anderson, Robert D., [redacted].
Armor, George W., [redacted].
Armstrong, Don W., [redacted].
Baldauf, Boyd J., [redacted].
Barker, Boyd C., [redacted].
Belet, Edward E., [redacted].
Bell, Carroll W., [redacted].
Bell, Robert W., [redacted].
Bentley, Otis K., [redacted].
Benton, Jack W., [redacted].
Beyer, John R., [redacted].
Black, Edward C., [redacted].
Blackstad, Charles O., [redacted].
Blomeley, Warren R., [redacted].
Boeck, Albert G., Jr., [redacted].
Boruski, Gerald G., [redacted].
Bradley, Ernest H., [redacted].
Braman, Keith W., [redacted].
Burk, Carl E., [redacted].
Burton, Jack C., [redacted].
Callison, Talmadge P., [redacted].
Carlson, Donald A., [redacted].
Cernik, Marvin, [redacted].
Chirigotis, George S., [redacted].
Ciancone, Elmer S., [redacted].
Collins, George W., [redacted].
Colwell, James L., [redacted].
Connell, Richard A., [redacted].
Cook, Edwin J., [redacted].
Coursey, John T., Jr., [redacted].
Cravey, David O., [redacted].
Currie, Craig H., [redacted].
Davis, Elbert F., [redacted].
Davis, Victor M., Jr., [redacted].
Duelger, Carl P., [redacted].
Dunnelly, John J., Jr., [redacted].
Dunofrio, Angelo, [redacted].
Dunaway, Edward G., [redacted].
Dye, Everett C., [redacted].
Ellzey, Madison P., Jr., [redacted].
Erswell, George A., Jr., [redacted].
Fels, John V., [redacted].
Finke, Warren L., [redacted].
Flurett, Garfield W., [redacted].
Flynn, Paul S., [redacted].
Fugel, Myron J., [redacted].
Forte, Michael P., [redacted].
Foster, Vincent V., [redacted].
Fox, Robert P., [redacted].
Francis, Norman R., [redacted].
Gaglio, Nicholas A., [redacted].
Garvin, Stanley J., [redacted].
Gebhardt, William A., [redacted].
Gerell, Robert E., [redacted].
Giles, Keith C., [redacted].
Gillespie, Loren G., [redacted].
Gossett, John E,, [redacted].
Green, Arthur W., Jr., [redacted].
Griesinger, Rankin L., [redacted].
Halpern, Earl, [redacted].
Hammond, Denzil L., [redacted].
Handy, Ralph P., Jr., [redacted].
Hanson, Max L., [redacted].
Hardwick, William H., [redacted].
Heyman, Paul D., [redacted].
Hickman, Cleo E., [redacted].
Hinman, Jerome A., [redacted].
Hublin, Philip J., Jr., [redacted].
Hoffman, Marion R., [redacted].
Holstine, William, Jr., [redacted].
Holt, Jack W., Jr., [redacted].
Horne, Richard B., [redacted].
Hudson, Robert C., [redacted].
James, John H., Jr., [redacted].
Johnson, Warren B., [redacted].
Johnson, William C., [redacted].
Jones, Harry S., [redacted].
Kadlec, Paul W., [redacted].
Kenney, Judson W., [redacted].
Kinney, Robert W., [redacted].
Kramer, Herbert F., [redacted].
Krebs, Buford D., Jr., [redacted].
Lawrence, Burnis K., [redacted].
Lilley, Daniel T., [redacted].
Lubow, Samuel M., [redacted].
Lydecker, Leigh K., Jr., [redacted].
Macbride, Arthur M., Jr., [redacted].
Maclasky, Milton S., [redacted].
Madden, John R., [redacted].
Maddox, Alva H., [redacted].
Magee, Thomas H., [redacted].
Mahan, John C., [redacted].
Mangus, Bennie M., [redacted].
Martin, Hall T., [redacted].
Martinez, Henry C., [redacted].
Massuros, William R., [redacted].
Mathey, Robert G., [redacted].
McBurnett, Robert N., Jr., [redacted].
Merchant, Dean C., [redacted].
Messick, Wiley S., [redacted].
Middough, Robert H., [redacted].
Miller, Howells D., Jr., [redacted].
Miller, William K., [redacted].
Montgomery, John E., [redacted].
Moser, John D., [redacted].
Muller, James L., [redacted].
Murphy, James L., [redacted].
Nelson, Clarence S., Jr., [redacted].
Neuman, Arthur E., [redacted].
Nunemacher, Robert O., [redacted].
O'Neil, Philip J., [redacted].
Osborn, Thomas L., [redacted].
Palmer, Gordon M., [redacted].
Pudlesak, Aldrich F., [redacted].
Quackenbush, David S., [redacted].
Rastall, George D., [redacted].
Ray, Roderick J., [redacted].
Reese, Calvin, [redacted].
Renasco, Manuel, Jr., [redacted].
Riess, Louis C., [redacted].
Roamer, James M., Jr., [redacted].
Sandin, John E., [redacted].
Sarullo, Michael J., [redacted].
Satterberg, Richard A., [redacted].
Schafer, Robert B., [redacted].
Scheb, John M., [redacted].

Schumaker, Bernard A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schwanenberg, Donald A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schwartz, Charles M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schwartz, Irving H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Schweitzer, Donald T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Seery, William F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sharp, Alan G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sherman, Earl D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sherman, George C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Shimek, Joseph F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sklow, Alvin L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Spector, Stanley R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Summerville, Wallace E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Swords, Smith, III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thompson, Donald D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thomsen, Nels, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Trippi, Frank T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ulbrich, Richard W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Visnovsky, Andrew J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ward, Samuel J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Weeks, Wendell J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wells, Jack G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wieland, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilson, Eugene M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wuest, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zellner, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zimmer, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Zurier, Melvin L., xxx-xx-xxxx.

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Acerra, Angelo T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Flood, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Jarrett, Tally H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Johnson, David H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Kucera, Edward J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McDonough, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McMullen, Francis R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McNicholas, Edward J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Roller, Lawrence H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Shields, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Sullivan, Joseph T., xxx-xx-xxxx.

DENTAL CORPS

Bateman, Alphalus, H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Carr, Bernard M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hollis, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Lamastra, Salvator J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Manuel, Maurice, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moore, Andrew, xxx-xx-xxxx.

MEDICAL CORPS

Adamson, John B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Francis, Gordon D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hermann, Lee K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Luhr, David C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Peterson, Emil W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Reinarz, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Yassin, John G., xxx-xx-xxxx.

NURSE CORPS

Androulakis, Denise F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bellarts, Stella B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brown, Patricia D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Collins, Joan P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Coombs, Marilyn R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Foley, Mary F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Forsythe, Ruth J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hastings, Marilyn L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Leonard, Emily R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
MacMurray, Beverly A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Malinoski, Bernadiene M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McDonald, Gregor R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Meads, Marian L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nesbitt, Harriet R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ronne, Ardis H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Smith, Grace P., xxx-xx-xxxx.

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Doyle, John T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hess, Dale E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Hill, Walter R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ragan, Durward D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Young, Sammie R., xxx-xx-xxxx.

VETERINARY CORPS

Adsit, Milton E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Martin, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McKee, Adam E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Otter, Jason I., xxx-xx-xxxx.

BIOMEDICAL SCIENCE

Brody, Sylvan D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nirk, Eugene W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Pearson, Adeline H., xxx-xx-xxxx.

## In the Air Force

The following-named officers for promotion in the Regular Air Force, under the appropriate provisions of chapter 835, title 10, United States Code, as amended. All officers are subject to physical examination required by law:

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

*First lieutenant to captain*

Abbott, Ira R. III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Abbott, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Abernethy, Russell H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Abold, Phillip L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Accetta, Joseph S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Accola, Thomas D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Acker, John F. F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Acton, Thomas D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Acuff, Steven D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Adams, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Adams, Louis S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Adams, Patrick O., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Adkison, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Aiken, Richard W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ainslie, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Aitken, Gordon J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Aja, Joseph G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Akers, Randall D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Akers, Robert K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Akins, Jerry G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Albanese, Joseph L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Albers, Ted L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Alderman, Leslie D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Aldrich, Charles L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Alexander, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Alexander, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Alford, Robert T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Allen, Charles L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Allen, Donald L. III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Allen, Edward H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Allen, Guy V., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Allen, Kenneth E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Allen, Robert W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Allen, Thomas L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Allison, Mark J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Alm, Kenneth R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Amatulli, Ladis W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ambos, Dale S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ambrose, David E., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Amisand, Richard P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Amrhein, Philip C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Amtmann, Raymond A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Andersen, David B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Anderson, Dennis L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Anderson, Dennis W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Anderson, Donald E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Anderson, Hal N., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Anderson, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Anderson, Kenneth C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Anderson, Philip J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Anderson, Robert K., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Anderson, Terrance M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Anderson, Timothy L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Anderson, William A., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Andrews, Gary J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Andrews, Ralph E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Angelico, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Anglemyer, Richard M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Angley, Jerry C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Anselmi, Michael S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Archer, Lawrence R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Arciero, Anthony P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Arn, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Arnold, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Arnold, Michael W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Arnold, Norman K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Asher, Robert B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ashton, Warren A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Askew, Benjamin F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Astle, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Aston, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Atkinson, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Atkinson, Thomas F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Atlee, William K., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Aucoin, James S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Auffert, Edward L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Augustin, Calvin J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Auld, Glenn A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Austin, Gary M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Autrey, Charles T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Backstrom, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Baden, Gerard T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bailey, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bailey, George R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bailey, Maxwell C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bailey, Riley W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bailey, Roger W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bainter, Elaine A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Baker, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Baker, Edward B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Baker, Larry N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Baker, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Baker, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Baldwin, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ball, Ronnie E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ballard, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Baltazar, Bill R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Balven, Terry L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Banks, Joe M., II., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Banton, George R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Baralt, Raymond A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Barbi, Kenneth W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Barker, Raymond H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Barlow, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Barnes, Carroll T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Barnes, Larry A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Barnett, Richard P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Barnette, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Barr, Roger B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Barraclough, John, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Barrick, Ronald D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Barrows, Henry C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Barry, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Barthel, Gerald R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bartkowski, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bartlett, John K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Barton, John B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Basha, Leroy C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bassi, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bateman, Simeon D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bates, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bauer, Jack L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Baumgardner, Thomas R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Baumgart, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Baxter, Harvey E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Baxter, Ronald, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bayers, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bean, Allan K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bear, Jonathan R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bearce, Douglas L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Beattie, John S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Beatty, Thomas R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Beaty, Andrew R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Beaty, Jerald H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Beauchamp, Jack R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Beauregard, Peter S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Beavers, Jessie K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Becht, Frederick J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Beck, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Becker, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Becker, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Beckman, Steven C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bedard, Robert J. C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bedwell, James S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Beers, Arthur W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Belcher, Dan B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Belcher, Kenneth A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Belden, Richard P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bell, Lee P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bell, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bellour, Jean C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bence, Christopher F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bench, Patrick S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Benedict, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Benedict, William N., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Benner, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bennett, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bennett, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bennett, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bennett, Ronald W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bennett, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Benson, Dick G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Benson, Donald R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Benson, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Benzing, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Berg, Walter R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bergen, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Berkey, Robert P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Berkshire, Walker E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bernhardt, Wayne A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Berry, Bruce M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Berry, Don K., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.

Bertelson, Gilbert M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bertoldo, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Betz, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Beyer, Charles T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bice, Earl D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Biedrzycki, Paul F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bielicki, Dennis E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bird, Stephen E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bird, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Birmingham, Donald D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Birnie, Cameron, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bishop, Dennis R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bishop, Donald W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bishop, Geoffrey T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bishop, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bishop, Robert G., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bittenbender, Leona C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bittner, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bitzer, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Black, Larry W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Black, Nathaniel L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Black, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Black, Thomas J., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Blackburn, Richard S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Blackwell, Gary L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Blake, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Blank Jonas L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bledsoe, Richard J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Blom, Raymond, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bluhm, Steven A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bocher, Gordon L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Boday, Kenneth F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Boe, Gary B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Boerum, Joseph E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Boesche, Gerald V., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Boger, Fred C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bogusch, Roy J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bohlen, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bohnenstiel, Robert L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Boland, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bolme, Gerald O., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Boltin, Gerald, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bolton, Claude M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bolyard, William T., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bolz, Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bond, Ronald L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bone, Terrence E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bonesteele, Raymond G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bonn, Robert C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bonne, Kenneth A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Boon, Thomas S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Borders, Charles W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Borgos, Peter W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Borky, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bornstein, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bosco, Salvatore R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bose, Clarence M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bost, Gary R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bothwell, David G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bott, Terrence W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bottomly, Roc, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Boudreau, Donald P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bounds, William S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bourne, C. D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bovim, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bowcock, Stephen W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bowen, Gordon H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bowen, James T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bowles, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bowman, Charles W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bowman, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Boyd, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Boyd, Frank L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Boyd, Stephen O., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Boyer, Charles A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Boyer, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bozeman, Charles L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bradeen, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bradford, Conley V., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brady, Roger A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brady, Terrence J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brakey, Robert J., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brandt, Keith A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brandt, Thomas R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brantley, Billy E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Braswell, Gary J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brennan, Peter E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brentnall, Gerald J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bretschneider, Roland W. P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brewer, George D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brewster, Brian A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brick, Jon C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bridges, John F., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bridges, Paul F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brining, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brink, Donald L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brister, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Britt, Clyde S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brogdon, Bill D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brooks, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brooks, Roger W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brothers, Kenneth G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Broussard Martial R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brower, Charles L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brown, David I., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brown, Donald E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brown, Donald P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brown, Francis T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brown, Gerald E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brown, Keith S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brown, Lawrence L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brown, Peter D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brown, Ronald J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brown, Ronald K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brown, Russell A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brown, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brown, Timothy A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brownell, Arthur N., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brownell, Michael E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Browning, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Browning, Ronald G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brownlow, Jeffrey F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Broyles, Stephen D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bruck, Lawrence A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brumbaugh, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Brunaugh, Harold L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bryan, Joseph T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bryant, Don R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bryant, O. K., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bryson, Allen L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Buchanan, Donald G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Buckingham, William A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Buckland, George H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Buckner, John H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Buckwalter, James R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Budzier, Gary A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Buell, Larry L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bullock, Darryl J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bullock, Ralph G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bulmann, Rudolf A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bunch, Edward A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bunch, Philip R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bundlie, Harold W., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bunjer, Verl A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Buran, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Burk, Larry L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Burke, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Burleigh, Ronald K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Burnaman, Joseph M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Burns, George F., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Burns, Hugh L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Burroughs, Richard O., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Burtt, David A., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Busching, Richard K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bush, John G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Bussian, Donald J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Buster, Danny C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Butcher, Jack M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Butkovich, Albert N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Butler, Frank S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Butler, Michael R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Butterfield, Alan V., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Byington, Kent L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Caddell, Ray L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cain, Donald D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Caldwell, Floyd W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Caldwell, Patrick A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Caldwell, Walter F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Callaway, Michael R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Callen, Jerrold K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Callen, Ronald C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Calligan, Michael P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Camacho, Joseph P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Camblin, Gregory K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Camblin, Roy W., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Camm, John A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Campbell, Claude W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Campbell, Donald G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Campbell, Jeffrey S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Campbell, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Campbell, Timothy R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Campione, Joseph A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cannon, Randall F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Capellini, Aristide M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cardaronella, Raymond I., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cardinale, Richard O., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Carlson, Arthur C., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Carlton, Kirby M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Carolus, Duane A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Caron, Gregory S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Carpenter, Margaret J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Carroll, Alfred R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cartagena, George L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Carter, Gregory S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Carter, Percy M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Carter, Stephen P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Carter, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Caruthers, Timothy D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Casamayou, Louis J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Case, Thomas R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Casella, Domenick A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Casey, Charles W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Castello, Dale A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Castle, Ronald C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Castor, Kenneth G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Catoe, Mitchell J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Caulfield, Michael D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cavato, Marty J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Censullo, Francis X., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Certain, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Chadbourne, Robert K., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Champagne, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Chapel, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Chapin, Robert R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Chapman, Frank W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Chapman, Jack W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Chapman, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Chapman, Terry C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Chatagnier, Timothy, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cherry, Clyde S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Chestnut, David D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Childs, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Chisholm, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Christensen, Bruce P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Christiansen, Dean L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Christman, Mark L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Christol, James S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Chrystie, Keith R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Chun, Edmund B. W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Churchill, Carol L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cieciwa, Gregory A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cinibulk, Robert, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Clark, Albert L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Clark, Carter B., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Clark, Dwight E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Clark, John K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Clark, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Clark, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Clark, Nathan B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Clarke, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Clay, Dennis R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Clemons, George B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cleveland, Grover, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cleyrat, Daniel A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Clinch, Thomas P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cline, Barry P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cobb, Alan R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cochoy, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cochran, Mary A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cochran, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Coco, Terrell, T. T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Coffman, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cogswell, Brent E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cohen, Lawrence A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cohrs, Edwin W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cole, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Cole, Larry D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Coleman, Alan J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Coleman, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Coleman, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Collavo, Jon G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Collie, Allan L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Collins, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Colpitts, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx.

Colson, Howard J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Colver, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Combs, Carol A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Compton, Richard N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Conaway, Vernon W., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Condratovich, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cone, Douglas B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Coniglio, Frank J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Connors, Michael D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Conway, Patrick M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cook, Allen B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cook, David C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cook, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cook, Joann P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cook, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cooper, Michael T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cooper, Monte V., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cooper, Robert N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cooper, Ronald E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Corbett, Charles E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Corbett, Philip J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Corcoran, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Corey, Garth P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Corey, Thomas D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Corl, Wiley F. III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Cornell, Gregg L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cornell, Roger D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cornett, Michael W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cornish, Stephen R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cornwell, Jerry I., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cornwell, Larry P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Corrie, Michael D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Corsetti, Charles D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cort, Richard A. C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Corwin, Arthur J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cothran, Thomas A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Couch, Neal T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Coulon, Whitney A. III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Countryman, Frank W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Courington, Timothy H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Courtwright, Terry E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Covell, Philip A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cowan, Jay G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Coyne, James G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Coziahr, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Craig, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Craig, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Craig, William B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Crane, John B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Crawley, Alfred L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Creighton, Barry F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Crenshaw, Kent R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Crisafulli, Joseph A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Crist, Michael D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Crittenden, Burr L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Crook, Harry W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Crowder, George E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Crowson, Crandler, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cruger, Frederick, xxx-xx-xxxx
Crumley, General F. II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Crump, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Culbertson, Charles N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Culbertson, Robert K., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cummings, James B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cummings, Thomas S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cundiff, Robert D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Curnow, Rodger P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Currie, Don J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Currie, Wayne D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Curtis, Thomas L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Curtis, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Daeke, Lynn E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Daigger, Dennis P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dalecky, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dallager, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dalton, Steven E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Daly, Robert P. II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Dambly, Thomas W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Damer, Stephen R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dameron, Tommy D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Daniel, David S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Danielson, David C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Darby, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Daries, Henry J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Darnell, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Datema, Charles P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Daub, Gene C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Daughety, James T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davenport, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Daves, George L., xxx-xx-xxxx
David, Daniel H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davidson, Steven R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davies, Raymond W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davis, Frank J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davis, Harry E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davis, Jack W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davis, James N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davis, Jon M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davis, Larry M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davis, Michael R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davis, Robert P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Daws, William L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dawson, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Day, Kenneth P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Day, Kenneth R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Day, Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dayley, George W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Deaver, Maurice A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Decarlo, Juan J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Decker, Joseph F., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Defend, Alan E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Defilippi, George, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Degaetano, Joseph W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Degroot, Douglas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Delong, Darrel J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Demmert, Paul F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Demont, Leon, xxx-xx-xxxx
Dennardo, Adrian L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Denny, Frederic M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Deroos, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Deschler, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dessert, Donald M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Deterich, Taylor L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Detwiler, Gene C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Devine, Thomas P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Devinger, Garry M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dewey, Alfred J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dewitte, Michael D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dezonia, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Diamon, Charles M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dick, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dickens, Dennis D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dickman, Joseph T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dickson, Allan M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dickson, Tillman E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dicus, Lawrence M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Diedrichs, Ronald W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Diehl, Ronald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dietzel, Ronald K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dilbeck, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dilda, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dingfelder, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dinwiddie, Porter R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dionne, Ronald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dixon, Charles W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dmuchovsky, Joseph, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dobbs, William W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dobson, Thomas W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Doehling, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Doherty, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dolan, Kennth R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dolan, Kevin, xxx-xx-xxxx
Donn, Jack J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Donnell, Earlton C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Donnelly, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Donovan, Brian W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dorough, John W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dorsett, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Douglas, Frank E., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Dowell, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Downes, Earl R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Downey, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Downs, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Doyle, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Draham, Joseph J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Drake, Leslie R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Drechsler, Peter, xxx-xx-xxxx
Dreier, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Drew, Terral W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Drinkhahn, Marc L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Drown, Richard G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Drury, Johnny B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Druzak, Stephen A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Duarte, Fernan, xxx-xx-xxxx
Dubler, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ducker, George T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Duerr, Eric R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Duesler, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dugle, Brian C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Duguid, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Duhon, Allan D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Duncan, Douglas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Duncan, John C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dungan, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dunham, Alan D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dunigan, Robert G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dunkerley, Alan G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dunlap, Shanon P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dunn, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dupre, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Durant, Earl, xxx-xx-xxxx
Durant, Howard R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Durham, Richard, xxx-xx-xxxx
Durniak, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Duval, Philip R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dwight, Nelson W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dwyer, Francis J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dybis, Ronald S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dyches, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dycus, Billy L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dye, Scott M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dyer, Leslie R., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Eagan, Dennis F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Eager, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Earl, Matthew W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Eaton, Richard T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Eberly, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Eberts, Randy D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Eckert, David K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Eckert, Gregory C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Eckert, Kirk D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Edelman, Steven H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Edenfield, John N., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Edge, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Edmondson, Jeffrey K. H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Edwards, Clifford D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Edwards, Harold M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Edwards, Harry M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Edwards, John D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Edwards, Roger L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Edwards, Samuel T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Egelston, Thomas G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Eggers, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Eldridge, Everett E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ellers, Thomas W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ellis, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ellis, Richard R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Elliston, Davie M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Elston, Roger E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Emery, James D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Emmanuel, George N., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Emory, Steven R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Engel, Gary E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Engel, Gilbert A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Engelmeyer, Michael H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Enger, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Engkjer, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Engle, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Eplett, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Epperson, Gerald W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Erickson, Mark R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Erickson, Ronald C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Erie, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Erle, Allen M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ernst, John R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Esmond, Marvin R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Estock, Mark V., xxx-xx-xxxx
Etzel, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Evackd, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Evans, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Evans, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Evans, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Evans, Joseph W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Evans, Richard G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Evans, Walter J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Evenskaas, Jean M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Everett, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Eversen, Barend, xxx-xx-xxxx
Fabbre, Richard B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fackler, Robert F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fagerson, Thomas D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Failor, Dean F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fairclo, David P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fanjoy, Richard O., xxx-xx-xxxx
Farcht, Joseph J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Farmer, Francis A., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Faught, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx

Faulhaber, Kenneth B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Faust, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Favela, Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fearing, Richard R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Feay, Wayne J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Federman, Rudolph R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Femal, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fenno, Donald K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fenton, William N., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ferencak, Andrew J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fergeson, Jerry A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ferguson, Richard F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fernald, Laurance N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fernandez, Juan D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fernandezmontes, Manuel M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ferrante, Joseph R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ferranto, Michael D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ferrara, Michael T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ferrata, Charles D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ferrell, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fessler, Clifford E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fey, Ronald J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fiala, Dale A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Filburn, Ralph B., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Fillmer, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Finch, Gerald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Finke, Phillip T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Finkelstein, Leo Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Finn, Richard M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Finocchio, William F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fischer, Bruce W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fischer, Richard F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fischer, Susan, xxx-xx-xxxx
Fischer, Thomas S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fishback, Alan C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fisher, Gary C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fisher, Walter D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fisk, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fister, Kent D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fitzgerald, Baldwin G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fitzpatrick, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fitzsimmons, James J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fiumara, Henry, xxx-xx-xxxx
Fjeld, Gary J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Flanagan, Gerald F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Flanagan, Thomas P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fleishman, Mark A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fleming, Glenn J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fleming, Thomas O., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fleming, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fletcher, Dennis A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Flood, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Florey, Gregory D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fly, Hugh G., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Fontes, Joe R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ford, Lawrence E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ford, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Forsythe, Hugh H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Forton, Hugh J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Foss, Thomas P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Foster, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Foster, Larry J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fowler, Arthur F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fowler, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fowler, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fowler, Ralph H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fox, Daniel B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Franceschi, Milan J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Franchi, Joseph L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Frank, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Franks, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Franta, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Franz, Dale V., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fratt, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Freeman, Frank N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Freeman, Jerrell E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Freeman, Ralph H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Freeman, Winfield S., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
French, Craig S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Friedenstein, Charles D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Friend, Arnold L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Friend, Ronald E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fries, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Frisbie, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Frischmuth, Phillip A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Froehlich, Ralph A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fry, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fry, Stanley D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fuhrmann, Heinz E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fulghum, Steven R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fuller, George A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fulton, Rodger L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Funa, Francis M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Funk, Craig S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Furne, Larry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gabrick, Lucien P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gaffey, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gahagan, James B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Galante, Albert R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Galer, Lawrence A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gallagher, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Galli, Paul Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gallo, Daniel W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Galloway, Kenneth R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Galloway, Richard N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Garbin, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gardner, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gardner, Guy S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Garrard, Walter E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Garrett, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Garrett, Roger G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Garrison, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Garrison, Donald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Garrison, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Garrison, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Garrity, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Garvey, Robert P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gavel, John, xxx-xx-xxxx
Geeding, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gehman, John R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Geiger, Stephen H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Geith, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx
George, David B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
George, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Geringer, Larry J., xxx-xx-xxxx
German, Elmer W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gertcher, Franklin L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Getz, Randall A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gibbar, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Giedras, Peter W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gies, Gary J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Giffard, Kenny N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gilbert, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gilbert, John M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gilchrist, Ronald C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gill, Peter H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gillette, Stephen C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gilliam, Fred T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gilligan, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gilligan, Tony R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gillum, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gingras, Terry J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ginsburg, Arthur P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gipson, Floyd, xxx-xx-xxxx
Givens, Gerald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gladding, Augustus L., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Glantz, Steven F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Glisson, Jessie E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Glover, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Godbold, Tom D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Goddard, Daniel W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Goddard, Henry B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Godfrey, Paul W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Godfrey, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Goehle, James S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Goeller, Craig J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Goff, James G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Golart, Craig S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Goldenbaum, Jonathan, xxx-xx-xxxx
Golly, Alexander W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Goddart, James W., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Goode, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Goodfellow, Ronald E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Goodman, Thomas A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gore, Larry R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gorman, Charles D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gossner, Jerry A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Grace, James J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Grady, Michael D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Graham, Eddie M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Graham, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Graham, Thomas M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Granath, Lars G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Granger, Gary S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Grant, William K. F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Graser, Warren L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Grattopp, Ronald A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Graves, Henry L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Graves, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Graves, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gray, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Graybeal, Wayne T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Grayson, Phillip B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Green, Alfred L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Green, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Green, William V., IV, xxx-xx-xxxx
Greene, John F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Greenlee, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gregory, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Greschke, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Grewing, Douglas D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gridley, Haines, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Griest, John G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Griffin, John T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Griffith, Betty L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Griffith, Henry R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Griffith, Ronald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Griffith, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Grim, Frank A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Grime, Jeffrey R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Grimes, Robert R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Grimm, Barry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Grindle, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Grinnell, Richard S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Groesch, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Groff, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gross, Laurence D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Grote, Leroy W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Groves, Anthony W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Groves, Clifton E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Grubbs, Quinton, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Guenther, Lynn E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Guidry, Earl J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Guiliano, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Guirreri, Joseph A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gunn, William B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Guris, John J., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Gurrieri, Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gustafson, Philip M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gustafson, Ronald A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Guthrie, William T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Guyote, Michael F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gwaltney, Curtis H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hablenko, Nicholas C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hackleman, Ferris J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Haddock, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hadley, Tee R., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Hagedorn, Phillip R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hagelin, Richard H., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Hagenauer, Lawrence S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Haggard, Freddy M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hagins, Ralph T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Haines, Dennis, G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Haines, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Haisley, Robert E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hake, David S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hakeman, Thomas G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hall, Charles F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hall, Donald B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hall, Eddie R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hall, George T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hall, Howard W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hall William E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hallemann, Frank M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hallenbeck, Ralph G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Halloran, Michael W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Halvorson, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ham, Steven W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Haman, Donald A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hamer, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hamil, Roy A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hamilton, David, xxx-xx-xxxx
Hamilton, Vernon H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hamlin, Kenneth E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hamm, Kenneth Y., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hammervold, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hammond, Charles H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hammond, Stephen O., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hamond, Terry A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hancock, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hancock, Theodora S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Handley, Ronald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hanes, Norris H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hanlon, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx

Hannah, Steven R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hannickel, Harold L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hannigan, Joseph C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hansen, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hansen, James G. R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hansen, Wayne N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hanson, Robin H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Harbison, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Harmon, Norman D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Harper, Jack L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Harr, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Harrell, William W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Harrelson, Rick, xxx-xx-xxxx
Harrington, Elkton E., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Harris, Frank R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Harris, Harold J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Harris, John H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Harris, Lawrence H., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Harris, Phillip L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Harris, Phillip W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Harrison, Robert P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Harry, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hart, Norwood A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hart, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hartman, Roger D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hartmann, David H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Harvey, Jack R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hatch, Andrew M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hatcher, Thomas D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hathcoat, James G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hauser, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hauswirth, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Harvard, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Havelka, William F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hawkins, Herbert C., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Hawkins, Larry J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hawkley, Daniel L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hawley, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hayden, Michael V., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hayes, Daniel E. E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Haygood, Hillis E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Haynes, Kenneth W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Haynes, Ronald E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Head, Charles W., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Headrick, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Heaston, Stanley G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Heaton, Kencil J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Heely, Oliver H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Heffernan, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hefner, Richard S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hegler, Carla J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Heiman, Virgil G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Heimple, Harry H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Heindel, Mallory J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Heinitz, Darwin D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Heise, Jan A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Helfenstein, William I., xxx-xx-xxxx
Heller, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Helton, Clarence A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hemmig, Floyd G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Henderson, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Henderson, James B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Henderson, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Henges, Charles M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Henkelman, Alan W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Henley, Raymond L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Henneke, Vernon M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Henning, Elaine M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Henry, Gary G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Henry, Robert C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Henry, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Henshaw, Kenneth M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Herbert, Randy P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Herklotz, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Herman, Edward J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hermecz, Glen C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Herndon, Terry M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Heroux, Albert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Herrington, Clarence D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Herrington, Norman L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Herron, Randall A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hess, Kenneth W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hewitt, Gary R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hewitt, James U., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hicks, Graydon K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hicks, Richard Z., xxx-xx-xxxx
Higham, George D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Highley, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hightower, Charles D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hill, Larry A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hillebrand, Charles D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hillenmeyer, Donald J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Himes, David A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hinchey, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hindmarsh, George R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hiner, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hinesley, Fredrick L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hironaga, Alvin T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hish, Lloyd R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hobbins, William T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hodges, Terry B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hoe, Gary L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hofer, George E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hoffpauir, Girard, III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Hogan, Jimmy D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hogan, Patrick M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hogge, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Holden, Philip C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Holder, Ronald C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Holland, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hollis, Teddy L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Holljes, Lee T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Holmberg, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Holmes, Burton K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Holt, James W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Holtkamp, William E., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Homrig, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Honaker, Raymond R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hood, Dennis, xxx-xx-xxxx
Hood, Herman, xxx-xx-xxxx
Hooker, Walter C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hooten, Thomas F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hoover, Lloyd W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hope, Oscar C., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Hopkins, Stephen V., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Hopper, John D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hopson, Hunter S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Horacek, Jack W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Horkovich, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Horn, Stephen M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hornbaker, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Horne, John K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Horton, James T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hoskins, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hoskins, Thomas R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Houghland, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Housch, Henry A. J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
House, Richard G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Howe, Gary S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Howe, Robert M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Howell, Lawrence D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Howland, Walter T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hoyt, Wilfred F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hozier, George C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hubbard, Michael T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hubbard, Ronald P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Huber, Benedict E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Huber, Thomas P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Huchingson, William P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hudkins, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hudnall, Ralph M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hudson, Donald W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hudson, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hufnagel, Alan E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hughes, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hughes, James H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hughes, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hughson, Jerry R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Huguley, John T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hukee, Byron E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hukill, Frank W., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Hunt, Aubrey F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hunt, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hunter, Anderson G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hunter, Cedric V., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hunter, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hunter, Richard M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hunter, Thomas R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Huntington, Dean, xxx-xx-xxxx
Hurst, Randy W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hurt, Michael G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Huskey, Clyde B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hutchens, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hutchings, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hutchison, Keith D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hyatt, Kenneth A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Icenogle, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ideker, Lester H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ingersoll, Howard J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ingram, Scott D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ireland, Thomas S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Iris, Benjamin W., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Irwin, Michael S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Isachsen, Gordon A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Iittner, Daniel R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Itzen, Bernard I., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jackson, Alexander, xxx-xx-xxxx
Jackson, James A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jackson, James M., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Jackson, Michael E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jackson, Phillip L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jackson, Robert F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jacobs, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jacobs, Paul L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jacobs, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx
James, Alan R., xxx-xx-xxxx
James, George M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Janke, Donald C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Janssen, Don W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jaquier, Jules A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jeffreys, Richard T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jenkins, Richard W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jenkins, William T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jennings, Bruce A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jensen, Edward J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jensen, Larry C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jensen, Owen E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jess, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jessup, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jessup, Theodore R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jester, Russell Q., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Joachim, David, xxx-xx-xxxx
Johannes, John N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Johannes, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnson, Andrew J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnson, Byron G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnson, Charles M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnson, Chris A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnson, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnson, Freeman L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnson, Gary E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnson, Glenn R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnson, Henry B., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnson Hubert O., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnson, Jackie L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnson, James L., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnson, James M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnnso, Jeffrey W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnson, Kenneth L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnson, Larry R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnson, Lee S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnson, Raymond P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnson, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnson, Robert M. L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnson, William R., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnston, Roland W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jones, Allen L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jones, Charlie E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jones, Dennis D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jones, Finch M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jones, Marvin D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jones, Peter E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jones, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jones, Robert L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jones, Robert R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jones, Robert T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jones, Roy S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jones, Theron R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jordan, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jordan, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jordan, Larry M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Joseph, Gilbert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Joyal, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Judas, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Judice, Marc W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Juhl, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Justin, Joseph E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kahley, Thomas C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kain, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kalinowski, Leonard E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kalish, Marc, xxx-xx-xxxx
Kalisky, Peter J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kamrath, Roger A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kandler, Raymond A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kane, Paul E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kanikeberg, Gary D., xxx-xx-xxxx

Kasik, Kurt H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Katnik, Dana R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kaufman, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kaul, Mahendra, xxx-xx-xxxx
Keady, Joseph F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Keck, Philip W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Keck, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Keesee, Orville W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kehoe, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kehres, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Keil, Carl R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kelley, Philip N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kellner, Edward O., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kells, Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kelly, Edward H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kelly, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kelly, Marsden G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kendall, Thomas R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kennedy, Lexie J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kent, Charles M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kern, Larry W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Key, Fred W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Keyes, Scott A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Keyserling, Steven, xxx-xx-xxxx
Kiefel, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kieffer, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kight, Freddie C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kiland, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kile, Raymond L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Killeen, Joseph M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Killeen, Timothy P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Killian, Quentin N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kimball, Byron N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kimmel, Paul S., xxx-xx-xxxx
King, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx
King, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx
King, Jon N., xxx-xx-xxxx
King, Peter E., xxx-xx-xxxx
King, Samuel J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kirkpatrick, Robert J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kirscher, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kirschner, Frank D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kithcart, Daniel J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Klein, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kleiner, Eric J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kleiv, Thomas C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Klindt, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kline, Gregory F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Klippert, Donald A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Klovstad, Donald W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Klube, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Klungseth, Terry J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Knight, Duane W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Knouff, Warren I., xxx-xx-xxxx
Knox, Norman H., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Koehler, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Koenig, George G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Koenig, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Koerner, William S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kolarik, Francis L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kolet, Steven A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kolias, Theodore G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Koller, Duncan G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kolodzinski, David C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Konowicz, Peter, xxx-xx-xxxx
Konrad, Gregory A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Koontz, Craig L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kopecky, Gary M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kopelke, Lee W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Korenko, Charles M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Korn, Stephen C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kotti, George H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kouts, Louis A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kozak, Michael D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kraft, Bryan W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kratz, Duane L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kraus, Gerald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kraus, Gordon W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kraut, Lawrence F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Krebs, Alvin E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Krejci, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kretzer, Carl S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kriley, Ronald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Krimsky, Harold, xxx-xx-xxxx
Krippner, Dennis W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kriz, Scott R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Krock, George J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kroncke, George T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Krueger, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Krulic, James J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kruppa, Joseph N., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kubicz, Lawrence, xxx-xx-xxxx
Kudlac, Milton P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kula, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kullander, Dennis W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kunkle, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kunnen, Mark E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kuratko, Louis G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kurzen, Wayne A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kwasigroh, Larry D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lacey, Michael R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lachotta, Richard P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lafferty, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lake, Lewis V., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lake, Peter G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lamb, Douglas G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lamb, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lamb, Terry M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lambertz, Rodney H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lambirth, Randall C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lammlein, Dennis R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lamontagne, Donald A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lamontagne, Richard R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lamoureux, Claude R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lamping, Bruce R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Land, Edward C., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Landis, Dale L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Landis, Daniel J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Landry, Larry P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Landschoot, Ronald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lane, Gerald M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lane, Phillip D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lang, Alvin R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Langer, Jerry A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Langham, Derald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lanier, Laurie T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lanphear, Michael B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Larsen, Keith I., xxx-xx-xxxx
Larson, Lanny J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Larson, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lasher, Richard F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Latham, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Latimer, Gary L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Latone, William I., xxx-xx-xxxx
Laub, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lavergne, Luke A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Law, Richard T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lawrence, Lloyd R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Laws, Warren P., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Lay, Carl W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lay, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lebarron, Daniel L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Leber, Randolph F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Leblanc, Nazaire G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ledwell, David T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lee, Monte D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lee, Terry S. H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lee, Walter G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lee, Warren M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lehman, Philip C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Leighton, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Leistico, Dwayne L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Leland, Alanson H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lemke, William A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lempke, Roger P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lendzion, Dennis G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lenney, William H., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Lentini, Joseph R., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Lenz, Brian R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lenz, John O., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lenz, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Leslie, Larry F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Leuthauser, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Leveille, Brent B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lewandowski, Adrian M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lewis, Charles T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lewis, Gary A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lewis, Howard A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lewis, Joseph B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Leydorf, Michael C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lheureux, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lias, Dayre C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lichty, Michael W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lierley, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lind, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lindauer, Frank W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Linde, Martin G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lindner, Gary L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lindquist, William B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lindstrom, Jon C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Linge, Delmer J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Linhard, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Linn, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lionetti, Gerard D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lipsey, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Liss, Raymond A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Liston, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Little, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Livermore, Robert N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Locher, Roger C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Locke, Thomas M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lockhart, George B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lockie, Douglas G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Locklar, Henry C., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Lockridge, Charles W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Logan, Henry R. III., xxx-xx-xxxx
Logan, Patrick J., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx
Lohse, Gary R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lombard,, Dennis L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Long, Charles B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Long, Gregory T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Long, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Loomis, Charles H., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Looney, Robert B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lord, Lance W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lorenz, Gary E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lorenz, Kenneth D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lotti, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Louden, Larry C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lough, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Love, Ronald H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lovejoy, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lowman, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Luallin, Gerald D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lubera, William, xxx-xx-xxxx
Lucas, Ben A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lucas, Luke L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Luckett, Perry D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Luffred, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lufi, Eldon D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lukasik, Stephen M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lumby, Ronald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lumpkin, Peyton P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Luna, Bruce G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lundell, Edward A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lutterbie, Thomas P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lykins, Thomas W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lyon, James K., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lyons, James F. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lytle, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mabry, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Macaluso, Kenneth B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Macdonald, Thomas C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Macey, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Machos, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Macias, Valente, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mack, David G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Madding, Gene A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Maddox, Stephen B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Maddox, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Maddux, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Madrid, Marcos J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Madsen, James K.,, xxx-xx-xxxx
Magee, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Magill, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Magill, William S., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Maher, Joseph P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mahlum, Ronald W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mahoney, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Maisey, William A., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Malatesta, Donald J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Malinovsky, Raymond A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Malishenko, Timothy P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mallamo, Arthur J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mallery, James P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Malling, Vik C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Malone, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Manclark, John T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mandros, Harry R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Maness, Ronald D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mang, Douglas K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mangold, Sanford D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mann, Jack V., xxx-xx-xxxx
Manning, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Marchesseault, Marc R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Marcotte, John C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Marcotte, Ronald C., J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Margerum, William H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Markisello, Dennis F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Marlow, Robert T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Marquardt, Michael F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Marr, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Marsh, Cary R., xxx-xx-xxxx

Marsh, Thomas C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Marshall, Bruce E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Marshall, Walter J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Marshbank, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Martens, Daniel P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Martin, Douglas K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Martin, Roger T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Martin, Thomas C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Martin, Victor M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Marty, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Martz, Warren B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Maruniak, Charles W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Marvel, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Maskell, Kenneth T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mason, Aubrey G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mason, Willard L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Materna, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mathias, Darryll A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mathis, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Matson, Arthur R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Matthews, Warren J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mattingly, Jack D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Haupin, Warren B., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
May, Buddy G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
May, Michael G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mays, Craig W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mays, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mazzeo, George C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McAbee, Ronald D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McAlister, Amos L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCall, Michael P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCallin, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCandless, Richard D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCarl, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCart, Dickie R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McClellan, Wallace G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCloud, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCommon, Leonard V., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCool, Paul A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCormack, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCoy, James D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCracken, Guy F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCracken, Michael S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCracken, Ronald W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCracken, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCrary, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCree, William A., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
McCullum, Harold W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McDaniel, Billy G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McDonald, John D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
MsDonald, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McDonald, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McDonald, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McDonald, Thurman D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McDonald, Woodrow W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McElroy, Richard B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McFarland, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McGalliard, Michael R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McGee, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McGlasson, Allan J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McGrady, Lloyd W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McGrain, Thomas R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McGrath, Thomas J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McGrath, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McGuirk, Dennis P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McHugh, Francis J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McInnis, Helene L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McIntire, Carl A., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
McIntosh, Donald W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McIntosh, Lyn D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McKee, Thomas B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McKeever, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McKenna, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McKenzie, Burton E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McKeone, James J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McKinney, Daniel M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McKinney, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McKinney, Peter C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McLain, John H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McLatchey, Kenneth D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McLaughlin, James P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McLendon, Michael H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McLeod, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McMahon, Gerald J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McMullan, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McMurphy, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McNeese, Larry B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McNeill, Malcolm G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McNerney, Larry J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McNierney, David F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McSwain, Donald L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McSwain, Thomas C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McTernan, Myles J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
McVeigh, George M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Meadows, Roy D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Meazell, Billy G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Medders, William T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Medeiros, Louis K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Medler, Andrew P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Medlin, Kenneth A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Medvedev, Agu, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Meeboer, Richard M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Meece, Jeffrey W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Meeker, William K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Meier, Douglas C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mellor, Guy L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Melvin, Michael P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mendez, Juan G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Menke, Lawrence F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mercer, James A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Merz, Edward W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Messer, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mewhirter, Roger P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Meyers, Jay D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Meyler, William P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Michalke, Arnold D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Michaud, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mickle, David B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Middendorf, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Midtbo, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Might, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mikolajcik, Thomas R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Milam, Jerry W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miles, Richard G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, Bowman H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, Charles W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, Craig E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, Craig S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, Daniel E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, David C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, Edward C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, James E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, John R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, Paul H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, Ralph L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, William L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miller, William T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Millett, Roger T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Million, Kenneth M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mills, Edward E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mills, James W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mills, Jimmie G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Minnehan, Patrick M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Minze, Lonnie C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mioduski, Henry X., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Misciasci, Frank J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mitchell, Barry L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mitchell, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mitchell, Delmar K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mitchell, John K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mitchell, Nathan S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mitchell, Ocie L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mittendorf, Ehrard, III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mixon, Ray B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Miyasaka, Michael K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moat, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mobley, David M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mobley, Michael W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mohan, James J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moll, Ronald R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mollison, John C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Monico, Paul D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Monson, Wayne E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Montgomery, Jerry L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Montgomery, Jimmie R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moody, Charles M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moody, Richard N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moore, Benny E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moore, Carl L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moore, Francis M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moore, George F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moore, Larry J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moore, Lynn H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moore, Michael F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moore, Richard P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moore, Robert P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moore, William F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moores, Milton R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moorhead, Glen W., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moravek, William D. K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morehouse, Merl A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morell, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morey, John B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morey, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morgan, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morrell, Mark W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morris, Anthony A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morris, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morris, Dewitt L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morris, Richard P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morris, Robert C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morrison, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morrison, Wade B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Morse, David G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moss, Howard R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Moss, Richard N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Motley, Alvin, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mozingo, Lloyd M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mueller, Michael A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mueller, Timothy A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mulcaha, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mullis, Asa D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Mumme, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Munder, Guy F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Munger, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Muntz, Edelmiro, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Munninghoff, Paul, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Munson, Ronald E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Muraski, Robert, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Murdock, Joseph W., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Murphy, Daniel L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Murphy, Dennis L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Murphy, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Murr, Paul E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Murray, Timothy J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Musholt, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Myers, Clem B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Myers, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Myers, Philip G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Myers, Thomas M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Myrick, Aubrey W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nadolski, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nagel, Steven R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nall, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nardi, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nardone, Girard F., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Neal, Keith L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Neary, Thomas H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Neel, Tommy E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Neeley, Patrick F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nelson, Christopher T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nelson, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nelson, Gordon R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nelson, Jon L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nelson, Kent D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nelson, Lynn R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nelson, Michael K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nelson, Ronald E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nettleship, Robert S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Neubert, William W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Neumann, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Neustrand, Carl B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Newcomb, Jerry L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Newell, Ernest C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Newlon, Thomas H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Newman, Daniel L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Newman, Leroy F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Newsom, Phillip A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Newsom, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nicrastri, Edward D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nichol, Robin L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nichols, Allen R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nichols, Jerry L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nichols, Johnny W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nickel, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nicolaus, James J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nicosia, Vincent F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nieboer, Kourtney C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Niedergeses, Henry T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nielsen, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nielsen, Ronald A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nielsen, Wade L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nipper, Ronald M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nix, John B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Noble, Max L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Noffsinger, Joseph B., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nolting, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Nourse, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx.

Novak, Paul G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Novakowski, Frank E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nozaki, Kenneth Y., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nunn, Terry D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nuttelman, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx
O'Guin, Gerald T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ohlson, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ohs, Harold M., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Olafson, Frederick K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Oliver, Carl E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Oliver, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Oliver, Thomas W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Olofson, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Olson, Marvin A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Olver, Eric T., xxx-xx-xxxx
O'Neill, Michael E., xxx-xx-xxxx
O'Neill, Thomas P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Orellana, William B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Orenstein, Steven M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Orgeron, James J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Orler, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx
O'Rourke, Kelly K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Orr, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ortgies, Donivan D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Osborn, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Osborn, Wesley R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Osborne, Ronald C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Osterthaler, Robert T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Osthoff, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Otero, Humberto M., xxx-xx-xxxx
O'Toole, Gary A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Overstreet, Jack C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Owen, Thomas G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Owens, Raymond W., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Ozolins, John, xxx-xx-xxxx
Packard, Stephen L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Padgett, William P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Padlo, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Page, Martin L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Paige, Alan L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Paine, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Palmer, Larry R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Papizan, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Parker, Charles H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Parker, Geoffrey S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Parker, James T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Parker, Roy E., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Parker, Steven C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Parr, Randall J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Parris, Howard L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Parris, Keith R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Parsons, Fredrick A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Parsons, Theodore H., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Patrick, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Patterson, Gail F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Patterson, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Patterson, James W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Patterson, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Patterson, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Paul, Craig A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Paul, Ira S., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Paul, John S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Paul, Roger J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pavel, Arthur L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Payne, Michael W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Peach, Richard H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pearce, Charles L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pearson, Frederick Y., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pearson, Jeffrey B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pearson, Sammy W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Peck, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pecsok, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pederson, Thomas C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pedro, Verne A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pelak, Andrew J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pellegrini, Joseph, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pence, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Penney, Forrest E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Perez, Albert W., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Perkins, Glenn D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Perkins, William W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Perry, Keye E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Personett, Joseph A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Peschke, Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Petek, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Peters, Bruce E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Peters, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Peterschmidt, David C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Peterson, Danny M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Peterson, Daryl A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Peterson, Gene L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Peterson, Kenneth A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Peterson, Mark E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Peterson, Ronald J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Peterson, Walter G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Petitmermet, Thomas M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pettyjohn, Claude G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Phalen, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Phillips, Claude M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Phillips, Clyde B., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Phillips, Dan A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Phillips, James G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Phillips, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Phillips, Jonathan R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Phillips, Robert D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Phillips, William M. F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Philpitt, Donald A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Phipps, Gary J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Phipps, William R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pickard, Wallace F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Piddington, Terry J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pierce, Elihu C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pierce, Ronald C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pierce, Ronald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pineda, Pete P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pinson, Ernest A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pirrie, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pitts, Charles W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pitts, Clifford F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Plant, Robert I., xxx-xx-xxxx
Plantikow, John S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pledger, Fay J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Plotnik, Alan W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Plummer, Stephen B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Poff, Richard G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Poindexter, Jeffry A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Poling, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Polles, Jeffrey J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pollock, Thomas S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ponder, Joseph T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Poole, John A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Porter, Allen L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Porter, Thomas D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Porubski, John S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Posner, Jeffrey M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Post, Oakley L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Potts, Vernon L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Poulin, Roger G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Powell, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Powers, Theodore R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Prather, Edgar J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Prather, Jerry D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pregill, Jeremiah T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Prenger, Larry B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Presutti, Anthony H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Price, Justus V., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Price, Lyndle W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Price, Milton W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Prokuski, Leon M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Prucha, Dennis R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pruitt, Mary C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Purkey, Ronald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pursley, Lewis F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Quein, Dennis, xxx-xx-xxxx
Quinn, Andrew M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Quon, Randolph D. S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Radzykewycz, Dan T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rainey, Hal L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rakers, Raymond A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rakestraw, Don W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ranalli, Daniel J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Randall, Clarence C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ransdell, Stephen J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ransel, Alfred D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rardin, George M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rasch, Ronald H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rastetter, Arthur L., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Rastl, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ratcliffe, Arthur W., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Rathgeber, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ratliff, Phillip M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rawls, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ray, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rayment, Larry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reagan, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reale, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reaves, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Recher, Donald J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reddy, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reece, Roger P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reed, Gary I., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reed, Raymond L., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Reed, Roy L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reid, Clark G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reid, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reid, Gloria B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reid, Jay, xxx-xx-xxxx
Reid, Paul A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reiss, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reistetter, Kalman E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reiter, Berwyn A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Relyea, Richard W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rendleman, Robert T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rendon, Henry M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Renouard, Kenneth S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reusser, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Revere, Michael F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rewalt, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reynolds, Craig E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rhoades, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rhoades, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rhodes, Patrick J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rhodes, Tracy, xxx-xx-xxxx
Riccardi, Frederick V., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rice, John W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rice, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Richard, Maurice J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Richards, James M., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Richards, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Richardson, Charles L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rickenbacher, Edward M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Riesenman, John F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rifenburg, Gerard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Riffel Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Riffel, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Riley, Daniel R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Risser, Donald E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Risser, Oakly L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ritchey, Vernon S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rittenmeyer, Kenneth A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rivers, Richard F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Roane, John O., xxx-xx-xxxx
Robbins, Cleudis, xxx-xx-xxxx
Robbins, Ronald J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Roberts, Gary A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Roberts, Leonard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Roberts, Ronald J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Robertson, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Robinson, Charles G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Robinson, James N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Robinson, King S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Robinson, Lynn C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Robinson, Lynn K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Robinson, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Robison, Douglas B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Roeber, David G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rogers, Christian F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rogers, Michael E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rogers, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rogers, William G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Romer, Irving F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ronn, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ronsick, Eugene J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Roper, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Roper, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rosburg, Kenneth P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rose, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rosen, Stanley G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rosenhammer, Franz G. A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ross, Ronald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Roten, Michael H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Roth, Thomas R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Roth, Timothy A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rothschild, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rountree, Michael E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rouse, David L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Roush, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Royce, William F., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Rudolph, Gregory W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rudy, Clifford M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rue, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rule, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rummell, Charles W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Runingen, Daniel C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rudtanen, Norman H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ruotsala, Michael G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rusby, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rush, George D., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Russell, Raymond B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Russell, Steven S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rust, Alan L., xxx-xx-xxxx

Ruth, Robert F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ruth, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rutledge, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ryan, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rydjord, Michael D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sadowski, Charles, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Safley, Jon G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Salas, Jesus T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Salmon, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Salton, Ronald D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Samples, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sampsell, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sampson, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sampson, James G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Samuel, Thomas H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sandefur, Jeffrey C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sanders, Gary M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sanders, John K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sanderson, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sanford, Guy J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Santillo, Vincent J., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Sasine, Kenneth P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sassaman, William W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Savage, Bryan J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Savage, James W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Savage, Sallie A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Saxton, Harold E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Scanlan, Thomas J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Scarbrough, Gail L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schade, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schaffer, Harold A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schaffler, Mark C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schaller, Robert N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schankel, Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Scheimer, Joseph M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schenk, Horst A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Scherm, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schifferns, James J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schilling, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schlabs, Glenn H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schlottog, Garry E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schmieder, William D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schmiesing, Roy L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schneider, Francis T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schoch, Michael P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schonenberg, Paul M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schott, Douglas W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schott, Marvin A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schramm, Stephen G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schramm, Ted S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schreck, Ronald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schriever, John G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schubert, Charles W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schubert, Jeffrey A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schuler, George P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schulmeister, Glenn, xxx-xx-xxxx
Schwab, Joseph P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schwalier, Terryl J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schwall, Arthur W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schwartzel, Gerard D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schwarze, Frederick C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schwenker, Duncan H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schwingendorf, Charles O., xxx-xx-xxxx
Scott, Charles R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Scott, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Scott, Dennis M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Scott, Donald C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Scott, Gary R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Scott, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Scott, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Screws, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Seale, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Searles, Donald G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sedabres, Gilbert V., xxx-xx-xxxx
Seeley, Edgar G., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Segal, James F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Seibert, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Seibold, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Seibold, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Seiler, Louis W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Seitz, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Self, Wayne L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Semon, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Senft, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Seuell, Gordon J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sewell, George R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shafer, Timothy E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shahbaz, Clifford, J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shale, Richard B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shamer, George P., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Sharp, Thomas W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shaw, Brewster H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shaw, Charles W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sheehan, Jeremiah F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shelton, Barry A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shendow, Jan W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sheperd, James G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sherman, John S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sherrard, Ancel R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sherrill, Lawrence A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shevis, Gordon R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shields, Gary L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shields, Richard M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shimomura, Richard K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shimp, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shinoskie, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shoop, Rodney M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shore, Thaddeus W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shores, James H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Short, Jewel J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shuffer, David K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shumate, William F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shumway, Thomas R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sias, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sienicki, Theodore S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Siepmann, Randy C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sigler, Stephen A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sikra, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Silverman, Martin L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Silvis, Daniel J., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Simmons, James R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Simmons, Larry C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Simmons, Susan D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Simmons, Vincent O., xxx-xx-xxxx
Simonds, Robert C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Simons, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Simonson, Robert T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Simpson, Arthur T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Simpson, Searcy L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sims, Terry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sinosky, John T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sipos, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Siracuse, George J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sisson, Patrick L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Skakal, Carol D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Skinner, Ernest M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Skolasky, Robert A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Skoog, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Skorupa, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Skripps, Thomas W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Slagle, Christine F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Slaughter, David F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Slayton, Tison E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sledge, George M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sleeper, Leigh E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sliwa, Brian A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sloan, Charles J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sluzevich, Sam C., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Small, John T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Alexander R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Andrew P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Baron H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Charles G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Donald W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Emmerson R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, George B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Hewey E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Johnnie N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Michael R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Niles E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Philip T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, R. C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Robert J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Ronald C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Ronny C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Stephen A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Snapp, Elbridge L., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Snapp, Michael R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Snook, Terry D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Snyder, John M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Soliah, Wayne E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Solomon, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Solomon, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sonnenburg, Allen E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sonnier, Kenneth J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sopato, Frank, xxx-xx-xxxx
Soteropoulos, Steve M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sovich, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Speace, Lyle M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Speakes, Roy W., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Spears, Daniel I., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Speelman, Thomas K., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Spencer, David C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Spiers, Allen N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Spivy, Frank A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Spooner, Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Spradling, William D., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Springle, Carl, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sprinkle, Clark J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Squires, James N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stahl, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stallings, Donald H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stamas, Louis N., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Standage, William N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stanicar, David, xxx-xx-xxxx
Stanke, Edward C., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Stann, John F., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stanton, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stark, Arthur E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stassen, Thomas C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stauffer, Christian W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Steck, Phillip G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Steere, Martin G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stegman, Gary C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Steiger. Nancy L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stelling, Jimmie D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stellmon, Lawrence E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stephenson, Blair Y., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stephenson, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stern, Scott W. M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stevens, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stevenson, Kenneth E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stewart, Frederic G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stewart, Gary E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stewart, Kirk D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stewart, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stewart, William G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stickel, Jack R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stiles, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stimer, Richard R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stocks, Maurice L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stoeber, Keith A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stoehr, Martin E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stone, Alan C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stone, Bobby H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stone, Russell J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stone, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stonge, John V., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Storey, James, xxx-xx-xxxx
Stovall, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stovall, Thomas B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stowe, Stephen D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stowell, Philip G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Streater, Donald A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stremmel, Kenneth G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Strick, David C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Strickland, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Strickland, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stricklen, Raymond, xxx-xx-xxxx
Strobridge, Steven P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sturm, Steven R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stusnick, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Suarez, George L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sullivan, Paul G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sullivan, Peter K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sullivan, Ronald J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Summers, Wilson IV, xxx-xx-xxxx
Sutherland, Bruce R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sutter, Joseph E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sutter, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sutton, Gregory W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sutton, Hugh V., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sutton, William G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Swailes, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Swaim, Samuel J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Swanda, Ronald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Swanick, David R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Swanson, Richard P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Swartz, Richard L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Swats, Donald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sweetnam, George H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Swegle, Steven D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Swens, Stanley D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Swett, Ozro S. Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Swindle, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sykes, Clifton L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Symsack, Elmer F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Synychak, Roman, xxx-xx-xxxx
Szabo, James, xxx-xx-xxxx
Szafranski, Richard, xxx-xx-xxxx

Szczesniak, John G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Talbot, Terry R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Talladay, Keith R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Talley, David H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Talley, David N., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tambone, Victor J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tanabe, Dick Y., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tarleton, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tate, Martin L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tatus, Ronald F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tauscher, Leon J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Taylor, Gregory F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Taylor, John W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Taylor, Larry D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Teal, Thomas F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tedesco, Richard P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Teel, Douglas W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Terhune, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Terrill, Donald R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Terry, Patrick R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Teschner, Charles F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tetlow, Lewis J., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tetreault, Frank H., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thatcher, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Theobald, Alan C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thieke, Christopher D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thode, Paul T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thomae, Steven A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thomas, Jackie R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thomas, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thomas, Merle S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thomas, Michael L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thomas, Randall F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thomas, Roy E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thomas, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thompson, Jack R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thompson, Michael W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thompson, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thompson, Steven A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thompson, Terry L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thomson, David V., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thomson, George R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thomson, George T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thordsen, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thorius, Jerry J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thornton, Jack T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thrash, Charles M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Thurston, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tibbetts, Daniel M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tibbetts, Jeffrey L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tieman, Larry W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tihomirov, Dimitry L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tilghman, Glen A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tippett, Floyd S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tittle, John G., Jr. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tkach, Vladimir, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tobin, Michael B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Todd, Richard A., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Todd, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Toews, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Toops, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Toothman, Robert J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Topper, Dennis R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Torgeson, Michael G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Torsiello, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Toth, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Townsend John C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Townsend, Ray E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Townsend, William G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tramontana, Frank J. xxx-xx-xxxx.
Trapnell, Robert N., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Trapp, Lansford E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Traugott, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Travers, Samuel S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Travis, Tyson T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Treadway, William G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Trefethen, Michael W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tremaine, Joel L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Trenary, Frank W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Triggs, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Triplett, Henry H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Trump, William J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
True, Ted W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Truesdell, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tucker, Alan E. M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tucker, Bartow C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tupper, Norman C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Turco, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Turk, Charles F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Turman, Bobby N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Turner, David C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Turner, Marc C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Turner, Thomas L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Turquette, John N., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tushek, Gordon M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Twilley, John T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tyre, Larry W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Tyree, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Uber, Clyde W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ullman, Bruce E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Unger, Robert F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Unz, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Unzelman, Louis R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Upp, Jefferey L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Upton, Craig P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Uramkin, Richael D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Utley, Tom W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Utsunomiya, Thomas M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Utter, Harry W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Valaika, John R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Valfre, Adolph A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Valkenburg, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vanallen, Robert L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vandenbosch, Gerald L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vanderhorst, Daniel R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vankeuren, Gerald M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vanmeter, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vansickle, Judd R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vargo, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vasilchin, Douglas M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Veith, Jon D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vessey, Charles L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Via, Samuel D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Viau, Richard P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vidmar, Randolph F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Villarina, Ricardo, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vlcek, Joseph G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vldet, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vogt, Donald A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vogt, John W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vojttech, Larry J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vollmer, Charles D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vonada, John A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Voshell, Keith A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Vosmeier, Michael G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Voss, Michael, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Voss, Paul O., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wade, Richard B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wagenhofer, Joseph R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Waggener, Conrad D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wagner, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wagner, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Waldron, Matthew B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Waldrop, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walinski, Carl O., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walker, Herman, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walker, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walker, Wendall L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wall, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wall, Deonn M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wallace, Calvin G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wallace, Cleveland H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walsh, Frank J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walsh, Kenneth V., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walsh, Margaret, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walsh, Thomas E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walters, David C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walti, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Waltman, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walton, Joel, D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walton, Larry K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Walts, Gregory L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wang, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ward, Herbert M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ward, Jack D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Ward, Ralph R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wardlow, David E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wareing, John L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Warner, George R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Warner, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Warner, Mark M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Warren, Philip H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Watkins, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Watkinson, Warren B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Watring, Harry G., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Watson, Robert F., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Watt, James B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Watts, George B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wax, Charles J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Weathers, Edward B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Weaver, Dennis R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Weaver, Richard L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Weaver, Russell L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Weaver, Warren I., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Webb, Earl A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Webber, Michael D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Webster, Alan H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Weeditz, Anthony J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Weeks, Dale J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Weigel, Nicholas C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Weight, Ronald L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Weir, Ted R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Weis, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Weise, Edward W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Welch, Larry M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wells, Floyd B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wells, Kenneth R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Welsh, Michael P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wendelken, Charles P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wert, John C., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wertz, Faust H., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wesloh, Thomas J., xxx-xx-xxxx.
West, Charles T., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Westerfield, Roy W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Westover, Frederick, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wethe, Wallace K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wetherbee, Jerry L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wetters, Ronald C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Weyer, Lawrence A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Weyermuller, Arthur P., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Whalen, Eugene R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wheaton, Ronald C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wheeler, Raymond E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Whelan, Bruce E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Whicker, Elmer, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Whisman, Edward K., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Whitcomb, Darrel D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
White, Charles G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
White, Cullen L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
White, Philip A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
White, Raymond D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
White, Richard M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
White, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
White, Roy M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
White Samuel S., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Whiteford, Frederick G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Whitehouse, Floyd G., III, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Whitney, Donald G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Whitney, Roger M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Whittaker, Carleton H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Widmayer, William M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wiesner, Edward J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wildung, Kenneth L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilfong, Timothy L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilhelm, Daniel L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilkins, Henry T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilkins, Richard G., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilkinson, David M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilkinson, Edward C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilkinson, Lawrence A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilkinson, William W., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williams, Dan D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williams, Daniel S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williams, Everett O., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williams, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williams, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williams, Joseph B., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williams, Lynn T., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williams, Richard B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williams, Ronald C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williams, Terrence D., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williams, Wallace E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williams, Warren E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williamson, Gary L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williamson, Steven L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williford, Wade H., IV, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Williford, William H., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Willis, John W., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Willoughby, Jerry O., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Willoughby, Steven B., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilson, Daniel E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilson, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilson, Robert S., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilson, Shelby A., II, xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilson, Truman E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilson, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilson, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wilt, Donald C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Winfrey, David C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Winkelmann, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Winn, Joseph E., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Winn, Robert C., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wise, Jeffrey L., xxx-xx-xxxx.
Wise, Kenneth L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx.

Wiseburn, Lawrence P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wiseman, Randall M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Withers, David B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Witiw, Michael R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wittman, Thomas V., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wittwer, Leon A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Witty, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wojdyla, Henry E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wolf, Michael G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wolf, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wolfard, Neal E., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wolfe, David R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wood, Frank R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wood, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wood, Rodney W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wood, Russell O., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wood, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Woods, Mickey E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Woods, Robert R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Woodworth, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Woolley, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Worden, Leslie C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Worley, Chandler P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Worley, Walter L., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Worrell, Gary D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wren, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wyatt, Phillip P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Yake, David J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Yama, Rodney N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Yanik, Albert S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Yantiss, William E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Yarger, Gerald L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Yasuhara, Philip K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Yelmgren, Kevin E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Yett, Daniel A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Yewdall, Edward C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Young, Freddy R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Young, Gregory B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Young, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Young, Richard A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Youngblood, Herman W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Yuknavich, Anthony R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Zapalo, Peter P., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Zappa, Patrick A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Zeitler, Arthur R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Zeitler, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Zier, George S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Zilin, Barry M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Zimmerman, Alan L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Zimmerman, Donald A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Zindell, Raymand C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Zink, Vernon R., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Zorn, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Zuckerman, Meyer D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Zukatis, Albert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Zwick, Kent W., xxx-xx-xxxx

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Barton, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Qualtrough, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stainman, Theodore H., xxx-xx-xxxx

DENTAL CORPS

Altschuler, Bruce R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Anderson, Ronald W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Benenati, Fred W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Borsky, David, xxx-xx-xxxx
Gabryl, Roy S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hanson, Robert W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hott, Wayne E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Howard, James H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hurd, Joseph J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Matiasevich, Laurie N., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nealis, Michael F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Nelson, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Peluso, Joseph R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Vakay, Lloyd R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Waldrop, Thomas C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Williams, Leslie F., xxx-xx-xxxx

JUDGE ADVOCATE

Alsup, Philip F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Anderson, Perry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Armstrong, James G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bearden, John H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Beck, Ralph A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bennett, Gerald F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Casper, John E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Champney, Richard K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davidson, Kenneth L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Davis, Jay L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Erickson, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Flynn, John T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Giovagnoni, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gonzales, James J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hamlin, Geoffrey R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Heupel, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hilton, Robert G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hotchkiss, Hervey A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnston, James D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Karr, William H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lang, Robert E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mangin, Charles G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Moorman, William A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Muncaster, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Paslick, Edward N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pedersen, Gary S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Petersen, Robert L., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Phillips, Walter D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Pillari, Thomas, xxx-xx-xxxx
Senander, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Silvey, Charles, Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Strobl, Edward J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Taggart, David A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Taraska, Joseph M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Teague, Charles M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Thiessen, Michael R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Throckmorton, Ralph R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Willett, Thomas E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wilson, Douglas D., xxx-xx-xxxx

MEDICAL CORPS

Andrassy, Richard J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Beaty, Clisto D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Beezley, Michael J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Calderon, Daniel A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carlton, Paul K., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Chasen, Marvin H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Clarkson, James E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cogburn, Bobby E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Evans, William M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Farrell, Paul W., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Gillham, Rober A., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gregory, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hallett, John W., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hinman, Craig G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jaeger, Warren P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jones, Edward R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kaltenbaugh, Orie E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kronberg, Gregory M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Laws, Harry F., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
LePage, John C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lobritz, Richard W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Martin, Michael E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mays, Denton L., xxx-xx-xxxx
McGinn, Richard C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Parker, Samuel B., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Roadman, Charles H., II, xxx-xx-xxxx
Rohrer, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ruehle, Charles J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shaw, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Shield, Charles F., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Staten, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wade, Billy K., xxx-xx-xxxx

NURSE CORPS

Abbott, Henry M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Allison, Linda K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Baran, Carolyn J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Barbi, Susan J. F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Barry, Margaret J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Boothe, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bordas, Carl, xxx-xx-xxxx
Bramble, Elizabeth A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Clark, Mary E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Cox, Mary K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dicke, Marilyn A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Didier, Larry A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Eeckhoudt, Barbara A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Euler, Sandra L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gans, Genevieve A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gardner, Marsha, xxx-xx-xxxx
Gardon, Kathleen M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gould, Roberta L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gregory, Patricia D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Grubor, Darlene A. M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Henry, Lynne M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Keith, Joan L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kirk, Harold E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Klein, Kathylou A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kuhlmann, Joanne A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Marshall, Margaret C., xxx-xx-xxxx
McDaniel, Sandra F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Menzies, James A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Moses, Sharon A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ocker, Shirley M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Post, Mary A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Propp, Janet G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rafter, Myrna L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sauls, Samuel F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Seibold, Margaret A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sims, Sonia, xxx-xx-xxxx
Slusser, Jennie K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Eva F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stanford, Joyce A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stanton, Cheryle L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Valdez, Andrea A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wagner, Nancy A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Walter, John J., xxx-xx-xxxx
White, Cheryl A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Whitlock, Martha A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wilson, Faye L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wolf, Linda A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wysocki, Judith P., xxx-xx-xxxx

MEDICAL SERVICE CORPS

Beck, William R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Bower, Jeffrey H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brannon, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Delagarza, Carlos A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Edwards, Robert P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Eickhoff, Darrell E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Farmer, Mavoric J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fessler, David J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Fleming, Eugene C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Gonzales, Eugene, xxx-xx-xxxx
Greer, Willis A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hanko, James F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Head, William C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hettick, Larry K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hooper, James J., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Ingle, Robert M., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jeffrey, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Jiru, Michael W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kearns, William P., III, xxx-xx-xxxx
Marshall, Douglas W., xxx-xx-xxxx
McAlpin, Brian A., xxx-xx-xxxx
McDermott, David W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Percy, James R., xxx-xx-xxxx
Peters, Thomas A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Quintana, Jose B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Reecer, Philip E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Russell, John P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Smith, Ross C., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Sorum, Larry N., xxx-xx-xxxx
Spencer, Melvin L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Stake, Terry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Tremblay, William G., xxx-xx-xxxx
Twedt, Gordon H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Vandehey, James T., xxx-xx-xxxx
Waggoner, Jerry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wilkinson, Lorenzo K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Wyrick, Michael K., xxx-xx-xxxx

VETERINARY CORPS

Baskin, Gary B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Burrows, Richard E., xxx-xx-xxxx
Carpenter, Robert H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Clubb, Fred J., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Dungan, Paul B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Hanna, Thomas L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Harvey, Roger C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Johnson, Jeffry L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Langloss, John M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Parker, George A., xxx-xx-xxxx
Spencer, James M., xxx-xx-xxxx

BIOMEDICAL SCIENCE

Anderson, Michael P., xxx-xx-xxxx
Braendlein, Russell G., Jr., xxx-xx-xxxx
Brown, Ray D., xxx-xx-xxxx
Browne, Michael H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Coburn, Middleton J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Howard, Jay M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Kaneshird, Duane K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Keller, James L., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lamb, Neil J., xxx-xx-xxxx
Lecain, William K., xxx-xx-xxxx
Mudryk, Victor, xxx-xx-xxxx
Neill, Marvin W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Patrick, Clarence S., xxx-xx-xxxx
Porter, Paul F., xxx-xx-xxxx
Prather, Jefferson B., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rice, Robert M., xxx-xx-xxxx
Rock, James C., xxx-xx-xxxx
Ross, Jerry W., xxx-xx-xxxx
Schwebach, Gerhard H., xxx-xx-xxxx
Semenschin, Charles E., xxx-xx-xxxx

Smith, Michael F., [redacted].
Stoflet, Yvonne C., [redacted].
Sweeney, Stephen J., [redacted].
Termaath, Stephen G., [redacted].
Warnken, Reimund G., [redacted].
Wasem, Gary A., [redacted].

The following-named officer for promotion in the Regular Air Force, under the appropriate provision of chapter 835, Title 10, United States Code, as amended. Officer is subject to physical examination required by law:

LINE OF THE AIR FORCE

*Captain to major*

Fleig, Norman G., [redacted].

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the U.S. Navy for temporary promotion to the grade indicated in the line subject to qualification therefor provided by law:

LINE

*Captain*

Adams, John Lewis
Agnew, William Franklin
Albertson, William Hunter
Alderson, Donald Marr, Jr.
Alexander, Howard Wills
Allen, Galen Bruce
Almstedt, Theodore A., Jr.
Ammann, Robert Eugene
Anderson, Erns Moses
Anderson, Robert George
Arthur, Glenn Neal, Jr.
Arthur, Stanley Roger
Atkins, Gerald Lloyd
Aut, Warren Edward
Baker, Walter Fay
Bannon, John Matthew
Barlow, James Dale
Barr, Ronald Lloyd
Bartholomew, James Harold
Batzler, John Richard
Bauder, James Reginald
Bausch, Francis Adam
Bennett, Raymond D.
Biegel, Herbert Karl
Bixby, Harry Llewellyn, Jr.
Black, Cole
Blackmar, Fredrik Seward
Blackwell, Jack Lester, Jr.
Blanchard, James Williams, Jr.
Blanchard, Ralph William, Jr.
Bley, John Earl, Jr.
Bock, E. James
Bond, John Roger
Boslaugh, David Lee
Bossart, Edmound Belfour, Jr.
Bosworth, Thomas Charles
Brace, Robert Lawrence
Bracken, Leonard Anthony, Jr.
Braun, Peter Joseph
Breast, Jerry Creighton
Bredbeck, William John
Brickell, Charles H., Jr.
Browder, Edward Hughes
Brown, Nicholas
Browning, Robert Barrett
Buck, Wallace, Alfred
Bull, Norman Springer
Bullard, Jerry Lynn
Burch, William Joheph
Burgess, Harold Ernest, Jr.
Burnett, Richard Walter
Butterworth, Frank W., III
Butts, Richard Franklin
Buzzard, Robert Dow
Cabot, Alan Seymour
Cameron, Jim Foster
Cann, Thomas Peter
Cannon, James Rowland
Carmichael, E. Inman
Carry, Allan Harry
Carter, Winfred Gibson
Caruso, Amedeo Brooke
Case, Robert William
Cellar, Charles Joseph, Jr.
Channell, Ralph Norman
Chase, Warren Pritchett
Chatham, Walter Lewis
Clement, Carl Clarence, Jr.
Coakley, Stephen Anders
Cobb, Emsley Foster
Cockfield, David Wellington
Coffey, Roger Lee
Coleman, Charles Louis
Collier, Neuland Craig
Conklin, Robert Brewster
Conley, David Jack
Conway, James McNarney
Cook, Charles Fred
Corr, Peter Sarsfield, Jr.
Courtney, Warren Paul, Jr.
Cowles, Robert Roger
Coyne, William Louis
Crane, Herbert Clatton
Crummer, James Frederic
Daleke, Richard August
Dallamura, Bart Michael, Jr.
Daloia, John, Jr.
Daly, Paul Sylvester
Darby, Jack Neal
Daus, Rudolph Halouk
Dawson, Albert Lee
Dean, Ronald Irwin
Debroder, Glen George
Degroff, James Lewis
Delano, George Broughton
Demaris, Darryl Arthur
Demars, Bruce
Demmin, Lester Franz
Diehm, William Charles, III
Diley, Lewis Edwards
Dillon, John Francis
Disher, John Stephen
Donnelly, Verne George
Dopazo, Anthony John
Dougherty, Gerald Patrick
Dowd, Gregory Patrick
Duffy, Francis Joseph
Eason, William Gaberial
Eastman, Alfred Clifton, III
Easton, Ervin Ray
Eckart, James Herbert
Edberg, Walter Olaf
Edwards, Leslie Richard
Ehrman, Robert Gronau
Eidsmoe, Norman Edward
Elder, William Norman
Elie, Gayle Owen
Elmore, John Elvin
Emerson, John Robert
Emery, Robert Edward
Ervin, Billy Maxwell
Estocin, Michael John
Fancher, Allen Prude
Farino, Francis Joseph
Fend, Clarence Edwin, Jr.
Fetterman, John Henry, Jr.
Fillingane, Hulon Perry
Finley, John Lawrence
Fischer, Theodore Arthur, Jr.
Fladager, Myles Edwin
Flight, John William, Jr.
Flowers, Walter Raymond
Foote, Everett William
Ford, James Nolan
Fortenberry, Thomas Nile
Frederick, Peter Griffith
Fredrick, Russell Earl
Froid, James Carl
Fulk, Gerald Albert
Galinsky, Jerome James
Gammell, Clark Morten
Garrow, Jack Alfred
Gasser, Thomas Albert
Gelke, John Joseph
Gerhan, Charles Frederic, Jr.
Gerow, Francis William
Gibson, Robert Byron, Jr.
Gigliotti, Felix Patrick
Gilbert, Donald Bruce
Gilfry, Mason Clark
Gleim, James Mac
Gooding, Charles Lewis, Jr.
Grafius, Guy Albert Boyer
Graham, Robert Francis
Grandjean, Charles Albert
Grantman, Roger Harold
Granum, Roger Barnes
Greathouse, Edwin Allen
Greenhalgh, William T., Jr.
Grimes, Laurence Hill, Jr.
Grose, Robert Howard
Grozen, Paul Barton
Guille, Sherred Leslie
Hague, John Douglas
Haines, Collins Henry
Halle, S. Portland, III
Hamilton, Robert Barry
Hammond, Leroy Lawrence
Hamrick, Franklin Garner
Hankins, Elton Ellsworth
Hanson, Edwin Eugene
Harden, Thad Harold
Harmon, James Orlando
Harmony, Lee Donald, Jr.
Harrison, Stuart Edward
Harvey, Neil Leavitt
Harvey, Richard Morris
Hastoglis Anthony Anastes
Hekman, Peter Maynard, Jr.
Henry William Frew
Hernandez, Diego Edyl
Herzog, Louis Landon
Hettinger, Louis Paul
Hickey, John Alan
Hine, Paul Melvin, Jr.
Hine, Raymond William
Hodge, Sidney Theodore
Holt, Henry Cutter IV
Hoover, Harry Allen
Horowitz, Charles Lawrence
Hosier, Charles Stone
Hoskins, Perry Don
Hughes, Richard McBurney
Jackson, George Lester
Jackson, Robert Stanley
James Harry Rees, III
Janes, William Eastman, Jr.
Jardine, Edward Fell, Jr.
Jefferis, Lawrence Richard
Jewell, Robert William, Jr.
Johnson, Billie Dell
Johnson, Roger David
Johnson, Thomas James
Johnson, Virgil John
Jones, Gerald Leon
Jones, Harry Wilson
Jones, Roycroft Clifton, Jr.
Juergens, John Goucher
Karlen, James Herbert
Kavanagh, Robert Garza
Keene, Thomas Jack
Kellaway, Peter Walter
Kellerman, Donald Wayne
Kelso, Frank Benton, II
Kennedy, Jack Martin
Kennington, William Arthur
Kerrigan, Robert Joseph
Kiefaber, Thomas Gilbert
Kiehl, Richard Lawrence
Kirby, Alexander Griswold, Jr.
Klusmann, Charles Fredrick
Knaus, Vincent Leo
Kolaras, Demosthenes Nicolas
Kollmorgen, Frederick Joseph
Kopfman, Theodore Frank
Kramer, James Bernard, Jr.
Kraus, Kenneth Eugene
Kristof, John James
Kucera, Ronald Cornell
Kuehmeier, Joseph Karl
Kuplinski, Stanley Joseph
Langford, John McClellan
Lee, Leonard Murray.
Leopold, Robert Koller.
Lewey, Ira Dale.
Lewis, Joseph Cornelius.
Lincoln, John Robert
Lindsey, Austin Monroe.
Lockhart, John Vangundia.
Looby, Robert Joseph.
Lucken, Frank Evan.
Lund, Eugene Patrick.
Lynch, Hugh Francis.
Lynch, Will Tudor.
Lyons, William Preston.
Mack, John Allen.
MacKay, Gerald Wallace.
MacLean, Robert Evers.
Manthorpe, William H. J., Jr.
Marnane, Thomas Arthur.

Marryott, Ronald Frank.
Martin, Donald.
Masterson, Leo Sylvester.
Mathews, Donald Reuben.
Mathews, Richard Louis.
Matt, George Edward, Jr.
McArdle, Stephen, Joseph, Jr.
McCarthy, Paul Fenton, Jr.
McClellan, Billy Louis.
McDaniel, Rodney Bonner.
McDowell, Curtis Gilbert.
McGuiness, Donald Arthur.
McIntyre, James Gaylord.
McIsaas, Alban Thompson.
McKeown, Thomas Joseph, Jr.
McNish, John Edawrd.
McVoy, Robert Paul.
Melton, Wade Inzer.
Michaels, Danny James.
Milligan, Jack Roland.
Miyagawa, George Robert.
Moore, Robert Wendell.
Morrison, Robert McKay.
Mortimer, Edward Hunter, III.
Mosman, Jack Herbert.
Moss, David Lee.
Munger, Burton Lorenzo.
Murton, David Blair.
Myers, Charles Elmore.
Myers, William Kennedy, Jr.
Norby, Merlin Robert.
North, Henry Carlton, Jr.
Nyquist, John Walfrid.
O'Keefe, James Lawrence, Jr.
Olsen, Walter Edwin.
Olson, Ross Stuart.
Ormond, George, Jr.
Ortmann, Dean Allen.
Osborn, Harold Nelson.
Osborn, Oakley Ernest.
Oslun, William John.
O'Sullivan, Richard Cyril.
Paganelli, John Ernest.
Parker, Elton Council, Jr.
Pearl, Harlan Robert.
Pedersen, Dan Arthur.
Pierce, William Bernard.
Perry, Timothy John.
Peters, Richard Anthony
Petri, Gordon Louis
Pfeiffer, Paul Nelson
Picciuolo, Stephen A. D.
Pierce, John Taylor
Pillow, George Ellis, Jr.
Pingel, Leon John
Plowman, Herschel Leigh
Plumly, Charles Moulton
Poindexter, John Marlan
Pollmann, Eugene Lawrence
Potter, Thomas Benjamin, Jr.
Pray, William Lawrence
Quigley, Francis Joseph
Ratliff, William Earl
Rausch, Leonard Marcene
Rentz, William Oliphant K.
Reynolds, Marvin Dennard
Rhodes, William Kennedy, Jr.
Riendeau, Gerald Louis
Robins, John Richard
Rockwell, William Andrew
Rodriquez, William Primitivo
Roe, John Emory, Jr.
Rollins, Everett Freemont, Jr.
Rush, William Herbert
Ryan, James Wallace
Ryan, John Norman
Sackett, Dean Reynolds, Jr.
Schatzle, Francis Joseph
Scheurich, Thomas Edwin
Schuppert, Vincent Joseph
Scott, Thoms Paul
Seibert, Markley Royer
Severance, Laverne S., Jr.
Shanahan, Thomas Edward
Sharpe, Lawrence Austin
Shaughnessy, Francis Michael
Sheets, James Robert
Sheldon, George Erford, Jr.
Shepherd, David Child
Shumaker, Robert Harper
Simonton, Bennet Stocum
Skorupski, Stanley Sidney, Jr.
Slack, Stephen Roger
Slayton, Marshall Thomas
Slingerland, Raymond David
Smith, Allen, III
Smith, Barton Leroy
Smith, Dickinson Miller
Smith, Edward George
Smith, Joel Eugene
Smith, Leighton Dale
Smith, Marvin Gilford, Jr.
Smith, Richard John William
Sommers, Carl William, II
Sottak, Edward John
Sousa, Manuel Benevides, Jr.
Spadoni, Eugene Arthur
Stanard, John Dunn, Jr.
Steele, Robert Jay
Steffes, Herbert John
Stone, Jack Wayne, Jr.
Stoneback, Charles Keith
Stouffer, John Willoughby, II.
Strange, Robert Cooper
Stratton, Richard Allen
Streit, John Brent
Stuart, Charles Joseph, Jr.
Stuart, Donald Bennett
Stuntz, Harley Lorraine, III
Sutherland, Paul Edward, Jr.
Sympson, William Goebel A., Jr.
Tallman, John MacDonell.
Tansey, Eugene Albert
Taylor, John Edward
Taylor, Patterson Corwin
Test, Richard Z.
Thearle, William James
Thomas, Richard Lee
Timm, Dwight Dorwan
Todd, James Forrest
Toncray, James Roblee
Toupin, Ernest Joseph, Jr.
Trask, Ace Freeman
Trygsland, Arnold Leif
Tsantes, George, Jr.
Underwood, Fred Shurlock
Ustick, Richard Coghlan
Vandewater, George Loft, Jr.
Vandusen, Harold Leroy
Vanmetre, James Merle
Vaught, Gerald Curtis
Veatch, Philip Allen
Vehorn, Raymond Chester
Vernam, Claude Cochran
Vonperbandt, Louis Kurt
Waggoner, Donald Lee
Walker, John Alexander, Jr.
Walker, William Edward
Wallace, Richard Jay
Walling, Eugene Kirtley
Walsh, Lawrence Patrick
Walter, Joseph James
Ward, Conrad Jackson
Watson, Jerome Francis
Ways, Raymond Arthur
Webb, James Eugene
Webster, Hugh Larimer
Webster, John Alden, Jr.
Weed, John Waterbury
Well, Peter Manning
Westall, Kenneth Wayne
Westbrook, Donald Herman
Westbrook, Darrell Edwin, Jr.
White, Billy Jerl
White, Jack Martin
White, William Adrian
Wickstrand, Don Raymond
Wiecking, Kenneth David
Wigley, Lawrence Stewart
Wigley, William Walter
Wildman, John Broughton
Willever, Edward Leigh
Williams, Gerald George
Williams, James Dale
Williamson, John Patrick, Jr.
Willis, James Langley, Jr.
Wilson, John Raymond, Jr.
Wilster, Gunnar Finn
Winchester, Warren Howey
Winn, Velmer Arnold James
Witherspoon, Beverly Wilson
Wolfe, Glenn Curtiss
Wolkensdorfer, Daniel Joseph
Wood, John Dillon, Jr.
Woodlief, Frank Lyon
Yonke, William David
Yosway, Philip Fred
Young, Leonard Robert
Yurso, Joseph Francis
Zuilkoski, Ronald Robert

The following-named women officers of the U.S. Navy, for permanent promotion to the grade of captain in the line, subject to qualification therefor as provided by law:

Denby, Sara Pat
Lewis, Nancy Applewhite

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of major:

Ted O. Dickson
Darcy E. Grisier
Robert F. Harrington
William P. Lakin
Richard W. Schulz
Morgan L. Wilkinson

The following-named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of lieutenant colonel:

George L. Alvarez
William D. Amberson
Ronald S. Ambrose
James A. Amendolia
William G. Andersen
Robert C. Anderson, Jr.
William D. Armstrong, Jr.
Bradley R. Baird
Jerry K. Baird
James R. Ballard
Bradley E. Barriteau
Frank M. Batha, Jr.
Rodney A. Beal
Theodore T. Bean
Walter C. Belcher
Maurice F. Bernier, Jr.
Robert A. Berns
Lee H. Bettis, Jr.
Homer E. Bever
John A. Bicknas
Norman K. Billipp
John A. Binder
Earl T. Bowers, Jr.
Edward B. Boyle
Robert J. Bradley
Harry A. Brown, Jr.
Ross A. Brown
Terrance D. Brown
Randolph D. Brunell
Allan S. Buescher
Kenneth R. Burns
Johnnie D. Burtscher
Charles J. Bushey
Charley M. Campbell
Jose R. Campos
Eugene E. Carlton
Edward E. Carmody
Gary L. Carnicle
Hugh T. Carter
Alex H. Caylao, Jr.
Justice M. Chambers, Jr.
James F. Chapman
John C. Church
Kenneth R. Clark
William C. Cleveland, Jr.
Clovis C. Coffman, Jr.
Dillard W. Copeland
Kermit C. Corcoran
William C. Corley
William V. Cowan III
Billy J. Cox
David E. Crais
Charles E. Creamer
Edward E. Crews
Richard A. Crowe
Terry M. Curtis
Robert J. Dalton
Neil B. Danberg, Jr.
Walden L. Daniel
James M. Darnell
Michael A. Davis
Thomas E. Davis
Samuel L. Dawson
David W. Decherd
Walter E. Deese
Richard J. Deichl
Henry A. Dierker
Henry E. Dill
Edward Dimajo
Jerome Drucker
Serge R. Dube
William E. Duke
John H. Eager
Edwin E. Eloe
George J. Eschenfelder
David P. Evans
John T. Fanning
William T. Farrow
Dennis L. Faust
Richard L. Ferris
Andrew R. Finlayson
Charles E. Finney
Augustus Fitch III
Wesley L. Fox
Robert L. Frantz
Richard H. Freeman
Gary A. Fry
William R. Fry
Carlton W. Fulford, Jr.
Larry T. Garrett
Howard L. Gerlach
Perry H. Gesell
Graydon F. Geske
Henry P. Giedzinski
Robert W. Gillespie II
John P. Glasgow, Jr.
Joaquin C. Gracida
Samuel T. Gray
Garratt W. Greene
Bruce R. Greisen
Bruce E. Griesmer
James H. Guelich, Jr.
John J. Gutter
Edward R. Haines
James C. Hajduk
Jerry E. Hankins
Dennis M. Harke
Kenneth L. Harmon
William H. Harris
Berne C. Hart
William F. Harvey
Orville L. Hastie
William M. Hatch
Gale E. Healvilin
Bruce A. Heitz
Ronald A. Hellbusch
Donald H. Henze
Peter M. Hesser
Robert G. Hill
Anthony S. Hilliard
Miles M. Hodges
Richard W. Hodory

Jack Hofstra
Robert E. Holdeman
Franklin D. Holder
Allen W. Hoof
Nathaniel R. Hoskot, Jr.
James L. Hurlburt
Douglas K. Isaly
Frank M. Izenour, Jr.
Buddy K. Jackson
Jack D. Jewell
Arney M. Johnson, Jr.
Carl R. Johnson
James E. Johnson
William F. Johnson
Reginald L. Jones
Walter F. Jones
Luis A. Juarez
Lawrence G. Karch
George P. Kasson
Michael S. Kelly
Anthony L. Keyfel
Ben W. King
David E. Knop
George W. Kralovec III
Everett W. Krantz
John J. Krauer
Robert J. Kuhlman, Jr.
Coleman D. Kuhn, Jr.
Michael R. Lamb
Timothy L. Laplaunt
Joseph A. Lavigne
Francis X. Lawler, Jr.
Edmond H. Lawrence
William S. Lawrence
Alfred H. Legere
Richard A. Lenhart
James W. Lewallen
Newton A. Lieurance, Jr.
Ronald A. Longtin, Jr.
Claude L. Lott
James W. Lucey
Freddie M. Luckie
Michael G. Malone
Gerald R. Martin
William R. Masciangelo
Dean H. Matzko
Herman L. May, Jr.
William T. McAuley II
William G. McBride, Jr.
John E. McCarthy, Jr.
Jimmy W. McClung
James B. McKenney
Warren R. McPherson
Lee N. McVey
James M. Meehleder
Anthony F. Milavic
Ashby R. Miller
Kenneth W. Moore
Paul Moore, Jr.
Theodore M. Moore
James H. Mort
Don E. Mosley
Alfred H. Mossler
Richard J. Muller
Michael W. Murphy
Timothy J. Murphy
William A. Murphy
Frederick Y. Nakatani
**Russell L. Nelson**
Peter W. Oatis
Charles W. Occhipinti
Mark D. O'Connor
Robert D. Olson
John P. Oppenhuizen
Thomas F. O'Toole, Jr.
William A. Parker
James P. Perkins
Peter L. Perkins, Jr.
Guy A. Pete, Jr.
William C. Peters
Wayne E. Peterson
Daniel R. Phipps
John P. Pindel, Jr.
Robert D. Pitts
Carl N. Ponder
Paul J. Prinster
Herman W. Quest
Lewis R. Quill
Michael E. Rafferty
Arvel H. Raines
James M. Rapp
Lawrence C. Reifsnider
Larry E. Rhodes
Wayne H. Rice
Clarence E. Richards, Jr.
Paul E. Ring
Robert J. Riordan
Jack W. Rippy
Raymond J. Roettger
Edward P. Rolita, Jr.
Arden E. Romsos
Hugh A. Ronalds
James A. Ryan
Billy C. Sanders, Jr.
Eugene D. Sanford
James W. Sanders
Kenneth R. Sandstrom
Robert T. Sarles
Leroy A. Scheller, Jr.
Bernard D. Schmidt
Charles W. Schmidt
Milburn F. Schuler
Russell W. Schumacher, Jr.
Rudy T. Schwanda
William O. Schwarz
Louis E. Sergeant, Jr.
Michael N. Shahan
Thomas J. Sheridan
William B. Shively
Kenneth C. Shumate
William J. Simpson
Hurman R. Sims
Stanley C. Skrobialowski
John J. Smith
Edward A. Smyth
Donald J. Snooks
Ronald L. Sousa
Robert L. Spooner
Larry J. Springer
Richard E. Squires
James E. Stoll
Thomas D. Stouffer
Donald E. Strassenberg
John M. Suhy
John J. Sullivan
Patrick J. Sullivan
William G. Swarens
Allen M. Sweeney
Bronson W. Sweeney
Charles E. Swisher
William P. Symolon
James R. Taylor
William K. Terrell
Richard A. Thome
William F. Thompson
Ralph E. Toholsky
Jerry L. Tomlinson
Edgar A. Toney
Thomas A. Toth
Gordon E. Tubesing
Fred Tucker, Jr.
Ellsworth J. Turse, Jr.
John H. Updyke
William P. Vacca
Jay H. Vandyne
Richard L. Vogel
Richard A. Voltz
Robert A. Walden
Laurence A. Walker
Thomas U. Wall
William J. Wallace, Jr.
James P. Weaver
Terrence M. Weber
Kenneth L. Werbinski
Alfred M. West
Carlton P. White
Eddie D. Whitehead
Charles B. Whitehurst
Michael C. Wholley
Frank G. Wickersham III
Frank P. Wilbourne III
James R. Williams
Lester H. Williams, Jr.
Mark D. Williams
Roger L. Williams
Wilbur C. Williams
Richard G. Wilmes
Bruce M. Wincentsen
William D. Wischmeyer
William J. Witt
Charles F. Wolverton
Larry L. Woodruff
Bascom C. Worley S.
Eddie B. Wright
Richard J. Yeoman
Robert H. Yoder
Jon L. Zellers
Roger D. Zorens
Lester M. Zwick

The following named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of major:

Eileen M. Albertson
Patricia R. Breeding
Juanita A. Lamb
Adelaide A. Quebodeaux

The following named officers of the Marine Corps for temporary appointment to the grade of captain:

Ronald Achten
Paul R. Ahrens
Robert A. Aikman
Frank A. Alexander
Ronald H. Alnutt
Frank C. Alvidrez
Donald P. Amiotte
Gary W. Anderson
Mike D. Anderson
Richard G. Anderson
Charles P. Annis
Michael R. Antonelli
Ralph H. Anzelmo
Gary D. Appenfelder
Peter N. Ard
Craig M. Arnold
Rayfel M. Bachiller
Marion R. Baggs
Thomas A. Bailey
Christopher L. Baker, Jr.
Lorenza T. Baker
John M. Ballard
Ronald E. Balske
William E. Barker
Barney K. Barnett
Donald C. Barnett
James R. Battaglini
Salvatore A. Battista
Douglas L. Bayne
Terry E. Beane
Mark T. Beck
Curtis M. Beede
Roger P. Beebe
Ivan M. Behel
James A. Belfiore
Ronald L. Bender
Thomas E. Benim
Charles D. Bennett
Chris Bennett
Fred S. Bennett
George H. Benskin, III
Richard P. Bess, Jr.
Stephen G. Biddulph
David W. Birch
Gary W. Bisplinghoff
Thomas E. Bjerke
Carl N. Blair
Scott A. Blair
Robert L. Blake
Robert E. Blankenship, Jr.
David R. Bloomer
Robert B. Blose, Jr.
James S. Bloxom
Richard A. Boeckman
Ralf R. Boedefeld
Wiley N. Boland, Jr.
Ronald A. Bonham
James L. Booker, Sr.
Robert B. Boone
Johal R. Boteler
John F. Bouldry
William G. Bowdon, III
William L. Bowling
Denham W. Bowman
Frank E. Box
Michael H. Boyce
David R. Boyer
Errett J. Bozarth, II
Thomas O. Brannon
James V. Branum
Frank X. Braun, IV
David L. Breed
Stephen H. Brighton
Clyde S. Brinkley, Jr.
Jude T. Brock
Arthur E. Brooks
Dennis L. Brown
Michael M. Brown
Palmer Brown
Shepard R. Brown
Robert E. Braithwaite
Stephen R. Brown
Donald F. Bruey
Craig L. Bryson
Danield J. Buckle, Jr.
Richard E. Buller
Leslie H. Burnett, Jr.
Ralph G. Burnette, Jr.
Paul A. Burrows
Richard E. Burton
Walter Burzinski
Kenneth O. Bush
Ronald D. Bussey
Gary A. Butler
Patrick C. Butler
William G. Byrne, Jr.
Robert D. Cabana
Timothy A. Capron
John L. Carson
William B. Carter
Thomas E. Cartier
Mark F. Carnevale
Charles T. Carroll
William H. Carver, Jr.
Dee H. Caudill
Thomas A. Caughlan
Richard C. Cavallaro
David L. Chadwick
Ronald W. Chambless
Richard Chandler
Stephen A. Cheney
James P. Chessum
James D. Churchman
John S. Cipparone
Michael J. Clarke
Alfred F. Clarkson, Jr.
Gary W. Claunch
Edgar L. Clemons
Robert Clydesdale III
Daniel E. Cobb
John M. Cocke
John R. Cohn
Larry P. Cole
William B. Collins
George W. Colvin
Michael R. Compton
Larkin E. Conatser
Vincent P. Conroy
Kevin A. Conry
John F. Corcoran
Max A. Corley
Alfred A. Cortez
Randolph P. Cotten
George B. Courtney
James P. Courtney
Glenn B. Cowen
Jimmy R. Cox
Sam B. Crimaldi
Shawn Crabtree
Doyce W. Crook
Jack C. Cuddy
Lawrence D. Cummings
Rex L. Curtis
Thomas R. Dalton
William C. Darner
Dacre G. Davis, Jr.
Donald L. Davis
Donnie B. Davis
Hartley R. Davis II
John A. Davis
David G. Decker
Joe W. Defur
Ronald V. Deloney
Melvin W. Demars, Jr.
William Z. Dement
Henry M. Denton
Van D. Dewitt
James S. Dicks
Thomas J. Dodson
Geoffry M. Doermann
Peter R. Dorn
Peter A. Dotto
Arthur J. Douglas
Gene L. Dowell
Stephen L. Dubinsky
William R. Duke, Jr.
Troy L. Duncan
Thomas E. Dunkelberger
Charles J. Dunleavy
Roderick M. Dunlop
James M. Durham
Jan M. Durham
Rhoades E. Dutton
Mark S. Dyl
Darrel B. Ealum
Carl W. Eckhardt, Jr.
Michael C. Eddings
Michael E. Edwards
Russell E. Ellis
Russell H. Erickson
James L. Eure
Michael S. Eustis
Jack H. Evans
Alex Falcon
Timothy N. Farlow
Jackie L. Farmer
Joseph C. Fegan III
James R. Felt, Jr.
Ronald J. Fenton
Thomas D. Ferran
Larry D. Fielder
Bobby J. Fields
John T. Fink, Jr.
Bruce V. Finley, Jr.
Robert M. Flanagan
George W. Flinn
Patrick J. Flynn
Thomas R. Fox
Carl W. Fredricksen
John P. Fremin
Osmund R. Fretz III
David R. Fry
Frank C. Fuchs
Ronald J. Fuhrmann
William A. Futrell
Roger D. Gabelman
Weldon M. Gainey
Joe A. Gale
Frank M. Gallagher, Jr.
Craig D. Gallan
Francis O. Galloway, Jr.
Donald P. Garcia
Lawrence E. Garcia
Mark S. Gardner
Thomas G. Gasparenas
Paul G. Gausch
Jerome L. Geil
Theodore R. Gendron
Raymond F. Geoffroy, Jr.
Peter J. Giacobbe
William M. Given III
Terry V. Gleason
Arthur Gomez
Robert G. Goodchild, Jr.
Ellwood D. Gordon
Gregory K. Gordon
Joseph P. Gordon, Jr.
Vincent J. Goulding, Jr.
Edward J. Grabus
Vernon C. Graham
Leo J. Grassilli, Jr.
Dwight E. Gray
Stephen E. Grayner
Michael J. Greene
Christopher J. Gregor
Barry P. Griffin
Terry A. Cusic
Pedro Gutierrez
Robert E. Haber
Emory J. Hagan III
James H. Hale
John R. Hales
Geoffrey T. Hall
Christopher T. Halverson
Charles F. Hamilton
Charles W. Hammond, Jr.
Timothy J. Hannigan
Thomas G. Harleman
James R. Harper
Gerald F. Harris
James R. Harris
Thomas E. Harris
Eugene G. Harrison, Jr.
Frank R. Hart
Robert E. Hartley
Walter P. Havenstein
Emerson W. Hawkins
Mark K. Hayden
Albert L. Hayes
Thomas A. Hayman
Thomas E. Hayward
Gregory T. Hedderly
Lambert C. Heikes
Jeffrey F. Hemler
Thomas R. Henry
Glen E. Hensley
Carl M. Herdering
Peter E. Hermann
John D. Hess
Donald E. Hesse
Steven C. Hibbens
Jerry N. Higdon
William H. Hill, III
John M. Himes
Timothy J. Himes
Clyde J. Hindes
Phillip L. Hindsley
Keith M. Hirvonen
Richard P. Hobbs, Jr.
James R. Hodgson
Ronald G. Hoffmann
William Hohnhorst, Jr.
Keith T. Holcomb
Ward A. Holcomb
Tony L. Holm
George E. Holmes
Charles Z. Hook, Jr.
Julius B. Hopkins
Stephen G. Hornberger
Jackson R. Howard
Russell J. Howald
Richard A. Huck
Patrick J. Hughes, Jr.
Jeffrey L. Hull
Leroy D. Humann
Douglas E. Humston
Billy D. Hunt
Richard F. Hutchinson
Harold L. Inabinet
Carl D. Inskeep

Elmer R. Jackson
Robert B. Jacobs
William M. James, Jr.
Thomas M. Jamison
Travis L. Jardon
Reid A. Jecmen
Peter J. Jeffrey
Joseph R. Jelinski, Jr.
Stephen C. Jennings
Charles A. Johnson
Eugene Johnson
Gerald H. Johnson
Gregory J. Johnson
James P. Johnson
Leslie B. Johnson
William R. Johnson
Eric A. Jones
Richard A. Joyce
Bruce Judge
Ronald Y. Kaaekuahiwi
Terrence W. Kadyszewski
Larry R. Kapp
Robert W. Kearney
David G. Keck
Charles E. Keeler
John S. Keene
James D. Keith
John E. Kellogg
Richard L. Kelly
Philip D. Kessack
Orville P. Kindschy
Thomas R. King
William L. King
Neil T. Kinnear III
Thomas W. Kinsell
Chester C. Kinsey
Joseph R. Kletzel II
David A. Knott
Michael E. Kossey
Norbert S. Koziol
Frank T. Kremian
Stephen J. Labadie, Jr.
Charles A. Lackey
Jerry L. Lamerson
John R. Landreth
Tony C. Landry
James J. Larkin
Jon R. Larsen
Albert R. Lary
James A. Lasswell
Earl L. Lavan
Joseph F. Lawler
Jerry F. Lawlor
Kurt T. Lawson
James H. Lee III
Harry C. Leeper, Jr.
Joseph E. Leinebach, Jr.
James D. Lenard
Floyd C. Lewis
Michael M. Lincoln
Thomas C. Lish
Redmond J. Loftus, Jr.
Bruce P. Lohman
Jeffrey L. Lott
John W. Loynes
Allen J. Luma
David J. Lynn
Mark S. Macklin
John D. MacKenzie
Donald P. Magers
Harold J. Maher
Roger E. Mahoney
William S. Maire
Richard A. Maloney
David G. Mann
Leo T. Marier
John P. Marlowe
Gary F. Marte
John J. Martinoli, Jr.
Martin J. Martinson
Raymond C. Matthias
Peter S. Mayberry
Robert C. Mayes
John S. Mays
Michael J. Maxie
Andrew F. Mazzara
Dennis C. McBride
John K. McClure
Ronald L. McClure
Field McConnell
Joseph X. McCormack III
Ian D. McDonough
James H. McGee
Daniel J. McGraw
Kevin J. McHale
William E. McHenry
Hugh M. McIlroy, Jr.
Scott W. McKenzie
Gene S. Mead
William D. Meadors III
John B. Meagher
Ellory M. Medor
William K. Meisenbach
James S. Mendelson
Ronald L. Meng
Larry G. Merrifield
Donald J. Mikkelsen
Ottavio J. Milano
Richard G. Miles
Charles M. Miller
Raymond T. Miller
Stephen W. Miller
Herman W. Mollenhauer, Jr.
Frederick J. Moon
James T. Moore
Jesse, Moore
Steven B. Moore
Timothy B. Moore
Henry O. Morris
James R. Morris
Michael J. Morrison
Charles L. Mott, Jr.
Michael J. Mott
Stephen F. Mugg
Robert S. Muir
John J. Mullarkey
Charles R. Murray, Jr.
Martin L. Musella
Keith E. Nadolski
Joseph A. Najjar
Michael R. Nance
Henry Napoleon, Jr.
Michael J. Neder
Ralph D. Nelson
Steven T. Nichols
Thomas E. Nicoletti
William G. Nix
Vincent W. Norako, Jr.
Robert H. Norman
John R. North
Dennis K. Oberhelman
Thomas P. O'Brien, Jr.
James S. O'Connell
Dennis M. O'Connor
Hillman R. Odom, Jr.
Hugh K. O'Donnell, Jr.
James P. O'Donnell
Donal A. Olsen, Jr.
Glen A. Osmond, Jr.
James R. Ottaway
Larry D. Outlaw
Forrest D. Owen
Richard L. Owen
Richard L. Owen, Jr.
Lowell B. Parkerson
Cruz Pardo
Frederic A. Parker
William H. Parrish
Eugene L. Pate
Richard L. Patterson
Philip J. Paul III
Ned G. Paulson
William C. Pedrick, Jr.
Brian A. Peirano
William A Penberthy
Terry S. Pendleton
William D. Penn
William A. Pepper
Alfred L. Perry
Dane L. Peters
Dale A. Peterson
Ronald W. Peterson
Michael W. Phillips
Gerald W. Pickett
James E. Picone
Alfred M. Pitcher
Clifford C. Pittman
Thomas G. Poeltler
John P. Poole
Lewis C. Pope, Jr.
John F. Porter
Robert A. Price
J. C. Privett, Jr.
Bruce W. Prout
Paul F. Pugh
Jesse P. Pullin
James E. Queen
John A. Quinn IV
Paul F. Quinn
Donald J. Radomski
Donald W. Ramsey
Bruce A. Randall
Curtis J. Rastetter
Dewitt R. Reid, Jr.
John W. Rerucha
Larry R. Rice
Herbert C. Richardson, Jr.
Stephen A. Riggs
George H. Risch, Jr.
Carl R. Ritterspach
Charles R. Rivenbark
Raymond M. Robertson
John R. Robinson
Neil H. Robinson
Alfred R. Rocheleau
John J. Roddy, III
Albert J. Rodenberg, Jr.
George L. Rodgers
Robert W. Roesch, Jr.
Ronald D. Rogers
Gerald H. Rohloff
Mark C. Ronning
Ralph C. Rosacker II
Bowen F. Rose
James K. Ross
Robert O. Rumble
Anthony Rusnak
James E. Russell
Thomas P. Ryan
Arthur J. Rybicki
James L. Sachtleben
John W. Sams
Stephen A. Sandwich
Joseph C. Santillo
John F. Sattler
Paul R. Schroyer
Karl T. Schwelm
Gerald M. Scienski
Joe E. Scott
James M. Searing
Peter A. Seitz
Thomas R. Sellers
Robert H. Settle
Robert Shearer, Jr.
Charles N. Sherman
James S. Shi
Robert G. Shillito
Peter J. Shimonis, Jr.
Richard Y. Shintani
Larry L. Shreve
James O. Shuler
David E. Shumpert
Harold L. Siemens
Gary B. Simpson
Laurence E. Simpson
Larry J. Sims
Minter C. Skipper, Jr.
Danny R. Smith
Herbert S. Smith, Jr.
Michael H. Smith
Paul R. Smith
Isaac A. Snipes
William R. Spain
Martin J. Speer
William F. Spencer
Leonard E. Spiker, Jr.
James A. Spooner
Ronald E. Spratt
Kenneth F. Stange
Terry A. Stephan
Walter C. Stephenson
Bruce S. Steward
Darrell L. Stewart
Clay O. Stiles
Carl M. Stipe
Steven H. Stokes
Christopher B. Stoops
David K. Storey
James A. Storey III
George G. Stuart
Lynn A. Stuart
Robert C. Stuart
Jonathan W. Stull
Patrick H. Sullivan
Thomas P. Sullivan
Frank W. Sultenfuss III
Mario J. Summa
Michael P. Summers
Gary D. Sweeney
Thomas E. Swindell
Michael J. Swords
Joseph B. Tarlton
Edward Tavares
Anthony T. Tavella III
Gene A. Taylor
Thelbert F. Taylor, Jr.
Jon D. Terry
David M. Thomas
Wayne P. Thompson
Joseph Thorpe
Arleigh E. Thurston
Michael K. Thweatt
Jerome P. Todd
Terry L. Tonkin
Richard F. Travis
Eugene M. Trippleton
Gene A. Tromly, Jr.
David J. Turner
Robert G. Twigger
Joseph S. Uberman
John B. Ullman
Daniel K. Upham
Daniel Vallee
Leroy D. Vansciver
Gerald J. Varela
Michael J. Verbarendse
James E. Vesely
James S. Vintar
Robert C. Vogel
Michael Vontungeln
Gregory J. Vonwald
Paul H. Voss
John H. Wagner
James H. Walker
Richard W. Walker
Sheldon E. Walker, Jr.
William J. Walker
Thomas A. Walsh
Robert E. Walton, Jr.
Bruce M. Ward
Donald G. Warfield
Rufus J. Washington
Brett N. Watermann
Dale M. Watson
Leonard R. Webb
Patrick J. Webb
David B. Weber
Michael J. Weiss
Terry T. Weiss
Gary C. Wells
Michael H. Wesner, Jr.
William A. Whiting
William A. Whitlow
Jimmy L. Whitson
Hugh N. Wiggins
Paul A. Wilbur
James L. Wilding
John A. Wilkins
Phillip E. Williams
Bruce M. Windsor, Jr.
Wallace E. Winslow
Tony L. Winstead
Anthony P. Witek
Ronald F. Wnek
Billy W. Woodard
John C. Worl
Robert P. Wray
Charles G. Wright
Larry W. Wright
James J. Yantorn
John D. Yarbrough
Wallace E. York
John P. Yost
Alden P. Young
Charles E. Young
Dale D. Young
James M. Younkins
Arthur Yow, Jr.

The following named women officers of the Marine Corps for permanent appointment to the grade of captain:

Mary S. Burns
Elizabeth F. Burroughs
Dian S. George
Rebecca A. Heldt
Bonnie J. Lewis
Mary K. Lowery P.
Michele Manning
Patricia A. Meeler
Patricia A. Miller
Linda L. Murray
Bonni L. Sutherland

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, October 6, 1975*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*The Lord is good unto them that wait for Him, to the soul that seeketh Him.*—Lamentations 3: 25.

Eternal God, our Father, who art the source of strength, the fountain of wisdom, and whose love endures forever, we come to Thee at the beginning of this new day offering unto Thee our minds and hearts to be renewed by Thy spirit, restored by Thy power, and redeemed by Thy grace.

May the light of Thy presence shine upon our path helping us to see the way we should take and giving us courage to walk in it. Grant that the life of our people and of all people may be permeated by Thy spirit and thus find the path to a greater life together.

May the goal of our efforts be to make this world a better world in which will dwell righteousness and justice, peace and good will. Give us the creative faith which dares to walk in this way.

In the spirit of the Master we pray. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.