

NATIONAL VIETNAM VETERANS COALITION

1000 Thomas Jefferson St., Sixth Floor
Washington, D.C. 20007
(202) 338 NVVC

AO file

September-October 1988

NEWSLETTER

No. 47

J. Thomas Burch, Jr.
Chairman

Jerry Kiley
Vice Chairman

Mike Milne
Vice Chairman

William Bennett
General Secretary

John Holland
Deputy Chief of Staff

John Molloy
Northeastern Coordinator

Sibley Cooley
Southwest Coordinator

Ed Rogers
Midwest Coordinator

Michael Booth
Northwest Coordinator

Lew Ross
Western Coordinator

Dr. William Bosch
Surgeon General

Hallie Williams-Bey
Comptroller

Kent Farquhar
Director, Communications

John Parsels
Director
POW Activities

Al Hallenbrook
Director, Political Action

Hon. Don Bailey
Deputy Director, Political Action

Ted Mortenson
Deputy Director, Political Action

Britt Small
Director, Membership

John Devitt
Deputy Director, Membership

Tony Diamond
Allied Forces
Liaison

Michael Sovick, Ph.D.
Director, Agent Orange Activities

Jan Scruggs
Deputy Communications
Director

Dr. Emilio A. Rivero
Cuban-American Liaison

Jesse Soriano
Mexican-American Liaison

BG Donald Schmuck
Deputy
Western Coordinator

William Wilder
Chairman
Bylaws Committee

COALITION LEADERSHIP BREAKFAST

Nov. 12, 1988

Details in the back

AGENT ORANGE

Legislation

The Coalition has endorsed S2675, the new bill introduced by Sens. Tom Daschle (D-SD) and John Kerry (D-Mass). A "Fact-Sheet" summarizing the bill appears on the next page.

In other developments:

Sen. Daniel Moynihan (D-NY) has introduced legislation to ensure that payments to veterans from the class action settlement fund not be "counted as income for purposes of Federal assistance programs. Without the change in law many veterans may not be eligible for other benefits, such as veterans pensions, supplemental security income and food stamps, because the Agent Orange settlement payments would push them over qualifying income levels." (Stars and Stripes)

State legislation may be needed in your state. A copy of the New Jersey statute is included in this newsletter as a sample of what is needed.

Class Assistance Foundation

The Request for Proposals for utilization of the approx. \$45 million has been released, to wit:

(T)he RFP seeks proposals for outstanding and innovative projects in the following areas:

- assistance for Vietnam veterans' children with birth defects and other special needs and for the families of those children;
- counseling and support for families of Vietnam veterans;
- assistance for Vietnam veterans in obtaining government and other benefits; and
- services for disadvantaged or homeless Vietnam veterans including psychological

VETERANS' AGENT ORANGE AND VIETNAM SERVICE DISABILITIES ACT OF 1988:

FACT SHEET

The Veterans' Agent Orange and Vietnam Service Disabilities Act of 1988 would amend title 38 USC to establish rebuttable presumptions of service connection for Vietnam veterans suffering from two categories of disabilities:

1) disabilities associated with Vietnam service, specifically non-Hodgkin's lymphoma and soft-tissue sarcoma; and

2) disabilities reasonably associated with exposure to dioxin or other toxic agents in herbicides (to be determined by the VA, based on annual scientific reviews conducted by the National Academy of Sciences). While current VA regulations presume that all Vietnam veterans were exposed to dioxin and other toxic herbicides, this bill would allow the VA to rebut the presumption of exposure if reliable blood or tissue tests show that the veteran's dioxin or other toxic agent level is within or below the normal range and the veteran did not have extensive field service in Vietnam. The National Academy of Sciences would also determine "normal" levels of dioxin or other toxic agents implicated in the report.

The VA would also be required to:

- * gather, analyze, and report, on a continuing basis, clinical data from the health records of veterans examined or treated for disabilities related to dioxin or other toxic agents in herbicides;
- * establish a tissue archiving system of voluntarily contributed blood and tissue samples to facilitate future research;
- * fund independent pilot studies to determine whether or not future scientific research on Vietnam service-related disabilities is feasible; and
- * improve Agent Orange outreach services and update the Agent Orange Registry.

The Secretary of Health and Human Services would be required to submit a report on research being conducted to identify and develop treatments for exposure to dioxin and other toxic agents in herbicides.

The bill would codify certain protocol requirements relating to the Air Force Health Study (Ranch Hand Study) and ensure that the peer review group reviewing the Study is independent.

The bill would specify that remaining funds from the Centers for Disease Control's aborted Agent Orange Exposure Study be used to fund the National Academy of Sciences review, the tissue archiving system, and the pilot studies.

Cost: A CBO estimate is not yet available, but based on cost estimates for S. 1787 (our earlier bill) and related legislation, our preliminary estimate is approximately \$50 million for the first year.

UN. IN 6/51
on 6/51

[OFFICIAL COPY REPRINT]
SENATE, No. 1633

→ PASSED SENATE
ACTION UNANIMOUSLY
ON MAY 8, 1986

STATE OF NEW JERSEY

INTRODUCED FEBRUARY 3, 1986

By Senator DALTON

Referred to Committee on Institutions, Health and Welfare

AN ACT concerning public assistance payments, and amending
P. L. 1947, c. 156.

1 BE IT ENACTED by the Senate and General Assembly of the State
2 of New Jersey:

1 1. Section 19 of P. L. 1947, c. 156 (C. 44:8-125) is amended to
2 read as follows:

3 19. The fact that an applicant for public assistance or any of
4 his dependents shall be receiving, or entitled to receive, income
5 from other sources or compensation for part-time or casual services
6 shall not make such person ineligible to receive public assistance
7 if such income or compensation is insufficient to support him and
8 his dependents properly but the amount of such income or com-
9 pensation shall be taken into consideration in determining the
10 amount of his public assistance by deducting from the amount of
11 public assistance which he otherwise would be entitled to receive,
12 the amount of such income or compensation; *except that any money*
13 *received because of a settlement agreement or judgment in a law-*
14 *suit brought against a manufacturer or distributor of "Agent*
15 *Orange" for damages resulting from exposure to "Agent Orange"*
16 *shall not reduce the amount of public assistance received by the*
17 *applicant *and shall not be subject to a lien or be available for re-*
18 *payment to the State or municipality for public assistance received*
19 *by the applicant*.*

1 2. This act shall take effect immediately.

PUBLIC ASSISTANCE

Exempts "Agent Orange" awards from being considered income
for purposes of determining General Public Assistance benefits.

Matter printed in italics (this is new matter).
Matter enclosed in asterisks or stars has been adopted as follows:
*—Senate amendment adopted May 5, 1986.

counseling for post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), treatment for substances transitional housing.

Responses to the RFP must be submitted no later than November 30, 1988. Copies of the RFP can be obtained by writing:

Agent Orange Class Assistance Program
c/o Kenneth R. Feinberg, Special Master
901 15th Street, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, D.C. 20005

. . . . The Assistance Program does not seek to duplicate or replace existing services, but rather to augment those services and to work in partnership with organizations dedicated to assisting members of the class. Furthermore, the Assistance Program will focus on programs and organizations with proven records of success. Through careful funding of selected projects the Assistance Program hopes to provide an impetus for government agencies and other service providers to better address the needs and concerns of the Vietnam veteran community on an ongoing basis

The Assistance Program will not fund projects in the following areas:

- . Activities related to POWs and/or MIAs;
- . memorials for Vietnam veterans;
- . construction of general office facilities for organizations;
- . any lobbying or political activity; and
- . large scale basic research projects

Specific Eligible Programs

1. (Assistance for Children). Projects that provide direct service to the child, such as educational or rehabilitative services, will receive consideration. Similarly, the assistance program will consider supporting projects designed to integrate children with special needs into social, recreational and vocational training programs

The Assistance Program may also fund a limited number of programs that address the needs of the family of a child with special needs, such as counseling, special care or case management services. In addition, the Assistance Program will

entertain proposals for projects to help Vietnam veteran families obtain services in the community and to match volunteers with children and families in need of assistance.

The Assistance Program will also consider proposals to help launch or supplement emergency relief funds to help families of Vietnam veterans defray the costs associated with a child's health care crisis. The Assistance Program will only consider giving start-up funding to such emergency relief funds if strong community support is evident and if matching funds are available from other local or individual sources. . . .

2. Family Counseling. Organizations that submit proposals in this area should have extensive experience with family-oriented social services and/or with working with Vietnam veterans and their families.

3. Assistance in Obtaining Government Benefits. The focus of such projects should be undeserved segments of the population. Since, as noted, an extensive network of veteran service officers already exists, the Assistance Program will give particular consideration to projects that seek to extend the reach of the existing network to Vietnam veterans that have not historically taken advantage of the network's services. . . .

4. Service for Disadvantaged. The Assistance Program will consider supporting projects to provide counseling and treatment for Vietnam veterans who are victims of PTSD or who have substance abuse problems. Because of the availability of treatment from the VA and Vet Centers, the Assistance Program will look most favorably on proposals that would not overlap these services. For example, the government programs may be unable to reach veterans in remote geographic areas or in historically underserved populations. Innovative programs that combine psychological counseling with attention to other problems are particularly encouraged. . . .

Employment projects must focus on providing Vietnam veterans with real long-term jobs at decent wages rather than short-term "make work" placements. Cooperative projects involving local business and industry will be viewed with particular favor. Priority will be given to agencies that have a proven record of experience and success in employment projects.

5. Concept Papers. There are undoubtedly worthy projects that are not covered by this RFP. . . . Organizations with programs or ideas outside the scope of this RFP are encouraged to submit Concept Papers describing the proposed project and the benefits that the class would derive from the project.

"Sprayed and Betrayed" - Round I

In July 1988, a substantial body of previously classified documents was released by the National Archives. Some of the documents have now been received by the Coalition. (Others are expected to follow, including, inter alia, documents on spraying missions into Laos and Cambodia.) E.g.:

Super Orange. Dow Chemical Company has formulated an oil-based mixture of Picloram, 2, 4-D and 2,4,5-7 called SUPER ORANGE which has combined the faster acting property of ORANGE with the longer lasting characteristic of WHITE plus being effective against a broader spectrum of plants than either ORANGE OR WHITE A comparison of SUPER-ORANGE with ORANGE (from) field tests in Texas, Puerto Rico, Malaysia and Hawaii indicates that SUPER-ORANGE is a more effective defoliant (LIC Crowell, AC of S, J3 to Chief of Staff, "Operational Evaluation of SUPER-ORANGE", 17ACJ3-09 (released by Chief of Staff, Dec. 25, 1968). In a July 9, 1968 memo A.P. Beutel, vice president, Dow Chemical Company, described it as "a herbicide developed along the lines of research done at Ft. Detrick, Maryland. The product, "a broader spectrum potentially longer lasting defoliant" was developed "(a)s a result of the Joint Industry/Military meeting in May of 1965, relative to enlisting industry competences in helping to solve problems connected with the conflict in Vietnam."

(S)perate incidences of reported herbicide damage (are) attributed to leaking spray nozzles on a helicopter operation, and improper use of "empty" herbicide drums [i.e.] the result of storing gasoline in used ORANGE herbicide drums....

[Enemy] propaganda attempts to convince the local population that the herbicide chemicals not only destroy their crops, but are the cause of serious sickness and death in both humans and animals. (MAC-V, MACJ3-09, "Summary of Herbicide Damage Investigation", Nov. 20, 1969.)

On 26 October Mr. Stickney, Mr. Flamm and Major Ridalgo visited other areas where damage had occurred. The damage was not nearly as bad in those areas. Also, it is significant to note that most of these areas lie outside of the flight pattern of the herbicide aircraft. In addition, vegetables are being grown in East Da Hang (area shown in brown on map) where there has been no damage, yet Ranch Hand aircraft habitually overfly this area. Another factor which quite possibly is contributing to the vegetable damage is the disposition of empty herbicide drums. Numerous drums were noted throughout the areas of light damage north and west of the airbase. Although supposedly empty, these drums could contain small amounts of herbicide which when

vaporized would be sufficient to cause damage to the highly susceptible vegetable plants. These drums were noted in the hamlets being used for trash containers and water barrels. Since the herbicide is controlled by ARVE, they also control the disposition of empty drums (Chemical Operations Division, "Herbicide Damage to Vegetable Plots Vicinity Da Nang Air Base", Oct. 31, 1968).

A "Trip Report - Danang - October 25-26, 1968," dated Oct. 31, 1968 recommended, inter alia: "Chemical barrels must be thoroughly cleaned before selling or giving to the local population."

Use Restriction On Nov. 8, 1967, a MAC-V memorandum for Chief of Staff, "Revised Policy on Use of Defoliants urged:

a. Define a large, heavily-populated area in all four CTZs where use would be totally and publicly banned. In fact, this area would be so defined as to cover those areas where there is very little use of defoliants any longer in any case; ...

2. The purpose of this exercise would be to meet criticisms of excessive use of defoliants by clarifying that they will no longer be used in large areas, while in reality not restricting our use of defoliants (since they are not now normally used in this area anyway). In addition, there would be an escape clause to category a. above, which would permit the use of defoliants even in the prohibited area provided that a strong case could be made to MACV/JGS.

In a Nov. 20, 1968(?) memo to the ambassador from the USAID associate director for economic planning, "Proposed Herbicide Mission - Quang Duc and Phu Ben Provinces," it is noted "In addition, our knowledge of the effects of herbicides on human health is far from adequate."

Meanwhile, Back at Times Beach. MACV forecast rate for ORANGE (281,900 gal p/mo) there is approximately 18 months supply on hand in the system. In addition, \$19 million has been committed for the completion of an ORANGE production facility at Weldon Springs, Missouri plus \$9 million for raw materials (Fact Sheet, Herbicides for SEA, by Col. H.F. Greenhow, USAF, undated).

(Ed Note: Weldon Springs is reportedly close to Times Beach, Mo.)

Miscellaneous

1. Last year's CDC study concluding that most U.S. Army ground troops who served in Vietnam were not heavily exposed to TCDD, except herbicide handlers, was published on September 1,

1988, by the Journal of the American Medical Association. (Cf. Stars and Stripes, Sept. 12, 1988, p. 1).

2. "Another fact of life that mother never told us: Two scientists at the National Institutes of Health have reached the "disturbing conclusion" that a third of the scientific papers being published contain misleading statements or departed from accepted scientific practices in their research." (The Washington Spectator, September 1, 1988, p. 4).

JUDICIAL REVIEW

The House Veterans Affairs Committee today approved a bill that would give veterans a limited opportunity to appeal to the Federal courts over denials of benefits. . . .

The bill backed by the committee would give claimants access, in appealing a denial, to a new Court of Veterans Appeals that would sit in Washington. In light of this, the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Representative Peter W. Rodino, Jr., Democrat of New Jersey, asked that his committee be given substantial time for separate consideration of the bill The bill, passed 29 to 4, would grant veterans a right denied them from Colonial times. The measure would also repeal part of a Civil War-era statute that kept most claimants before the Veterans Administration from retaining lawyers. The 1866 statute limits to \$10 the fee a lawyer can charge a veteran seeking benefits from the Veterans Administration.

The different version of the measure has been approved by the Senate. Proponents of the bill see little chance for enactment of a law this year with Congress headed for an election-year adjournment in a matter of weeks. . . .

Some of Representative Montgomery's critics said today that the committee chairman knew the bill would not be enacted. (New York Times, September 16, 1988, p. A16). Rep. Lane Evans (D-Ill.), ... expressed the opinion that (the bill) would create "unresolvable problems" with the Senate (Stars and Stripes, September 26, 1988)

A committee explanation of the new draft bill ("Proposed Compromise in Reference to Judicial Review"), states: The Court of Veterans Appeals would have exclusive jurisdiction to consider. . . factual, legal and constitutional questions [under laws administered by the VA]. Decisions on legal matters could be reviewed by the Court of Appeals for the Federal Circuit . . . (emphasis added).

(T)he court would be authorized to sit at any place in the United States in order to afford veterans a reasonable opportunity to appear before the Court . . .

(A) Fees of up to \$50 for the filing of any petition with the court. . . could be waived in the case of hardship . . .

(T)he Court may not require that a person be a member of any profession in order to appear before it. . .

(The bill would) abolish limitations on fees that attorneys may charge veterans for representing them once the Veterans' Administration has made a final decision on a claim. The Court of Veterans Appeals could review and reduce fees if it finds that the fee is excessive or unreasonable.

A Different Approach is sponsored by Veterans Due Process in a case styled Marozsan v. United States, No. 86-1954 (7th Cir. 1988), wherein seven of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals's eleven judges join in a ruling that "a veteran may obtain review, not of his individual claim determination, but of unconstitutional methods employed by the V.A. in arriving at that benefits decision." According to the dissent by four judges, this "is to say that the veteran may obtain review in his individual case."

Claims Processing

Excerpts from the findings of the newly released report by the House of Representatives Committee on Government Operations ("Investigation of Disability Compensation Programs of the Veterans Administration," House Report 100-886).

The committee finds that the [Statistical Quality Control] error rates provided by the VA are inaccurate and misleading . . . VA management officials were aware of internal agency findings that the SQC error rates were being deliberately under-reported. The initial discovery of the problem was made in 1982 by the VA IG. . . subsequent to the issuance of the IG audit report, a legal consultant responsible for reviewing VA claims processing. . . concluded that the error rates are as much as three times higher than those reported by the VA. . .

An initial draft report of the task force [established in 1986 by a VA Deputy Chief Benefits Director] concluded in 1987 that the SQC process was flawed. The report stated. . .

"The station SQC presently being performed is biased for many reasons. . . self preservation dictates that error rates will be manipulated to fall within the standards."

Ten of the fifteen Republicans on the committee dissented, noting, inter alia, the testimony of VA Chief Benefits Director, R. J. Vogel:

"SQC validation program is not a method for 'catching' all erroneous cases. It is a management tool for detecting problems in the overall program performance. It is a means of detecting trends, validating regional office quality reviews, and identifying areas which require additional guidelines or training."

The majority labelled a similar quote by the Deputy Chief Benefits Director for Management "as confusing as the SQC process itself."

(The report has) been labeled "grossly misleading" by (VA) top officials "The committee appears to criticize the VA for errors that the agency's own internal reviews identify and which lead to improvements in processing quality. Cited were data from an isolated individual report and a 1982 VA Inspector General examination of a complex sampling procedure, neither of which indicated overall system quality. The committee report failed to cite significant steps taken by VA in recent years to refind quality review measures. . . . The committee's report is based on an extremely limited overview of VA claims activity and on isolated anecdotes that hardly represent either the entire system or quality improvements measures adopted in recent years. . . ."

(VA Administrator Thomas K. Turnage further challenged the contention that Board of Veterans Appeals) "decisions are reached in less than 8 minutes. The committee apparently accepted at face value a flawed statistic computed by a former BVA employee. According to VA data, each three-member panel independently deciding a case spends an average 2.7 hours per decision. BVA legal and professional staff reviews require an average additional 5.9 hours per case." (Stars and Stripes, September 12, 1988, p. 15)

NATIONAL POLITICS

The Conventions

Democratic - A Vietnam War veteran from North Carolina says he and his bamboo cage were expelled Monday from a downtown park here and he was told by police to move his vigil somewhere else

(Jim) Solomon had hoped to spend 72 hours camped in Walton's Springs Park publicizing the plight of American soldiers he believes are still being held prisoner by the Vietnamese. His

cage, a four-foot cube, is a symbolic representation of those some POWs were held in.

Police, he said, watched him Sunday night as he set up his cage and a display of POW-MIA paraphernalia for sale. One even bought a T-shirt. But a new shift took charge Monday morning and ordered him and Jere Berry, a fellow vet from Georgia, away . . .

He said the officers told him that Mayor Andrew Young had decided not to allow vendors in the park, three blocks from the convention center.

Solomon is Southeast regional director of the [Coalition member] National Forget-Me-Not Association for POW-MIAs . . . , (Wilmington (NC) Morning Star, July 19, 1988).

Republican - On the second night of the convention, (Tom) Burch led a rally of some 250 supporters who want increased government efforts to bring the POWs home. Some 200 prisoners of war from the Vietnam conflict are believed to remain in Southeast Asia.

Burch, whose coalition is a federation of 45 veterans' organizations, said his group was virtually the only one that managed a demonstration during the convention. Other groups that tried were stopped for security reasons, he said.

While at the convention, the veterans' coalition collected 500 signatures on a petition asking for a meeting with Bush on the POW issue, Burch said. He added that Bush campaign officials indicated that they probably would be able to set up a meeting between the veterans and the veep in about a month. (Alexandria (VA) Gazette Packet, August 19, 1988, p. 6).

Party Platforms

Democratic: We believe... (in) more adequate care for our Vietnam and other veterans,...

Republican: Republicans insist that Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia must provide adequate information on American POWs and MIAs..... We put the government of Vietnam on notice that there will be no improvement in U.S. - Vietnam relations until such a satisfactory full accounting has been provided by the government of Vietnam. . .

We must continue to address the unique readjustment problems of Vietnam veterans by continuing the store-front counseling, vocational training and job placement programs. We support veterans preference in federal employment and are vigilant about the serious problems associated with delayed stress reaction in combat veterans, particularly disabled and Vietnam veterans. An

intense scientific effort must continue with respect to disabilities that may be related to exposure to ionizing radiation of herbicide.

The Republican Party supports sufficient funding to maintain the integrity of the VA hospital and medical care system and the entitlement and beneficiary system. We also support the efforts of the Department of Labor to properly meet the needs of unemployed veterans, particularly disabled and Vietnam veterans.

Resumes

Like GOP vice presidential nominee Dan Quayle, most eligible members of Congress didn't fight in Vietnam.

Of 208 members of Congress of draft age between 1964-72, 4 were on active duty, 13 in Southeast Asia. Thirty were in the National Guard or Reserves and 129 did not serve, a USA TODAY survey shows.

Lawmakers stayed home for many reasons: high draft numbers, family needs, medical problems or college. (USA TODAY, Aug. 24, 1988, p.9a)

(Ed. Note: the survey appearing on the next page, which was prepared by USA Today, did not include three Vietnam veterans outside the age group: Sen. John McCain (R-Az.), Rep. John Murtha (D-Pa), Rep. Ben Blaz (R-Guam).

So Who Do You Believe?

(Sen. Dan) Quayle was defended by... J. Thomas Burch... (who) said "he served six months on active duty. He put the uniform on...."

Burch said he contacted veterans groups in Indiana yesterday and they all had praise for Quayle

"What we have trouble with is when the guy went over to Canada to avoid the draft".... (Richmond New-Leader, Aug. 19, 1988, p.5)

Jerry Kiley, vice (chairman) of the (Coalition), said coalition members were upset that Bush had chosen to defend Quayle's record at the VFW convention.....

"The issue is how he got (into the Guard). By doing that, Quayle bumped somebody off that list, and it's likely the person he bumped went to Vietnam.

"But what makes this worse is here's a hawk, a man clamoring to send our boys into battle but who did not have the courage of

Congress and Vietnam

Members of Congress born between 1938 and 1952 were eligible for the draft in the Vietnam era — 1964 through the 1972 draft lottery. Here's what they did: (Story, 4A)

ACTIVE DUTY

DEMOCRATS

Sen. Thomas Daschle, S.D., 40, Air Force 1969-72
 Sen. Chris Dodd, Conn., 44, Army 1969-75
 Sen. Wyche Fowler, Ga., 47, Army 1963-65
 *Sen. Albert Gore Jr., Tenn., 40, Army 1969-71
 *Sen. Tom Harkin, Iowa, 48, Navy 1962-67; Naval Reserves 1968-74
 *Sen. John Kerry, Mass., 44, Navy 1967-70
 Sen. Sam Nunn, Ga., 49, Coast Guard 1959-60
 Rep. Les Aspin, Wis., 50, Army 1966-68
 Rep. Les AuCoin, Ore., 45, Army 1961-64; Army Reserves 1964-67
 Rep. Jim Bates, Calif., 47, Marines 1959-63
 Rep. David Bonior, Mich., 43, Air Force 1968-72
 *Rep. Tom Carper, Del., 41, Navy 1968-73
 Rep. Ronald Coleman, Texas, 45, Army 1967-69
 Rep. Peter DeFazio, Ore., 41, Air Force 1967-71
 Rep. Ben Erdreich, Ala., 49, Army 1963-65
 Rep. Lane Evans, Ill., 37, Marines 1969-71
 Rep. Charles Hatcher, Ga., 49, Air Force 1958-62
 Rep. George Hochbrueckner, N.Y., 49, Navy 1956-59
 Rep. John LaFalce, N.Y., 48, Army 1965-67
 *Rep. Martin Lancaster, N.C., 45, Navy 1968-70
 Rep. Edward Markey, Mass., 42, Army Reserve 1968-73
 Rep. Frank McCloskey, Ind., 49, Air Force 1957-61
 Rep. Robert Mrazek, N.Y., 42, Navy 1967-69
 Rep. Leon Panetta, Calif., 50, Army 1964-66
 Rep. Tommy Robinson, Ark., 46, Navy 1959-63
 *Rep. David Skaggs, Colo., 45, Marines 1968-71; Reserve, 1971-75
 Rep. John Spratt, S.C., 45, Army 1969-71

REPUBLICANS

Sen. John Heinz, Pa., 49, Air Force 1963-69
 Sen. Gordon Humphrey, N.H., 47, Air Force 1958-62
 *Sen. Larry Pressler, S.D., 46, Army 1966-68
 Sen. Steve Symms, Idaho, 50, Marines 1960-63
 Rep. Doug Bereuter, Neb., 48, Army 1963-65
 *Rep. Hank Brown, Colo., 48, Navy 1962-66
 Rep. Dan Burton, Ind., 50, Army 1956-57
 Rep. Dan Coats, Ind., 45, Army Corps of Engineers, 1966-68
 Rep. Hal Daub, Neb., 47, Army 1966-68
 *Rep. Duncan Hunter, Calif., 40, Army 1969-71
 *Rep. Jim Kolbe, Ariz., 46, Navy 1967-69
 Rep. Jim Lightfoot, Iowa, 49, Army 1955-56, Army Reserve 1956-63
 Rep. Bob Livingston, La., 45, Navy 1961-63
 *Rep. David Martin, N.Y., 44, Marines 1966-70
 Rep. Bill McCollum, Fla., 44, Navy 1969-72
 Rep. John Miller, Wash., 50, Army 1960-61, Army Reserve 1961-69
 Rep. Charles Pashayan Jr., Calif., 47, Army 1968-70
 Rep. John Rhodes III, Ariz., Army 1968-70
 *Rep. Tom Ridge, Pa., 42, Army 1968-70
 *Rep. Denny Smith, Ore., 50, Air Guard 1958-60; Air Force 1960-67
 Rep. Robert C. Smith, N.H., 47, Navy 1966-67
 Rep. Frank Wolf, Va., 49, Army 1962-63, Army Reserve 1963-67

* means served in Southeast Asia

NATIONAL GUARD

DEMOCRATS

Sen. David Boren, Okla., 47, National Guard 1968-75
 Rep. James Bilbray, Nev., 50, Guard 1955-63, Reserve 1963-present
 Rep. Wayne Dowdy, Miss., 45, Miss. Guard, Army Reserve 1966-72
 Rep. Richard Gephardt, Mo., 47, Air National Guard 1965-71
 Rep. Claude Harris, Ala., 48, Army National Guard 1967-present
 Rep. Jimmy Hayes, La., 41, La. Air National Guard, 1968-74
 Rep. Gerald Kleczka, Wis., 44, Wis. Air National Guard, 1963-69
 Rep. Richard Lehman, Calif., 40, Army National Guard 1970-76
 Rep. Jim Slattery, Kan., 40, Army National Guard 1970-75
 Rep. Robert Thomas, Ga., 44, Ga. Air National Guard 1966-72
 Rep. Wes Watkins, Okla., 49, Okla. Air National Guard 1961-67

REPUBLICANS

Sen. Bob Kasten, Wis., 46, Air Force 1967, Wis. Air Guard 1967-72
 Sen. Dan Quayle, Ind., 41, Indiana National Guard, 1969-75
 Sen. Don Nickles, Okla., 39, Okla. National Guard 1970-76
 Rep. Rod Chandler, Wash., 46, Oregon National Guard, 1959-64
 Rep. Larry Craig, Idaho, 43, National Guard 1970-72
 Rep. Robert Walker, Pa., 45, Pa. Air National Guard 1967-73

RESERVE

DEMOCRATS

Sen. Jeff Bingaman, N.M., 44, Army Reserve, 1968-74
 Sen. Bill Bradley, N.J., 45, Air Force Reserve 1967-78
 Sen. Chris Dodd, Conn., 44, Army Reserve 1969-75
 Sen. Tim Wirth, Colo., 48, Army Reserve 1961-67
 Rep. Glenn English, Okla., 47, Army Reserve 1965-71
 Rep. Martin Frost, Texas, 46, Army Reserve 1966-72
 Rep. Dave McCurdy, Okla., 38, Air Force Reserve 1969-72
 Rep. Alan Mollohan, W.Va., 45, Army Reserve 1970-present
 Rep. Bill Nelson, Fla., 45, Army Reserve 1965-71
 Rep. Gerry Sikorski, Minn., 40, Navy Reserve 1984-present

REPUBLICANS

Rep. Joseph DioGuardi, N.Y., 47, Army Reserve 1963-69
 Rep. Bill Emerson, Mo., 50, Air Force Reserve 1964-present
 Rep. Toby Roth, Wis., 49, Army Reserve 1962-69

NO MILITARY SERVICE

- 1 - family deferment
- 2 - medical deferment
- 3 - academic deferment
- 4 - high lottery number
- 5 - eligible for draft, not called
- 6 - information not available

Name	Age	Why	Name	Age	Why
DEMOCRATS					
Senators					
Joseph R. Biden Jr., Del.	45	2	Philip Sharp, Ind.	46	6
John Breaux, La.	44	6	Lawrence Smith, Fla.	47	6
Kent Conrad, N.D.	40	4	Stephen Solarz, N.Y.	47	3,5
Patrick Leahy, Vt.	48	6	Richard Stallings, Idaho	47	5
Harry Reid, Nev.	48	1	Charles Stenholm, Texas	49	5
Donald W. Riegle, Mich.	50	6	Mike Synar, Okla.	37	4
Representatives					
Gary Ackerman, N.Y.	45	5	Robin Tallon, S.C.	42	6
Michael Andrews, Texas	44	6	Billy Tauzin, La.	45	6
Beryl Anthony Jr., Ark.	50	6	James Traficant, Ohio	47	4
Chester Atkins, Mass.	40	6	Bruce Vento, Minn.	47	6
Howard Berman, Calif.	47	3	Peter Visclosky, Ind.	39	4
Robert Borski, Pa.	39	4	Doug Walgren, Pa.	47	6
Douglas Bosco, Calif.	42	3	Henry Waxman, Calif.	48	6
Rick Boucher, Va.	42	2	Alan Wheat, Mo.	37	3,2
Terry Bruce, Ill.	44	4	Bob Wise, W.Va.	40	2
John Bryant, Texas	41	2	Howard Wolpe, Mich.	48	3
Benjamin Cardin, Md.	44	1	Ron Wyden, Ore.	39	2
Bob Carr, Mich.	45	6	REPUBLICANS		
Jim Chapman, Texas	43	5	Senators		
Tony Coelho, Calif.	46	2	Kit Bond, Mo.	49	2
George Darden, Ga.	47	2	William Cohen, Maine	47	1
Norman Dicks, Wash.	47	6	Phil Gramm, Texas	46	3
Brian Donnelly, Mass.	42	2	David Karnes, Neb.	39	3
Byron Dorgan, N.D.	46	6	Mitch McConnell, Ky.	46	5
Thomas Downey, N.Y.	39	2	Paul Trible, Va.	41	5
Richard Durbin, Ill.	43	1	Representatives		
Roy Dyson, Md.	39	6	Dick Armey, Texas	48	5
Dennis Eckart, Ohio	38	6	Richard Baker, La.	40	5
Vic Fazio, Calif.	45	2	Steve Bartlett, Texas	40	2
Edward Feighan, Ohio	40	6	Joe Barton, Texas	38	2
Floyd Flake, N.Y.	43	6	Beau Boulter, Texas	46	5
Harold Ford, Tenn.	43	6	Jack Buechner, Mo.	48	1
Barney Frank, Mass.	48	3	Dick Cheney, Wyo.	47	3
Sam Gejdenson, Conn.	40	5	Thomas Coleman, Mo.	45	5
Dan Glickman, Kan.	43	2	Larry Combest, Texas	43	2
Bart Gordon, Tenn.	39	2	Jim Courter, N.J.	46	6
Bill Grant, Fla.	45	6	5 Thomas DeLay, Texas	41	3,5
William Gray, Pa.	46	6	Michael DeWine, Ohio	41	1
Tony Hall, Ohio	46	2	Elton Gallegly, Calif.	44	5
Dennis Hertel, Mich.	49	6	Newt Gingrich, Ga.	45	1
Steny Hoyer, Md.	49	6	Fred Grandy, Iowa	40	4
Jerry Huckaby, La.	47	6	Judd Gregg, N.H.	41	2
Tim Johnson, S.D.	42	2	Steven Gunderson, Wis.	37	4
Joseph Kennedy II, Mass.	36	3	Dennis Hastert, Ill.	46	6
Peter Kostmayer, Pa.	41	4	Paul Henry, Mich.	46	5
Mickey Leland, Texas	43	6	Wally Harger, Calif.	43	6
Mel Levine, Calif.	45	2	Clyde Holloway, La.	44	2
John Lewis, Ga.	48	5	Peter Kasich, Ohio	36	4
Mike Lowry, Wash.	49	2	John Kyl, Ariz.	46	1
Robert Matsui, Calif.	46	6	Jim Leach, Iowa	45	2
Matthew McHugh, N.Y.	49	1	Trent Lott, Miss.	46	6
Kweisi Mfume, Md.	39	5	Bill Lowery, Calif.	41	2
Daniel Mica, Fla.	44	2	Dan Lungren, Calif.	41	2
George Miller, Calif.	43	1	Connie Mack, Fla.	47	1
Bruce Morrison, Conn.	43	3,4	Bob McEwen, Ohio	38	6
David Nagle, Iowa	45	2	Raymond McGrath, N.Y.	46	2
David Obey, Wis.	49	6	Michael Oxley, Ohio	44	5
David Price, N.C.	48	3	Thomas Petri, Wis.	48	3
Nick Rahall, W.Va.	39	3	Don Ritter, Pa.	47	3
Bill Richardson, N.M.	40	2	James Saxton, N.J.	45	6
Charlie Rose, N.C.	49	6	James Sensenbrenner, Wis.	45	2
Marty Russo, Ill.	44	3	Clay Shaw Jr., Fla.	49	1
Martin Sabo, Minn.	50	5	Lamar Smith, Texas	40	3
Thomas Sawyer, Ohio	43	6	Pat Swindall, Ga.	37	2
Charles Schumer, N.Y.	37	6	Tom Tauke, Iowa	37	3
			William Thomas, Calif.	46	6
			Curt Weldon, Pa.	41	6
			Bob Whittaker, Kan.	49	6

Source: USA TODAY research, *The Almanac of American Politics 1988*, the National Guard Assoc. of the United States, Vietnam Veterans in Congress

his own convictions to go himself." (Chicago Tribune, Aug. 23, 1988, p.16).

POW - MIA

Government-to-Government Negotiations

Vietnam, in a sudden abandonment of a four-week-old position, has agreed to resume cooperation with the United States on politically sensitive prisoner-of-war and missing-in-action issues, the State Department announced yesterday.

Spokeswoman Phyllis C. Oakley welcomed the Vietnamese reversal and said no U.S. "concessions" or policy changes were involved. Congressional sources said it appeared likely that the strong and adverse congressional reaction to Vietnam's Aug. 3 announcement had brought about the change in Hanoi....

Sen. John S. McCain III (R-Ariz.) and Rep. Thomas J. Ridge (R-Pa.), the sponsors of a resolution calling for the opening of U.S. and Vietnamese diplomatic "interest sections" in each other's capitals, immediately suspended their efforts at the time of the earlier Vietnamese announcement, saying they would not be manipulated by Hanoi.

Ridge said yesterday that because of Vietnam's "inconsistent approach" in recent weeks, he would "wait and see" what actually takes place on a range of humanitarian issues before restarting his legislative efforts. McCain also said he would wait and see....

Oakley said the United States is "disappointed" that Vietnam has not offered to resume cooperation on "reeducation camp: detainees.

At the invitation of Vietnam, a U.S. team will visit Hanoi next week to advance the work of U.S. nongovernmental organizations in supplying prosthetic devices to Vietnamese who lost limbs in the war, Oakley announced. (Washington Post, Aug. 31, 1988, p.A7)

In other developments:

- Vietnam has agreed to a joint effort to find the remains of U.S. servicemen who were missing in action during the Vietnam war, defense secretary Frank C. Carlucci said.... "And I am pleased to announce that joint activity will begin on Sept. 25." (Washington Post, Sept. 18, 1988, p.A7).

- Since announcing plans last May for a major troop withdrawal from Cambodia and removing its military high command with public fanfare, Vietnam has not removed any more troops and

appears unlikely to meet its declared goal of pulling out 50,000 of its soldiers this year Vietnam may be reluctant to remove additional troops because of the surprising success Khmer Rouge guerrillas have had in retaking some of the base areas evacuated by the first wave of departing Vietnamese troops. (Id., Sept. 17, 1988, p.A15)

- The number of Vietnamese 'boat people' refugees picked up by U.S. warships has already tripled over last year, Navy officials have reported.... (Id., Aug. 12, 1988, p.A 2D)

- Vietnam has asked the United States to pay the expenses of last week's rescue of three U.S. Navy fliers who crash-landed near islands claimed by Vietnam.... (Stars and Stripes, Aug. 8, 1988, p.8)

The Remains Game

The percentage of identifiable American remains being found in recent shipments to the United States by the Vietnamese government has dropped sharply, raising concerns among some U.S. government officials, a State Department source said yesterday.

The official, who asked not to be named, said that U.S. officials are puzzled by the decline, to as low as 30 to 40 percent, and are uncertain what it means. It could mean that the Vietnamese are offering many human remains to the United States in an effort to show their motivation for better relations or it could be an effort by the Vietnamese to illustrate how difficult it is to recover the remains of missing American servicemen, the official said.

Retired Army general John W. Vessey Jr., who last week told an association of families of missing U.S. servicemen of the decline, sought yesterday to minimize its importance. "What I said was that I wasn't going to get overly excited about that at the moment," he said in an interview. Vessey, who has played a key role in negotiating agreements for searches of the missing Americans, said that the Vietnamese government probably lacked adequate scientific resources to survey the remains before giving them to the United States and that Americans had asked for all remains the Vietnamese were unable to identify.

"I think we should give them credit for trying to resolve the issue. Give them credit for what they are trying to do and recognize that their technical resources are limited," the general said. (Washington Post, Aug. 2, 1988, p.A7)

Of the 77 remains returned since Gen. Vessey's original mission, only 18 have been identified. The Central Identification Laboratory has "solid indications" that most of

the 59 remains are indigenous or not identifiable. (National League of Families Update Line, Aug. 30, 1988).

Responding to the Coalition's June 30 letter to Gen. Vessey expressing concern that Vietnamese technical discussions at the Central Identification Laboratory might be educating Vietnamese to "play games" with the U.S. on forensic identifications, LTC William T. Mayall, Vessey's executive assistant, replies on Aug. 18, 1988: "None of the discussion was intended to train the Vietnamese in our techniques but rather provide an orientation to our processes. Obviously, it would be impossible to train them with any degree of efficiency within three days. . . I can assure you that no trade secrets were discussed."

U.S. Interests Section?

Excerpts from Congressional hearings on July 28, 1988, and August 2, 1988, on the McCain-Ridge bill to establish a U.S. interests section in Hanoi (Ed. Note: As noted above, the sponsors have since withdrawn the bill for the time being).

Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.): I believe that these factors [i.e. pending withdrawal from Cambodia, Vietnam's shattered economy, new generation coming to power, resentment of Soviets] will induce Hanoi to be more forthcoming in working to resolve the issues outstanding between us. Fifteen years of slow progress in resolving those issues led us to introduce this legislation. During those years, this country had de facto representation in Hanoi. Our emissaries came not from the executive branch, but from the legislative. An endless stream of Congressman visited Vietnam, seeking answers to outstanding issues. More often than not, they lacked expertise in the area, and, partly as a result, returned with inconsistent and contradictory responses. The missions of General John Vessey, for whom I have enormous respect, have increased the pace of efforts to resolve issues between our nations. It is obvious, however, that intermittent consultations by Congressmen or Presidential envoys must be supplemented by a regular dialogue in Vietnam if we are to resolve the painful legacies of the war. . .

Interests sections are used as a permanent forum for discussion of issues between nations which do not wish to establish diplomatic relations. Since 1977, for example, we have had a U.S.-staffed interests section in Cuba. . .

(T)he most vocal critics of the legislation have been the ASEAN nations. . . Four of the six ASEAN nations have embassies -- not interests section -- in Hanoi. The ASEAN nations are responsible for one seventh of Vietnam's international trade, and one third of its commerce with non-communist nations. Singapore,

an ASEAN member, is second only to Japan as Hanoi's largest free world trading partner.

Collectively, ASEAN failed to withhold diplomatic recognition and commercial relations to accomplish its own goal -- a Vietnamese withdrawal from Cambodia. Does anyone seriously believe that, after the Cambodia question is settled, ASEAN will use its leverage in ensuring that issues of concern to Americans are addressed by Hanoi? By establishing interests sections, the United States would simply be following the lead of ASEAN nations in ensuring that respective bilateral issues are addressed.

Sen. Mark Hatfield (R-Ore): A look at the Soviet occupation of Afghanistan and our ongoing diplomatic relationship with the Soviets proves that we have used the Vietnam occupation of Cambodia as a pretext to punish Vietnam, because current policymakers don't want diplomatic relations with Vietnam until that government has been punished for what it did to us in the war.

Would any member care to predict what the Department of State's reaction would be if the Vietnamese announced today that it was withdrawing all of its troops from Cambodia tomorrow? I will tell you what the U.S. response would be: Vietnam, don't you dare remove your troops from Cambodia! We don't want a civil war there. Mr. Chairman, I believe the U.S. set a Vietnamese withdrawal of Cambodia as a condition precedent to any diplomatic relationship because the U.S. wanted to make such a relationship out of the question. And now the Vietnamese are down to 100,000 troops and the U.S. may have its bluff called.

Setting aside the Vietnamese occupation of Cambodia, let's turn to what really is the major impediment to a diplomatic relationship with Vietnam - I am speaking of the resolution of the POW-MIA issue. The Department of State was quoted in last Friday's New York Times as saying that this was not a "political" issue - proving to my satisfaction that it is a good thing these officials hold appointive positions because they have no conception of what a political issue is. If the U.S. Government really wanted to put this issue to rest quickly and finally, why have we resisted setting up offices in Hanoi and Washington to facilitate the dialogue, to accelerate the process, and to remove the logistical impediments? . . . (T)he hundreds of U.S. families who have some reason to expect that the remains of their loved ones may return for a proper burial, should not have this possibility turn on a handful of meetings, typically snarled in misunderstandings and distrust, totally dependent upon long-distance follow-up.

Rep. Stephen J. Solarz (D-NY): But there are real questions as to whether this is the best time to start the normalization

process. Ever since the Vietnamese occupation of Cambodia in 1978, the United States, with the strong support of Asean, has pursued a policy designed to isolate Vietnam politically, diplomatically, and economically until such time as it withdraws its forces from Cambodia and fully cooperates with us in resolving lingering questions about our POW/MIAs. Now it appears that this policy is beginning to bear fruit. Vietnam has publicly stated its intention to withdraw its troops from Cambodia by 1990. The credibility of this statement has been strengthened by the withdrawal of approximately 20,000 Vietnamese troops from Cambodia in 1987, as well as Vietnam's announcement that it would withdraw another 50,000 troops this year.

I am very concerned that if the United States changes course at the present time, before Vietnam has completely removed its forces from Cambodia and while much more remains to be done on their incentive to carry out its stated policy on Cambodia and to more actively cooperate with us on POW/MIA matters. It would be a cruel irony if a stop intended to promote U.S. policy objectives by improving U.S. - Vietnamese relations unwittingly led to exactly the opposite result.

Rep. John F. Murtha (D-Pa): Now, in various parts of the world you can agree or disagree with the U.S. position, but my point is that once the U.S. Government has set a course, it is vital, whenever possible, that we live up to our agreement. In Southeast Asia, we have worked together with our allies. There has been an agreement that several steps have to occur before the U.S. would establish any kind of ties with Vietnam. Those steps include: that Vietnam get out of Cambodia; that we see the Vietnamese Government more open on questions of emigration and Amerasian children; and that we have more information on the MIA/POW situation. Those steps have not occurred. To establish an interests section prior to them occurring would remove the incentive for Vietnamese action and would run counter to working in the region with our allies. . .

Like it or not, agree with it or not, a concern remains in the world community that the U.S. deserted our allies in Vietnam. I hear that concern when I talk to foreign countries. They question the willingness of the U.S. to make a long term commitment. The faith of ASEAN and the viewpoint of China would be shattered by a U.S. interests section in Vietnam, and we would be seen further as an unworthy military ally.

Miscellaneous

1. The Wall Street Journal (Sept. 19, 1988, p.20) provides evidence that up to 46 crewmen, including 21 Americans and some Chinese, on the Glomar Java Sea, an oil drillship lost in a 1983 typhoon, were rescued and then incarcerated by the Vietnamese:

"(T)he crewmen probably became pawns in the Vietnamese-Chinese battle over oil-drilling rights."

2. Deja Vu (In Afghanistan) the mujaheddin use prisoners as bargaining chips. . . The rebels have recognized the value of Soviet prisoners for publicity and for future prisoner exchanges. According to mujaheddin sources, one party, Gulbuddin Helematyar's Hezb-i-Islami, has even been buying prisoners from commanders of other factions. (Washington Post, Sept. 20, 1988, p.A17).

EMPLOYMENT

Acting in concurrence with an administration request that the Veterans Job Training Act not be funded, Congress refused to put any money into the Veterans Administration (VA) appropriation for the program for fiscal year 1989. The means for all practical purposes the Veterans Job Training Act program will cease to exist in about one week as the last million dollars is obligated.

PL 100-323 The Veterans Employment, Training and Counseling Act signed by President Reagan this May authorized \$60 million a year for two years to extend the Veterans Job Training Act. Many of the critical provisions of PL 100-323, such as counseling and training, were predicated upon the Veterans Job Training Act being funded. PL 100-323 now provides little new substantive assistance to unemployed and underemployed veterans.

The new law, noted former Veterans Affairs Committee Chairman Alan Simpson (R-Wyo.), goes a long way toward preserving, protecting and expending the existing Veterans Employment Service bureaucracy, but does little for the unemployed veteran.

The Veterans Job Training Act, originally enacted in 1983, showed great promise for assisting unemployed veterans. Initially the VA and the Department of Labor made a concerted effort to effectively implement the program. Over 600,000 veterans applied and nearly 200,000 job training slots were approved.

But the program encountered serious problems because there was not an effective counseling assessment and matching program to provide essential supportive services. The Department of Labor rebuffed efforts from the private sector and other federal agencies to develop an effective computer-based matching and assessment system as mandated by law. Eventually, the program suffered a 60 percent dropout rate and only 40,000 veterans ever completed training.

The poor performance of the Department of Labor in turn soured the Appropriations Committee position on the Act and eventually led to their unwillingness to appropriate fund for the program. . .

Thus, once well-paid and productive veterans (now dislocated) are being shunted into menial, non-productive, low-paying jobs in which there is little potential of their increasing inflation. (Stars and Stripes, Aug. 8, 1988, p.3)

PTSD

Dr. John E. Helzer, a professor of psychiatry at Washington University, . . . found a rate of 20 percent in a very small sample of wounded veterans who were among the survey population. . .

Medical scientists have developed some understanding of why the afflicted startle so easily. "These people apparently have very high levels of norepinephrine," says (Dr. Lawrence O. Kolb Norepinephrine is a hormone that activates the adrenal gland. . .

(T)he federal Centers for Disease Control found chronic posttraumatic stress disorder in only 2 percent of veterans. But preliminary findings from (Richard A) Kulka's study (i.e. Research Triangle Institute) indicate that as many as 15 percent may have it. . .

There is enough denial and forgetfulness among victims, says Kulka, that the CDC probably missed many cases that were picked up by the institute's interviewers. . .

Interestingly, the centers' study found that the disorder hit hardest among blacks, the underprivileged and those who had behavioral difficulties as children. . .

Mysteriously, the Centers for Disease Control found significantly higher rates fo the disorder among veterans who served before 1968. . .

The good news in the studies is that for the most part veterans have readjusted well to civilian life. More than 60 percent of those who have married are married to first wives, and most are gainfully employed, according to the CDC. Sixty to 75 percent are free of psychiatric symptoms of any sort, says Kulka. (Insight, Aug. 22, 1988, pp. 50-51)

PANEL IS TOLD V.A. FACES DEEP CRISIS

Hospital Chiefs Say Deficits Have Forced Cuts in Staff and Health Services

By BEN A. FRANKLIN

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, Sept. 7 — The Veterans Administration's nationwide hospital network was described at a Congressional hearing today as being in a deep financial crisis that has left it understaffed, poorly maintained and forced to use money meant for medical equipment to pay salaries.

The House Veterans Affairs Committee heard from a long list of witnesses it had summoned to answer its charge, in a report last month, that under the Reagan Administration the V.A. had taken 13,000 hospital beds out of service without reporting the reduction.

Congress has required the agency to maintain 90,000 beds at the 172 V.A. medical centers, the world's largest health care system with an annual budget of \$8.4 billion.

Although he acknowledged that the V.A. has only 73,588 beds available, Maj. Gen. Thomas K. Turnage, a retired National Guard division commander who has been the agency's Administrator since 1986, said that by counting 12,000 nursing home beds and 6,000 others temporarily out of service for "building renovations," the total meets the Congressional requirement.

Statement Is Contradicted

"The V.A. is providing quality medical care," General Turnage said. But his testimony that "we have not turned away any veteran whose care is mandated by Congress" was directly contradicted by one of the agency's senior hospital managers and challenged indirectly by others.

Dr. Wendell Musser, the chief of staff of the V.A. Medical Center in Atlanta, said eligible veterans seeking medical care there "have been turned away" because the hospital ran a \$5 million deficit this year. He calculated that the systemwide shortage was \$1.5 billion.

"We will do our best," Dr. Musser said. "But I am sorry, we will ration health care because we have no other choice. We have reached a crisis level."

Other V.A. hospital directors from Boston, Chicago and Salisbury, N.C., acknowledged delays of from two to six months in scheduling surgical and other admissions.

Poor Management Blamed

One of them, John Fears, director of the V.A. Medical Center at Hines, Ill., near Chicago, said his hospital had been referring veterans with Medicare coverage to private hospitals.

"We use equipment money for salaries," Mr. Fears said. "It's like eating an arm to feed the body."

The hearing on a hospital care financial problem that members of Congress in both parties attributed to a lack of data and poor management by the Veterans Administration followed a similar disclosure by the Senate Veterans Affairs Committee.

In a statement today, that panel's chairman, Senator Alan Cranston, Democrat of California, charged that the Veterans Administration had "withheld from Congress vital information" on the "adverse effects on veterans' medical care" of President Reagan's final budget. Senator Cranston said an unpublished V.A. task force report estimated that the agency's medical care budget for the fiscal year, beginning Oct. 1 would fall \$819 million short of the hospitals' needs.

'We Have Done Well'

Testifying near the end of today's, nearly five-hour hearing, General Turnage insisted that, although "perceptions will differ" about the readiness of V.A. hospitals in different parts of the country, "across the board we have done well." He said that, while there was a "grievous shortage of nurses" at the agency's Manhattan Medical Center, the nursing staff at the V.A. hospital in Brooklyn is "at 97 percent."

Dr. John Gronval, the V.A.'s chief medical director, said that changes in treatment, such as more out-patient visits and quicker patient discharges, had brought a more rapid decline in hospital admissions than the decline in available beds.

Representative G. V. Sonny Montgomery, the 68-year-old Mississippi Democrat who heads the committee, gave General Turnage a list of dozens of veterans he said had been denied medical treatment at V.A. hospitals: "And some of them are my cousins," he added, amid laughter.

One Democratic committee member, Representative Charles W. Stenholm of Texas, tried to place some of the responsibility on Congress. "We have overpromised" veterans in legislation creating their benefits, he said, then failed to provide the money.

But Mr. Montgomery disagreed. "Over the years," he told General Turnage, "you haven't made enough requests for money."

WOMENS MEMORIAL

A bill to place a memorial to American women who served in the Vietnam war passed the House of Representatives by unanimous consent

But the bill differs substantially from the one passed resoundingly by the Senate in mid-June.

That proposal, which is for a stature of a lone Army nurse sited on the ground of the 2.2 acre Vietnam Veterans Memorial, has been criticized by many because it unusually specific wording circumvents two federal monumental advisory boards, the National Capitol Planning Commission (NCPC) and the Commission of Fine Arts (CFA). Both hands rejected proposal for a memorial on that site last year.

The House bill reestablishes the role of the two boards by stipulating that the guidelines of the 1986 Commemorative Works Act be followed. Under that act, which guided the establishment of the recently approved Korean War veterans monument, the Vietnam women's memorial will have to get approval on design and placement. The committee report attached to the bill does, however, recommend that the women's memorial be put on the Vietnam memorial site. (Washington Post, September 24, 1988).

BULLETIN BOARD

1. The Veterans News, 3220 N St., N.W., Suite 244, Washington, D.C. 20007, has begun publishing.

2. Programs: "Liberty. . . Let Freedom Sing." Contact Chris Parr, "Musically Speaking," 8029 Hazel Avenue, Orangevale, cal. 95662.

"The American Dream Interrupted," The Jackie Marx Project, American Dream Enterprises, Inc., P.O. Box 38, Wes Dundee, Illinois 60118, (312) 426-6733.

3. 2nd Annual Richmond Remembers Vietnam Veterans Reunion, February 3-5, 1989. Contact Tet '68, Inc., P.O. Box 31885, Richmond, Virginia 23294

- H.R.M.S.

NATIONAL VIETNAM VETERANS COALITION

1000 Thomas Jefferson St., Sixth Floor
Washington, D.C. 20007
(202) 338 NVVC

COALITION LEADERSHIP BREAKFAST

DATE: Saturday, November 12, 1988

PLACE: Quality Hotel
1200 N. Courthouse
Arlington, Virginia 22201
(703) 524-4000
(Near Courthouse Metro Station on Orange Line)

TIME: 9:00 a.m. - 12:00 noon)

1) The next meeting of the Coalition leadership breakfast will be held on Saturday, November 12, 1988 in Arlington, Virginia, speeches are to be announced.

2) The breakfast is being hosted by the New York POW/MIA Awareness Coalition.

3) Since seating is limited it is strongly requested and recommended that reservations be made as soon as possible. Cancellations will be accepted up to 48 hours in advance of the breakfast. Reservations should be accompanied by a check for \$20.00 per person. Officers and Board Members of Coalition member groups are urged to be in attendance.

JTB/dmr

J. Thomas Burch, Jr.
Chairman

Jerry Kiley
Vice Chairman

Mike Milne
Vice Chairman

William Bennett
General Secretary

John Holland
Deputy Chief of Staff

John Molloy
Northeastern Coordinator

Sibley Cooley
Southwest Coordinator

Ed Rogers
Midwest Coordinator

Michael Booth
Northwest Coordinator

Lew Ross
Western Coordinator

Dr. William Bosch
Surgeon General

Halle Williams-Bey
Comptroller

Kent Farquhar
Director, Communications

John Parsels
Director
POW Activities

Al Hallenbrook
Director, Political Action

Hon. Don Bailey
Deputy Director, Political Action

Ted Mortenson
Deputy Director, Political Action

Britt Small
Director, Membership

John Devitt
Deputy Director, Membership

Tony Diamond
Allied Forces
Liaison

Michael Sovick, Ph.D.
Director, Agent Orange Activities

Jan Scruggs
Deputy Communications
Director

Dr. Emilio A. Rivero
Cuban-American Liaison

Jesse Soriano
Mexican-American Liaison

BG Donald Schmuck
Deputy
Western Coordinator

William Wilder
Chairman
B/Laws Committee

I desire to continue receiving the Coalition Newsletter.

I am/am not able to send a donation.

Donation of ___ is enclosed.

NATIONAL VIETNAM VETERANS COALITION

1000 Thomas Jefferson St., Sixth Floor
Washington, D.C. 20007

BREAKFAST RESERVATION FORM

Saturday, November 12, 1988
Quality Hotel
1200 N. Courthouse
Arlington, Virginia 22201
(703) 524-4000

J. Thomas Burch, Jr.
Chairman

Jerry Kiley
Vice Chairman

Mike Milne
Vice Chairman

William Bennett
General Secretary

John Holland
Deputy Chief of Staff

John Molloy
Northeastern Coordinator

Sibley Cooley
Southwest Coordinator

Ed Rogers
Midwest Coordinator

Michael Booth
Northwest Coordinator

Lew Ross
Western Coordinator

Dr. William Bosch
Surgeon General

Hallie Williams-Bey
Comptroller

Kent Farquhar
Director, Communications

John Parsels
Director
POW Activities

Al Hallenbrook
Director, Political Action

Hon. Don Bailey
Deputy Director, Political Action

Ted Mortenson
Deputy Director, Political Action

Britt Small
Director, Membership

John Devitt
Deputy Director, Membership

Tony Diamond
Allied Forces
Liaison

Michael Sovick, Ph.D.
Director, Agent Orange Activities

Jan Scruggs
Deputy Communications
Director

Dr. Emilio A. Rivero
Cuban-American Liaison

Jesse Soriano
Mexican-American Liaison

BG Donald Schmuck
Deputy
Western Coordinator

William Wilder
Chairman
Bylaws Committee

I will attend the Coalition breakfast on November 12, 1988.

I cannot attend the Coalition breakfast.

1. Name: _____

Organization: _____

Street Address: _____

City and State: _____

2. Name: _____

Organization: _____

Street Address: _____

City and State: _____

3. Name: _____

Organization: _____

Street Address: _____

City and State: _____

Enclosed is _____ for _____ reservations.

Make check payable to National Vietnam Veterans Coalition,
1000 Thomas Jefferson St., N.W., Suite 600, Washington, D.C.
20007 in the amount of \$20.00.

READERSHIP SURVEY

NATIONAL VIETNAM VETERANS COALITION
1000 Thomas Jefferson St., N.W.
Suite 600
Washington, D.C. 20007